California
STATE LIBRARY
FOUNDED 1850
PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE, SHAPING OUR FUTURE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

California Library Services Board
December 3, 2014

California State Library
914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
Sacramento, CA

REGULAR BUSINESS
10:30am – 12:00pm

CLOSED SESSION
12:45pm – 4:30pm

RESUME REGULAR BUSINESS
IN OPEN SESSION
4:30pm – 5:00pm

For further information contact:
Sandy Habbestad
California State Library
P.O. Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
(916) 653-7532
sandy.habbestad@library.ca.gov
http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/board/agendas/agendas.html

A. BOARD OPENING

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   Welcome and introductions of Board members, staff, and audience
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
   Consider agenda as presented or amended
3. **Approval of September 2014 Board Minutes – *Document 1***
   Consider minutes as presented or amended
4. **Closed Session – *Document 2***
   Consider the Board's CEO on the interview panel for the appointment of an Administrative Assistant II

B. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

1. **Board President's Report**
   Report on activity since last Board meeting
2. **Board Vice-President's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting
3. **Chief Executive Officer's Report**
   Report on activities since last Board meeting

C. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING

1. **CLSA System Audit Reports – *Document 3***
   Consider System audit reports

D. BOARD FOCUS 2014/2015

1. **Broadband update**
   Update on broadband for California public libraries
2. **Digitization update**
   Update on digitization efforts

E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

1. **Consider state legislative issues – *Document 4***
2. **Consider federal legislative issues**

F. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

G. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Board member or officer comment on any item or issue that is under the purview of the State Board and is not on the agenda

H. OLD BUSINESS

Board Strategic Planning Session

I. CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to Section 11126(a) (1) of the Government Code, the Board will meet in Closed Session to interview candidates for and discuss appointment of an Administrative Assistant II

J. RESUME OPEN SESSION PUBLIC MEETING

Report from closed session

K. AGENDA BUILDING

Agenda items for subsequent State Board meetings

L. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn the meeting

California Library Services Board Meeting

September 19, 2014

California State Library

914 Capital Mall, Room 500

Sacramento, CA

Welcome and Introductions

President Maghsoudi called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on September 19, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. Board members, State Library staff, and the audience were invited to introduce themselves.

Board Members Present: Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Aleita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Penny Kastanis, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Liz Murguia, Eric Schockman and Connie Williams.

California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian, Greg Lucas, Janet Coles, Suzanne Flint, Darla Gunning, Sandy Habbestad, Susan Hanks, Jarrid Keller, Carla Lehn, Cindy Mediavilla, Lena Pham, and Elizabeth Vierra.

Adoption of Agenda

It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the September 19, 2014 meeting as presented.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the March 18, 2014 meeting as presented.

Board Resolutions

Lucas read the resolutions for Dr. Tyrone Cannon and Victoria Fong.

It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts CLSB Resolution 2014-06 for Dr. Tyrone Cannon. (See Attachment A)

It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts CLSB Resolution 2014-07 for Victoria Fong. (See Attachment B)

Election of Board Officers for 2015

It was moved by the Nominating Committee (McGinity) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2015.

It was moved by the Nominating Committee (McGinity) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Elizabeth Murguia as Vice-President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2015.

Board Secretary Position

President Maghsoudi requested background information for the position of Board Secretary. Habbestad reported that there had been a Board Secretary in the early years of CLSA, but the position had not been used as intended. Habbestad invited Vierra of CSL Human Resources to provide background and answer any questions the Board might have about the position, and what must be done to recruit for it. Vierra stated that the hiring process was quite involved. The exempt position was under full authority of the Board, which meant that the Board could make an appointment to fill it. The candidate did not need to be a state employee; it could be someone from the public. The governor's office would review the Board's recommendation and approve it. The process entailed the selection of a two-person subcommittee from the Board that would work with Vierra to make a recommendation. The subcommittee should be selected today. A proposed job description was included in the agenda packet and needed to be approved by the Board with any recommendations for changes.

Member Schockman remarked that he did not see any requirements for education. Vierra responded that as an exempt position, there were no formal education requirements, but the Board could make recommendations for desired education. Schockman recommended the candidate hold a degree in Public Administration, Political Science, or Social Studies. Vierra said they could certainly list those as desirable, but not as a requirement. The position was full-time, with a salary range around $60,000 to $65,000 per year. Member Christmas agreed with

Schockman. Member Kastanis suggested that people from community colleges should be considered, so long as they had the expertise to do the job. Vierra said she would work with the subcommittee on these issues.

Member McGinity had a reservation about the Board needing a full-time position and requested the State Librarian's opinion. Lucas replied that because it was a full-time position, the job description was broader than it previously had been. It was hoped that the position would help fill some unmet needs at the State Library. McGinity then asked why the position was exempt rather than asking for an FTE through the budget process. Vierra answered that it was part of the Education Code and an exempt entitlement under that Code; therefore, it fell under the exempt position process. Vierra and Lucas affirmed that to gain an asset for the library, the exempt process was a better approach than the budget process.

Member Huguenin was in favor of keeping the job description as general as possible, to allow for the needs of what actually had to happen. She encouraged the people who screened for this position to find someone who was very flexible and could work on their own.

Vierra pointed out that Habbestad, who had been doing the work of the Board, would be retiring, but if the Board acted quickly, she could be available to provide some training for this position. Member Bernardo asked if the position would be approved as soon as the hiring committee had made their decision. Vierra stated it had to be submitted to the higher authority of the Governor's Appointments Office for approval.

Vierra referred to a timeline in the Board packet. Typically there was a recruitment process of ninety days. She and CSL Human Resources staff would be working with the two-member selection committee. A job announcement would be prepared and posted on the State Personnel Board's exempt position vacancy database. The Board could then elect to send it out for recruitment to any membership associations and to CALIX. She would work with the selection committee to develop some pre-screening criteria so that applications could be selected on the basis of things like community college certificates or university bachelor degrees. The subcommittee would then select candidates to interview and could elect to hold a pre-interview if they wished. Candidates were to be considered in closed session with three to five candidates to be selected to interview before a quorum of the Board in closed session. A

determination would be made in closed session and an announcement would be made in public session. Because the position should be filled as soon as possible, another special Board meeting might be called.

President Maghsoudi called for two Board volunteers for the selection committee. Vierra warned that there was a considerable time commitment. Maghsoudi and Schockman then volunteered to sit on the committee.

> ***It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board seeks to restore and recruit for the exempt Administrative Assistant II position to act as Executive Secretary to the State Board and that the State Board directs State Library staff to assist the Board in carrying out this recruitment.***

Board Meeting Schedule for 2015

Habbestad said the next Board meeting was already scheduled as a conference call for February twenty-fifth. Maghsoudi asked if the process should begin now, or after Vierra had posted the job announcement. Vierra answered that she could work within any timeframe established by the selection committee, but she requested a minimum thirty-day job posting. Early December was agreed upon for a special meeting in Sacramento. Habbestad would pool the Board for a date.

Maghsoudi invited a discussion about the Board meeting schedule throughout the upcoming year. Murguia was in favor of moving meetings to when the Legislature was in session. Christmas concurred, expressing that it was one of the primary responsibilities of the Board to work with the Legislature. He suggested a meeting be held after the May Revise. Habbestad stated the Board used to meet in May, but now that meetings were twice each year, CSL preferred to hold the meeting after the state budget had been signed, so the Board could consider issues that were addressed in the state budget. August or September had been found to work well and the Legislature was back in session in mid-August. Christmas said that it was important to talk to Legislators about priorities of this Board within the library budget. Perhaps a third meeting could be held in May. Lucas said that the May Revise was traditionally on May 14th. It was suggested the Board meet before the May Revise to provide input to the Legislature.

Schockman asked Lucas if members should meet more often with Legislators. Lucas replied that it was always helpful for more voices to speak about the importance of public libraries around the state. Schockman asked if there was a budget allocation for Board meetings. Habbestad said that one of the reasons meetings were cut to one in-person meeting per year was the operating budget had been reduced. Huguenin, having worked with the Legislature for years, expressed the importance of personal contact. The Legislature changed continually due to term limits, with hundreds of issues before it. It was a better political tactic to get Legislators attention just before they decided upon a budget. Bernardo suggested the fall meeting could be turned into a teleconference while keeping the other two meetings. Habbestad stated that the February/March meeting could be moved to a later date. Kastanis asked if travel was the major expense. Habbestad responded that transportation, meals and lodging were the major expenses. Meetings had been cut back for that reason, as well as fewer matters for discussion. April or early May was suggested for an in-person Board meeting. Habbestad would poll Members in January for a date.

Schockman asked Lucas whether he had a liaison that worked with the Legislature. Lucas replied that he did not, but he hoped that legislative issues could be included in the duties of the new Administrative Assistant II position.

Board President's Report

As the Director of the City Library of Whittier, Maghsoudi had been busy with their summer reading program, for which 4000 kids had signed up. Twenty-five hundred people had come to their party. She had also been busy attending the CLA Legislative and Advocacy Committee, as often as possible.

Board Vice President's Report

Since the Board conference call last March, Murguia had followed up on the budgetary request with Dylan Associates, met with her own assembly member, and spoke with McGinity, to whom she ascribed most of the Board Nominating Committee work.

Chief Executive Officer's Report

Lucas began by saying the renovation of LC I had been completed, everything had been moved out of the warehouse in West Sacramento, and the books were back in the building. The library was taking the opportunity to weed its collection, carry out some of its preservation strategies, and pursue some of its digitization priorities.

In the governor's budget there had been $2.25 million to join CENIC, the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California, for high-speed broadband backbone networking for libraries. Yesterday, the State Library sent out requests for proposals to library systems to act as aggregators, a sort of intermediary, to work between CSL and CENIC. This allowed for a quicker response time than if the State Library handled everything. There were various phases to the broadband effort. Some libraries were more hook-up-ready than others. Currently, CSL was assigning libraries to one of three phases, although not entirely on the basis of hook-up readiness. Consideration was being given to sites with lesser access, but stood to receive greater transformation. It was not as though the first group to be connected would be the easy ones in places around the state where they already had plenty of internet access.

Lucas welcomed input from the Board for directions or actions CSL could take, either through legislation, or through the executive branch. With regard to public libraries, one of the things that had struck him in the short time he had been State Librarian, was the tremendous value of literacy programs around the state. It was amazing to see the magic that happened when someone worked with a volunteer to learn to speak and read in English. There was no recidivism to literacy. Supposing he were taught to read, he could fill out a job application, make a better resume, get a better job, and pay more taxes to government. Literacy was the number one indicator of how kids would perform in school, and whether they would go to jail or prison, which was very expensive for the taxpayer. September was literacy month, and the governor had issued a literacy proclamation. If it were up to Lucas, every month would be proclaimed literacy month. Illiteracy was the number one complaint from colleges and universities. A recent article revealed that the number of fourth grade children who could read at the fourth grade level was very small. He did not understand why that was the case, but if there was anything he and the Board could do about it, they should do it.

Lucas concluded his report, expressing that he looked forward to working with the Board to help accomplish what it wished to do.

Maghsoudi asked if there were questions or comments. Kastanis remarked that there was a time when school districts had adult education, with programs to teach people how to read. These programs were statewide, within the large school districts. But with funding cuts to these programs, the children of struggling parents no longer had anywhere to go to get help. They needed to have the expertise of reading, in order to help their own children learn to read. The Board ought to take a look at why there was no longer any place to go, and how to make adult literacy happen again. The public libraries were picking up some of pieces of that, but it was not really enough.

Lucas suggested the place to speak about adult literacy was probably the school boards. But he would like to talk to this Board about the AB-86 consortiums, and how that was working, and about the collapse of adult education. He had received mixed reviews from public libraries around the state, as to the efficacy of adult education in their libraries. Lucas would like to talk more about that, as well as the relation of school libraries to public libraries. Kastanis remembered a regular school for adult education in Sacramento, before it was closed down. It was a place where people could go and learn English, prepare for citizenship exams, and get their GED. In the few trips he had taken around the state as State Librarian, Lucas had noticed that the most successful literacy programs tended to be linked with citizenship preparation. Citizenship education was piggybacking on the dollar being spent on literacy. Huguenin described how Salinas had a place where they encouraged parents in the citizenship program to bring their children, who were given access to old, donated computers. From there, they began drifting into reading. It was easy to learn to read, but children must have the opportunity to do it. Once they learned to read, it could never be taken away, and it only got better. It was a great step up and encouraged the use of California's libraries. Many lower income people believed libraries were only for the rich because they had never been exposed to one. Kastanis added that many of the schools did not even have libraries. Williams stated that more and more schools were closing their libraries, as opposed to just getting rid of their librarians.

Williams would like the Board to have a conversation about how a variety of libraries, such as school, adult education, public, and community college libraries, could mix; and how services could proceed from them. She would like to think of libraries not only as a third space where people worked, but where a variety of work could take place.

Lucas said that part of the intent of AB-86, the consortiums, was to do exactly what Williams was describing. Although it was primarily targeted toward adult education, it was meant to get community colleges working with public libraries and other community organizations. Another part of the intent was to initiate the conversation Williams was describing.

Williams suggested that another valuable conversation would be about maximizing resources across the venues. As an example, her school had a 40-language, computer-based language course for their students. But any blood relative of the student was welcomed to participate in that language facility.

Schockman asked if there had been any longitudinal mentoring studies of the intercept of adult literacy done by libraries around the state, with how the transformative process had taken place. The data could be reported to the Legislature and others, and serve as a reality check for the work that libraries had done. Lucas responded that there was nothing being done right now exactly corresponding to what Schockman was asking. However, recently he had seen a national study about the value and effectiveness of one-on-one mentoring and tutoring, both for young children and adults learning to read. This was cited in opposition to learning in a class or on-line. Of course, the standard objection was the expense of one-on-one tutoring, but evidence revealed there was a qualitative difference in the results.

Williams stated there were many studies that showed access to books made a difference for any person, young or old, for learning to read; hence, the importance of making people aware of their library's availability. Lucas commented how struck he was by the number of libraries that brought books to people; for example, in Section 8 housing, or migrant camps in Gridley, where people could not get to a library.

Although not exactly related to the current discussion, Kastanis spoke about her involvement in a program called Blessings in a Backpack. For children in schools, who might not have enough to eat through a weekend, they would fill up a backpack with food that the child could take

home. Kastanis had undertaken to go out and find books suitable for primary and intermediate reading-level children, to add to each of the backpacks. The children said that they liked getting food, but that they were excited about getting their own books to keep, too. She knew that children were excited about computers and other technology, but when they got their own books, they would begin to build their own library. They received 10 – 12 books each year. Not everyone needed to participate in this program, but there were many ways to help children and adults who could not read, by just reaching out in some manner or other.

Maghsoudi cited a program at her library, funded by a private foundation called *Book of My Own*, in which they worked with the police department and social service agencies to give out a book and Teddy bear to children. Kastanis said some of the things Lucas was talking about could take the Board in a different direction.

Christmas believed providing literacy services was very important. Most libraries offered it, but because the state and local jurisdictions were not funding literacy at appropriate levels, it was dependent on volunteers.

Lucas thought it was a two-step process: express the importance of literacy programs, then follow up with something better. Most of the money for CSL's literacy programs went to public library staffing. The problem at present was that there were more people wanting assistance than there were volunteers. The places where the greatest number of people required assistance were the places where there were the least number of volunteers available. He did not know the answer, so he invited the Board to help.

Murguia wished to follow up on the earlier CENIC discussion. She wanted to know about the grants to the local jurisdictions, the timing with mention of the three phases, and how quickly this would be out the door.

Keller stated the governor's budget had two parts. One part, $2.25 million, went for the CENIC membership fee. The same amount went to TeleConnect. The other part was $1 million in one-time grant funds, going for such things as equipment purchases, such as routers and switches used to provide interconnectivity to the CENIC backbone. Also, in some cases, this grant funding applied to minimal last-mile costs. For example, some libraries actually had fiber outlets one hundred feet away, or less, so they would be able to accommodate cost benefits.

But the primary emphasis was on the equipment. Many libraries needed higher routers and switches in order to take it to the higher gigabit connectivity. As soon as the program got going, there would be webinars for the field. There were criteria for what qualified for funding and what did not.

Prompted again about the time-frame, Keller explained that as soon as the agreements that went out yesterday were returned on October 24th, they would be evaluated and an aggregator chosen. Then the aggregator would enter into a contract with CENIC, which would be designated as the provider of broadband services for the California public libraries who had chosen to be a part of the consortium. Keller thought hook-ups would begin sometime this December or January.

Williams inquired how E-rate fitted into this. Keller responded that one of the wonderful things about being a CENIC member was that it would actually do E-rate on behalf of libraries. Nationwide, E-rate was an issue with libraries in general, with only about 50% of libraries utilizing it; far less than schools. Part of the reason was that filling out the application was like filling out the worst tax form imaginable. Dealing with E-rate was very time-intensive for libraries. Over time, participating libraries would see significant cost savings through CENIC and would be able to draw down funds they were not receiving today.

Williams asked Keller why a public library would not choose to join CENIC. He replied that in cities and counties, Information Technology tended to be consolidated, with rules that might prevent a library from having a contract with CENIC. However, when they began looking at what they would get, and the cost savings, he thought they would be very favorable to it. Murguia added that unlike schools, CENIC had not been available to libraries, previously. Keller resumed, stating that a telecommunications subsidy called California TeleConnect Fund had been a precursor to E-rate. But, oftentimes libraries had not participated, because cities and counties had not understood it; it had required a lot of time and effort. This broadband initiative with CENIC was looking to be a great way for California libraries to become the best connected in the nation. A number of other states were looking with interest at what California was doing.

Lucas pointed out that 20% of California's population did not have broadband. Public libraries might not sign up because there was insufficient money in their budgets to cover last-mile hook-ups. That was part of the intent behind the $1 million grant fund.

Huguenin stated that every elected official had a constituent that libraries served. From her experience of many years as political consultant for the California Teachers Association, it was amazing what pressure from the local level could do to move the Legislature to action. Lucas found that now more local jurisdictions thought of broadband connectivity as a component of their public works or infra-structure. It was being seen as something essential to their operation.

Keller said that they were going to select one aggregator, who would serve as fiscal agent for this project, as well as perform some specific administrative and project management responsibilities. CSL was drawing upon a model used in the college sector and K-12, in which aggregators were also utilized. CSL's was slightly different, but it would help push this service out much faster than if CSL were to do it internally.

Bernardo briefly looked at the RFP yesterday. It was posted on CALIX. Keller replied that it was also sent out to the public library directors, the cooperative systems and the not-for-profit organizations. It was very important to have an aggregator who understood libraries, how they worked, what their challenges were, how the jurisdictions worked, and how the systems worked.

CLSA Budget for FY 2014/15

Habbestad reported that CSL was pleased that an additional $2 million had been included in the CLSA appropriation. These funds were being allocated as one-time monies and staff was discussing how best to budget the funds to offer maximum flexibility and benefit for libraries. For this reason, staff was recommending that half of the appropriation, $1 million, be distributed to most cooperative systems for Communication and Delivery, and the other $1 million among the public libraries with equipment upgrades to connect to the high speed internet, as Keller just mentioned.

Murguia asked if that distribution would bring the grant opportunities for equipment up to $2 million. Habbestad replied that was correct. Schockman asked why some cooperatives received a greater allocation, others less. Habbestad responded that it was derived from a formula developed by the State Library and approved by the Board. It was based on the population of their system service area, the miles traveled between library jurisdictions, and the number of members in each cooperative system. Some systems had over forty members, some had six. Lucas stated that some system areas were geographically compact and others greatly extended. Habbestad gave examples of NorthNet, a large geographic area, but sparse in population, whereas the Southern California Library Cooperative had a huge population in a small area.

McGinity understood that the Board had CLSA budget discretion, so he would like to see all of the available funds used to digitize the State Library's collections. But if that could not be done, then it would be his preference to see the entire $2 million go to broadband equipment upgrades, but he would not offer an amendment to the current motion. Gunning responded that it was for local assistance only, and could not be used to digitize the CSL collection. It could, however, be used solely for equipment upgrades. Christmas inquired whether that alternative had been discussed among the system directors. Habbestad replied that no discussion had taken place about money going to the systems for equipment upgrades rather than Communications and Delivery. They were quite happy to receive the additional allocation of $1 million and planned to make good use of it. Of course, the funds had not yet been allocated. Gunning stated that the decision had been made because the revised plans of service and budgets were due before this week.

Being no further questions or comment from the Board or field, Maghsoudi asked for the motion.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the 2014/15 CLSA one-time budget augmentation totaling $2,000,000 as follows:

- ***$1 million to be distributed among cooperative systems for local Communications and Delivery efforts***
- ***$1 million to help public libraries with equipment upgrades to connect to the high speed network.***

System Plans of Service and Budgets

Habbestad reported that the annual approval of the system population and membership figures was required in order to calculate the system allocations based on the population. The only change this year was for NorthNet Library System, which reduced the population served by Lassen Library District as a direct result of the district's failure to obtain the necessary approval to access the existing library tax to the unincorporated area of Lassen County. The change in population for the purpose of allocating system funds became effective in the 2014/15 fiscal year.

Gunning explained that originally, Lassen Library District was built to serve the city of Susanville. Several years ago, they took action to serve the entire county of Lassen. But changes in taxation and related considerations prompted them to return to serving Susanville, alone. That left the rest of Lassen County as an unserved population, having no library of its own. Under conditions like that, CSL became the public library for the unserved population. But, Lassen Library District, as a member of the NorthNet system, would lose the unserved population of Lassen County.

Habbestad replied that the Board's role was to approve the population and membership, as seen in Exhibit A. The State Librarian annually approved the populations. Then, the CLSA regulations require that the Board also adopted the populations figures.

Kastanis had a question with respect to the fire that burned down the library in Weed. Did this funding have any bearing upon relief for that misfortune. Gunning replied that it did not. The fire in Weed occurred in Siskiyou County, the library still existed and the population continued to be served.

In response to McGinity's question, Habbestad stated that the population data came from the Department of Finance's Estimates for Cities/Counties, from which CSL pulled and developed the systems information.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the System Population and Membership figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year 2014/15.

Habbestad reported on the CLSA Plans of Service for FY 2014/15, noting that summaries were provided for on-going budget activities for meeting the needs of the communities in the system service area, as well as for use of the one-time budget allocation. At its March 2014 meeting, the Board approved the CLSA budget allocation so that partial payments could be made to the systems upon passage of the state budget act. All nine systems had submitted forms to claim the first half of their total allocation. The remainder of the funds, including the one-time augmentation, would be released after system annual reports and expenditures were reviewed and approved for FY 2013/14. Staff was recommending that the Board approve the Systems Plans of Service for FY 2014/15, as summarized in the exhibits.

McGinity had a concern which he had previously expressed to the Board, but would like to express again to the new State Librarian and Board members. He stated that he had nothing but the greatest respect, and he assumed the greatest integrity, for each of the public library systems. However, he was concerned that there were no audits or other kinds of checks to provide data for what actually happened to the money. It could be asked whether money should be spent for audits when the libraries had been crushed with shrinking budgets in recent years. He wished to stipulate that. But he was concerned about the lack of data for what was really happening on the ground floor. Nonetheless, he affirmed that the Board should move ahead to approve this year's budget. Schockman referred to a discussion at the last meeting which mentioned a state auditor could be requested to do a special audit at the request of the State Librarian. He believed that McGinity's instincts were right. The Board ought to consider it, so there was an accountability structure in place. McGinity hoped Lucas would share this concern, discuss it with staff and consider an audit, perhaps something that could be conducted every four, five or six years. Lucas offered that more transparency would be better. Gunning believed that most of the systems had their own audits done; the Board could request copies of those. Vera Skop from the Inland Library System informed the Board that her system paid $6,000 per year to their County Fiscal Agent for an audit, which took a significant chunk out of their budget. She completely agreed with the concerns of McGinity and Schockman; and as a taxpayer, she wanted to ensure that the money actually went where it belonged. Gunning responded to Christmas that CSL could request copies of the audit reports from the systems on

behalf of the Board. Ibanez advised an audit request be added to a motion. Christmas agreed, urging the Board to formally make a motion to request a copy of the most recent audit from each of the nine cooperative systems. He thought the Board should include it with the approval of the Plans of Service.

Schockman wished to have someone review the audit reports, but he did not think it should be the Board or the State Library. Perhaps the State Audit Bureau should be requested to do an audit. A discussion about who could do an audit and how much it would cost ensued. Lucas asserted that there were several mechanisms to get an audit, one being through a request of a Legislator to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee. Often those were approved, but it took a considerable amount of time. What was being proposed would take considerably longer than having CSL review the system audits and report to the Board. Schockman agreed to a CSL review of the system audits, with a report to the Board. But, for the long term, he thought the State Audit Bureau should be requested, with the Board asking for the greatest amount of accountability for the money of which they were in charge. However, McGinity was concerned not to inflict an audit on the individual public libraries, in light of their budget constrictions. He suggested thinking about this in two parts. First, the Board could look at the audits they would be receiving. If there were red flags, then the Board could consider bringing in other resources.

Linda Crowe from Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) asked if the Board was requesting audits on CLSA funds only, or all of the system funds audits, such as membership. The Board consensus appeared to be for CLSA funds only. Williams asked the Board whether they would be developing criteria for what they were looking for, or were they looking to see that everything was in the right spot? Maghsoudi responded that the state must already have some kind of criteria for spending of CLSA funding. So, those criteria could be used in the Board's evaluation. McGinity was primarily interested in two things, with respect to audits. Had audits been done, and had there been any findings? If the audits had been done and they were all clean, that would go a long way to satisfy him. If not, and there were findings, then there was a bigger conversation for the Board to have.

Lucas asked when the Board would like to have the reports. Maghsoudi suggested that it could be when they met in early December.

Terri Jackson with PLP said that when their audits were done, they were submitted for approval to the executive committee or a larger group. If this Board set standards, they could be shown to the auditors.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/McGinity) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service for the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for fiscal year 2014/15, and requests each system submit a copy of the most recent audit for CLSA funding and that findings be reported to the State Board at its next meeting.

Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs

Habbestad reported that CSL was now in its fourth year with no state funding for the TBR program, but statistics continued to be collected from the library jurisdictions. A list of CLSA participants was provided in Exhibit A, which listed libraries by cooperative systems, and whether or not they participated in the Equal Access and Universal Borrowing programs. There were four libraries that had not participated in the Universal Borrowing Program and charged a non-resident fee for a library card. And there were an additional eight libraries that had not participated in any cooperative system. Exhibit B provided the Board with a list of those libraries and the amount they charged for non-residents. Exhibit C was a complete history of the loan activity through last year. The statistics for FY 2013/14 were showing a sizeable increase in transactions from the previous year. Habbestad had not had a chance to analyze all of the data, but on the basis of telephone calls she had received, she judged the increase a result of more accurate reporting of the lending between libraries like Link+, SNAP, MarinNet and other consortium libraries that had not reported in previous years. Lucas questioned the spreadsheet showing Hayward Public Library as a part of this program when they no longer wished to be. Habbestad replied that Hayward would be removed from the list for FY 2015/16.

McGinity asked Habbestad if there was any sense of whether or not more libraries would leave the systems. She replied that it was possible, but the broadband effort could induce some to remain. Lucas said that some of the system coordinators, at their meeting yesterday, were saying that increased funding in this year's budget might have quieted the desire of some libraries to depart. Christmas asked if any of the departed libraries were contemplating a return to the systems. Lucas heard that a couple of attendees at yesterday's meeting had spoken of

returning to the systems. He had received one or two calls from libraries already in a system who had asked if they would lose a significant amount of state funding by departing. He had told them that such would be the case.

Broadband Update

Keller reported that yesterday CSL had sent out the Request for Applications-Partner for Statewide Broadband Aggregator. An aggregator was CSL's partner, who would work with us, hold the main contract with CENIC, and serve as fiscal agent and do other administrative duties. There would be a conference call on September 29th, to answer questions for those who applied to be an aggregator. It had been sent out to public library directors, cooperative library systems, and library-related, not-for-profit organizations eligible to apply. Applications were due October 21st. Maghsoudi asked if city government IT could apply. Keller responded that they had to be a not-for-profit organization, so the city IT was a gray area. They were looking for more nimble organizations than government entities could be. After the applications were received, there would be a review committee evaluating them, then making an award. Following that, applications would go out to the field to those who were awarded. Then, the aggregators would begin working with CSL and CENIC to get the master service agreement in place, so that libraries could begin to be connected. Optimistically, Keller would like to see connections beginning in January. It may not be that soon, but it would definitely be sometime in 2015.

Bernardo asked what the priorities were going to be. Keller said that in order for everyone to hear the same thing about priorities and how they were being determined, a webinar would be held. There were a lot of factors for determining that. Just because a library happened to be in phase three, it did not mean that it could not migrate earlier. Broadband politics in California and in the nation were very complex. Although, on paper a library may look like it was ready to go tomorrow, there could be other intervening factors that came in, pushing it further down the road on the list. McGinity thought this structuring of priorities appeared to be a policy issue with which the Board should be involved. If library connections were to begin next year, when would the last libraries on the list be connected? Keller replied that this was going to be a multi-

year project. Ideally, it could be hoped that all the libraries could be connected in four or five years. But, it should be remembered that there were still 20% of California libraries that had very little connectivity. There were many factors that made an end-point very difficult to determine. McGinity asked if more money would make this easier. It appeared to him that this issue was something the Board should discuss, with the criteria made available to understand how these decisions were being made. Maghsoudi asked Keller if there were criteria for each of the tiers or phases. Keller cited the broadband study that had been done last year. Within it, there were site-readiness criteria. Did the library have location permanency, a redundant tower, fire suppression, etc.; much of that was driving who would be ready. There was also to be a second phase of site assessment that would help determine library readiness. And there was another set of factors, such as location of the fiber to the library. It was very complex, with multiple factors, and CSL was continuing to work to establish the site-readiness phases.

Williams was concerned that if this project went to 2025, by then the technology would have changed. How were these phases figured out? And by the time phase four was reached, phase one would need to be updated. Keller said that he had been involved with state government networking for twenty years. In any network roll-out, every few years there were what are called network refreshes. Usually, this was done on a two- to four-year cycle. Just because a library was initially a phase four assessment, it did not mean it was stuck there. Perhaps a local community would decide that this was very important and invest more money towards last-mile issues. Huguenin was concerned that poor communities would always be last. Keller replied not necessarily. There were grant funds available to libraries, and that was being factored in. They had a formula to help with that.

Christmas wanted to know if the different criteria had been discussed with the systems and individual public libraries. Keller said they had not, but libraries were being evaluated on the basis of what they had self-reported to CSL. They had been encouraged to work with their IT professionals in order to provide accurate data to CSL. There would also be site visits to verify data the libraries had sent. All the criteria would be covered in the webinar mentioned earlier, and had been laid out in the grant application.

What McGinity heard from Keller was that CSL was applying the criteria, putting it out there, and that was it. Keller affirmed that was what CSL was proposing. CSL had taken information from some other states doing broadband projects similar to this one. The State Library of Pennsylvania was one example. He had taken some information from Utah, as well. The criteria being used in California was becoming the common standard among other states.

Ibanez was very concerned about underserved communities, who may not be top tier, with an insufficient level of broadband readiness. Keller reminded him that CSL was not only looking at who was most ready. There were other criteria being applied. And, there was the grant assistance for those less ready. Lucas said that if one of the criteria was greatest transformation, then broadband ought to be installed where it would make the greatest transformation. Keller assured Ibanez that CSL was very mindful of that.

Maghsoudi, returning to what McGinity had earlier requested, asked if the criteria or standards could be shared with the Board in order to get a better idea of how the process was done. Keller said they could be supplied. Lucas welcomed the Board's input, as it was a major initiative that touched all of the public libraries in California, as well as, indirectly, academic and public school libraries. He believed public libraries would take less time, as there were 1183 of them, versus the many public schools, to hook up. One of the things CSL had done in setting this up was to revisit the aggregator relationship after two years. Better ways of accomplishing library connections might be found, so we did not want to get locked in. McGinity stated that the aggregator relationship did not necessarily have anything to do with policy, but how libraries were being selected did. He thought this matter was important enough to open it up for discussion. He did not know how the Board could provide thoughtful input to Lucas, if there was no chance to meet as a body. Also, he did not know how much authority the Board had in this area; the Board may have a great opinion, but in the end it might be the State Librarian's alone. Lucas interjected that whatever decisions were made were better for having been informed by more opinions.

McGinity asked about the date of the webinar, as he assumed that it would be the public announcement of CSL's broadband policy. Keller said the date was not set, but would be held in December or January. McGinity asked Keller whether it would fit CSL's time-frame if the Board

had a conversation at its next meeting in early December, and potentially tweaked the broadband phase criteria. Keller responded that it was quite possible, but he would have to get back to the Board about that.

Lucas was somewhat familiar with the open meeting law, but he deferred to Habbestad, asking if CSL would be running afoul of the law, were they to send the Executive Summary of the Needs Assessment to each of the Board members and encouraged feedback. Habbestad did not believe so. He then asked the Board if that would be a first step in the right direction. Murguia pointed out that what had gone to the aggregator were not really the criteria for the libraries. Keller agreed that the aggregator did not determine the phases, but rather were concerned with the fiscal and administrative components, as CENIC was with the more technical aspects of the project.

In order to better grasp the process, McGinity wished to assume that the Board first looked at the criteria, and then at what it actually meant on the ground. Suppose, for example, that the number of under-represented communities was found to be 1% of Tier 1, and 30% of Tier 3. Further, suppose that the Board decided that 5% of the first batch of underserved communities should have first priority. The aggregator's role would be to ensure the fiscal and administrative details were in place so the line was laid down wherever directed. Keller said the aggregator would take direction from CSL. Before the December meeting, McGinity hoped Board members would have reviewed the criteria. Then, in December, they could have a discussion about the priority of those being served.

Lucas suggested that the Board could send their thoughts to the library on the Needs Assessment that CSL would be sending to them.

Murguia commented, recalling the State Library Bond Act back in 1985, when there was a huge need, but few resources. In terms of developing criteria, greatest needs were to be considered, but so was their ability to actually meet that. The Board should begin thinking about criteria, because there was only $2 million statewide, at least initially, to help fund equipment. McGinity said if there was more money allocated in future years, providing an opportunity to make a five-year plan would be better than figuring it out every six months. The criteria already would have been established, and we would know where the funds were going.

Murguia continued, saying that as she understood the matter, a jurisdiction not in need of state funding for equipment, and all ready to go, could then move forward quickly with broadband connection. Lucas responded that they probably could go forward, but there might be other impeding factors, such as whether it could break free of an existing service contract.

Contiguous Borders Requirement

Habbestad said that this item was to be considered for action at this meeting. However, it was the recommendation of staff that the Board hold this item open until a new term and definition could be developed for universal access. In response to a question, Habbestad provided the definition of direct lending provisions. The bigger need at this time was to explore the modification or merging of the terms into one broad universal access policy for all Californians. Schockman asked whether universal access would be available to anyone. Would someone with a library card need to be a citizen of the United States? Habbestad replied that the law requires residency in California. Maghsoudi specified that a patron would only need proof of address in California.

Williams asked how that impacted electronic things, such as e-books and databases, as well as how that was currently funded. If this were really universal access, would it allow statewide access to all public library databases? Had this discussion gone into this universal access card? Gunning answered that access had been left up to the local jurisdictions. That was largely because their licensing was based upon adult populations served, or number of borrowers cards. Every database had a slightly different licensing requirement. To require a library to have a license that would cover all 38 million Californians would be onerous. Williams wondered if a statewide buy of licensing could be a matter for future discussion. Gunning replied that it had been discussed, but financially it was really difficult, because almost all licenses were still granted on a population basis. But, considering the power of numbers, CSL would like to continue having that conversation.

Lucas wondered if libraries could do something like textbook publishers were doing. Textbook publishers were very eager to get themselves on the state's preferred list. A state entity comes up with textbooks that the state may use, K-12. If a local school buys those approved

text books, the state would pick up something like half the cost. Analogously, Lucas wondered if there was some way the state could interest the private sector to strike a universal library licensing deal or something similar.

Williams thought the better analogy was databases. There were states that had provided database access for all of their schools. There were consortia that might do a buy for schools, where the state might not pay, but the power of numbers would reduce the cost. Lucas reported that the State of California was taking some steps toward an open-source data portal, where data could be added from a variety of different sources. Christmas asked if the state continued to use some sort of consortia for buying things like that. Gunning replied that it was Califa. Christmas continued that one of the functions of Califa was to make it easier to buy as a group. Gunning resumed, going back to the original question. A Californian could go into any library and get their library card. And in her experience, a patron generally would have access to that library's database. Lucas said that when this Universal Borrowing/Equal Access law was written, the primary concern would have been the issue of the presence of a physical library building.

The issue as McGinity understood it was that a library had to be geographically contiguous to be in a particular system. In the 21st century, when borders did not matter anymore, it seemed to him like a complete anachronism. Lucas thought that too, but there was a system at a coordinator meeting yesterday, who made some really solid arguments why contiguous borders work in favor of some of the systems. McGinity said that this conversation began about a year ago. Maginnity gathered data, resulting in a pretty mixed bag of responses, with some in favor of retaining it and others opposed. The one thing that had not come up before, which did come up this time, was the idea of having to go through the rule-making process, which he knew could be pretty onerous. He did not necessarily want to inflict that upon CSL staff, with his intention of moving forward on this. Since he had missed the window for rule-making, when could the issue next be change? The next would not occur before three years from now. Or was there something coming sooner, in which this issue could be baked into it? Habbestad responded that it would have to be a separate rule-making process. That could be done at any

time, as it was only in the regulations, not in the law, the CLSA statutes. She did not see any other changes being made in the near future.

Lucas asked McGinity what he would like to see happen. McGinity said he would like to remove the regulation that required contiguous borders. Lucas asked if there had been testimony at previous Board meetings. McGinity replied that there had not been testimony at the Board meetings. But there had been testimony and a report from the library directors written in 2013, whose viewpoints had been mixed. The Board delayed a decision about moving forward with his idea, because it was felt that maybe they should wait for more input and discussion around the issue. As it turned out, there was not any more forthcoming. He believed that there had been an adequately robust conversation and report, laying out the issues involved.

Vera Skop, Director of Santiago Library System, said that this was actually a very big issue. She felt passing the motion would open up an entire hornet's nest. For the systems that she represented, contiguous borders worked. It worked for Santiago's libraries that just got back together. They had been part of a bigger system, but they wanted to meet and see each other more often. Inland Library System also wanted contiguous borders because they were 35 thousand square miles. And frankly, who would Imperial County and Blythe join? They paid a membership fee of $250. They could not afford to join PLP, who did all sorts of wonderful things, but were much too far away, and did not meet their needs.

The systems would lose Imperial County and the rural libraries of California. Before the Board decided to vote on this, she wanted to make sure the Board understood that it would make a critical difference. McGinity acknowledged Skop's excellent points. What the language would say was if you wanted different options, you would have other choices. If this was changed, probably most libraries would not alter what they were already doing. Keeping in mind the Board's mission statement, that decisions were best made by local government, if there was a rule in place that stated that something could not be done, such as a beneficial move to a non-contiguous system, then it seemed to him like an anachronism, something left over from the 19th century. Another option that was brought to the table was affiliate membership. If there was a project that one of the systems was doing and a library from another system wished to

be a part of it, that library could be an affiliate member of that other system in order to participate in that project.

Diane Satchwell of SCLC, Serra and 49-99 addressed the Board. She began by remarking that the Board had expressed passionate concern about the smaller libraries and those that were more socially and economically challenged. By not having the contiguous borders language, especially for San Diego, many of the libraries would be left hanging. By having contiguous borders, it ensured that all members were more robust and working together.

Christmas had a question about how the affiliate membership worked and was there a fee to join. Gunning said each system had its own bylaws concerning affiliate. Christmas asked how is each system impacted by affiliate membership? Crowe responded that this had not been worked out in PLP, but they were going to be talking about it in greater depth. The affiliate member may not have to pay another fee, but they might pay for the service they were interested in. Gunning stated that some of the systems had affiliate members going back to the sixties. It had been a strengthening measure to have cooperation amongst the systems. Christmas asked if there were numbers on how many libraries had chosen to affiliate with a system outside a contiguous system. Habbestad stated it was data that could be collected. Gunning resumed that individual libraries could have multiple affiliations. Murguia asked for an example of what one of these services might be. Gunning answered with the example of databases. Satchwell said that 49-99 had an affiliate member that was a community college. They paid additional funding for the delivery of services. In SCLC, a couple of libraries charged for services, they wanted to have physical delivery of materials, so, they paid a nominal fee, as well as some delivery costs.

Crowe pointed out that various arrangements could be achieved without going into the rules and regulations.

Kastanis said it was an appropriate topic to talk about—whether it should continue to be done, whether more should be done, or whether it should be upgraded, were things to discuss. Maghsoudi said that by taking the contiguous borders requirement out of the regulations, it would not force anyone to do anything, one way or another. It was just a matter of the language.

Williams remarked that she did not fully understand all of the ramifications. But, was having member affiliates better than just getting rid of the whole process itself? Maghsoudi replied it was not. If they became a member, they received funding based on the number of members. Gunning said that when CLSA was designed geographically, they made sure there was at least one major resource library within each system. So, if the Board opened it up, and a library could choose to go to the Bay Area, it might leave some of the large, rural geographic areas without a large resource library member. That was a fear of the rural libraries, but even for some of the small and medium-sized libraries. Having somebody that was geographically close by was part of that agreement for what CLSA and the systems were originally based upon.

Murguia stated that what she was beginning to understand through this discussion was that the contiguous border requirement did not preclude service. It was a very permissive regulation. Libraries were not prevented from doing something. Gunning said that what it would do, though, was to affect the remaining funding going to that system. So, would it be taking away even more from the *have-nots*, when the *haves* departed? Lucas offered his understanding of the matter, saying the language would change simply from "you shall be contiguous" to "you may be." It would be permissive rather than directive. Christmas said to make it permissive would be to eliminate the contiguous requirement, but then the big issue would be funding. For example, if Brawley chose to affiliate with NorthNet instead of contiguous San Diego, whatever funding it had been receiving would go to NorthNet. So the people in the San Diego area would no longer have the benefit of that money. Brawley could pay extra to get the services they wanted from NorthNet by becoming an affiliate member. Gunning said the systems also had an affiliate member fee. Those who were part of a bigger system that provided more services had significantly higher member fees, which would preclude some of the smaller libraries from actually joining them.

McGinity asked about the difficulty of the waiver process. Habbestad replied it was as simple as requesting a waiver from the Board. McGinity said he did not want to take an action on this, and he was unsure whether anyone else wanted to do anything at this time. Lucas said that McGinity should not withdraw action on it because it might be onerous for the State Library.

McGinity stated his preference for dealing with this issue down the road, when a library came forward that would like to join a non-contiguous system.

Ibanez expressed his appreciation for the preceding discussions, because they had been very informative to him as a new Board member. He had learned something about how the systems worked, how things came forward from the past, the role of the Board, and the kind of assistance it could provide.

Terry Jackson, Pacific Library Partnership, said the system coordinators had spoken yesterday about the need for education for new library directors, of whom there were many in California. One of the things that could be done would be to talk about the waiver process.

Brainstorm Ideas for Board Focus

Schockman asked Maghsoudi to provide some parameters for what the brainstorm section was aiming at providing. She replied it could be about issues or projects, anything a member would like the Board to discuss to see if it was something CSL would like to take up, or it could be anything CSL would like the Board to focus upon. Lucas said his interest was in receiving feedback about the priorities of the Board for himself and CSL. What would the Board like him to focus upon?

McGinity referred to a discussion that took place last year at the August 2013 Board meeting. The Board had considered having a retreat and hiring a consultant to work with the Board to set priorities and goals, to establish a mission statement, and other things of that nature. With the number of new members, was there a need for something like this? After considering that and CSL's limited resources, and the relatively few decisions this Board could make, it was decided to shelve the idea for the time being, but keep it as a place-holder for the future.

McGinity expressed he would like to put digitization of the CSL collection back on the table. It was previously reported that digitizing the 43 million volumes of material in the collection would take 623 years to complete it. The collection had been built over the course of two centuries, with all of it sitting in drawers and on shelves. In a 21st century economy, one of the really important things that could be done for the citizens of California was to get all of the

photos, magazines, newspapers, and all of the other kinds of materials, onto the web. According to a former State Librarian's rough estimate, it would take a $50 million appropriation to get the workforce to get this done. As McGinity saw it, this was a high priority, not just about individual libraries, or systems, but about access to this amazing collection by any citizen of California, or even any citizen of the world. The Board should make digitization of the CSL collection its budget and policy priority.

Huguenin stated that although not everything in a collection should be digitized, some things should be made easily available to the public. Maximum public access to library treasures would be one of her primary goals as a Board member. There was also the benefit of protection of more important items that potentially could be destroyed in a fire and lost forever. She would like the Board to find ways to persuade people to make donations for the purpose of digitization of library collections, making books that might have been on a shelf untouched for twenty years, now more easily available by a Google search. Libraries were no longer only in buildings, but on keyboards.

Kastanis responded that students, teachers and other adults in Sacramento did not know about the State Library, its building and resources. The question was how to get the word out there about this jewel. It was not a matter of money, but an information issue. Once people got to know about it, there could be a time when they would come to see what was here.

Williams acknowledged that getting the word out was one of the items the Board could talk about in future brainstorming. But concerning digitization, she made the point that technology could not save us. Just because something had been digitized did not mean it could be discarded. Federal Depository libraries were having a conversation about being overwhelmed with materials, so there was a desire to digitize them. But once they were digitized, could they be thrown away? Just what exactly could be thrown away after digitization? She expressed that judicious care should be taken in what was being digitized, making it so that students in schools could find primary documents for discussion, which was really important now for students in Common Core, and for citizens to find their heritage and their history.

McGinity remarked that there were 184,000 linear feet of items at CSL, based on a previous report. At current capacity, 7,000 items could be digitized in a year. But what a library could

discard was a separate conversation. In any case, an item should be put up on the web so everyone could see it.

Schockman expressed appreciation for his Board colleagues brainstorming discussion about what the focus of the Board should be and how it could assist the State Librarian and his staff. But he wanted to take a broad view, not so much at project aims, but at how they could arrive at their goals. There had been enough of the Board being the tail-end of every budget cycle. We must be smart about helping to make libraries more entrepreneurial and teaching that as its goal. There were entrepreneurial opportunities for arriving at their goals, to which the Board should be helping local libraries, as well as the State Library. When the Affordable Care Act came to California, people without health care came to the libraries. Kaiser Permanente and other private entities were not asked to donate money to help libraries provide this service to the citizens of California. There had been insufficient creative thought about what support was needed and what steps should be taken to get that support, in a state that continued to see the library board as an appendage, instead of a major focus of work that should be done. The Board needed to become more entrepreneurial in what it did and how it arrived at its goals.

Christmas thought the Board could advocate for digitization at the local public library and the State Library levels. The Legislature could be asked to fund the State Library's digitization effort, and the local jurisdictions urged to request their governing bodies to allocate funds to digitize their libraries. And the Board could look into urging other organizations, such as library foundations, to support digitization. There were many other things for which the Board could advocate. But, digitizing the State Library collection was something the Board could get a grip on because it was something the Legislature could do. If the state allocated $50 million to digitize CSL's collection, it would provide an example to the other jurisdictions to put value into funding digitization of their own libraries. He would support the Board having a discussion and some action in the future to make it a legislative priority to digitize the State Library's collection and use that as an example for other libraries.

McGinity pointed out one of the political difficulties in getting funding for digitization was that it would not have any particular benefit for any particular constituency. It benefitted everyone. It also would fit with the governor's budget policy of not beginning anything that

would be an ongoing program. It would come to an end, and not result in ongoing expenditure. But it would not be cheap. Perhaps a shorter, less expensive plan of digitization could be devised.

Maghsoudi asked if this was something to put on the December agenda, as a point of discussion. Lucas asked the Board if it would be helpful to provide them with a digitization lay of the land around the state of California. There were a variety of issues accompanying digitization, and a variety of digitization needs that went beyond the State Library. The University of California had a hand in the matter, in addition to the local libraries. Other things touched upon what here is being proposed. It would be advisable to touch upon those in the Board's discussion. This complex matter is a little daunting, considering the brief time he had been at the State Library. What happened if digitization came to be replaced by something else? On the other hand, one of the things the governor had said to Lucas was "Why does the State Library need to be just a building in Sacramento?" And the Board is now speaking directly to that concern.

Huguenin offered that there could be a conversation with other state libraries about this, maybe Oregon and Washington. She had recently visited Seattle Public Library, an amazing library that provided a great tour, and was well worth a visit. Of course, they had Microsoft, Nordstroms, Boeing and others supporting them. How could collaboration with digitization take place? Lucas said there has been money invested in digitization in California for more than twenty years, but where was the result? The University of California has had a relation with Google for over 20 years. Google came in, took a shelf of books away, digitized them, and then returned them. There were now 12 million UC books available online, some easily available, others indirectly so. UC runs the California Digital Library. San Francisco and Los Angeles public libraries will be sending items to it, which in turn will send them to the Digital Public Library of America. In his discussions with the California Digital Library, Lucas has learned that it is easy for them to work with large, well-funded and sophisticated libraries like San Francisco and Los Angeles. But there is another tier of libraries with already-digitized, ready-to-digitize or ought-to-be-digitized items that need assistance. Huguenin suggested they needed to work with a consortium.

Listening to the foregoing conversation, it occurred to Kastanis that this would be a wonderful place for Lucas to take a leadership role, as he was apparently excited about it. Perhaps he could begin the conversation, establish some priority issues and then share them with the Board.

Gunning stated that under LSTA, much of this conversation has already started. They had been talking about prioritization, going back over the twenty years of digitization projects, collecting that information and finding a place to store it, as well as a secondary storage place for redundancy. They were also looking at how to provide access to these materials via the Digital Public Library of America, as entities must have over 250 thousand items in order to feed into it as "content hubs". However, they were also developing "service hubs" that would allow smaller entities to feed into a secondary place, which in turn could upload to DPLA. CSL was funding a LSTA project this year which was developing prototyping for those service hubs.

Lucas said that he had spoken with someone who had asked why there was not something like a truck, a mobile digitization lab, that could pull up to a library and begin digitization work on their unique and other designated items. Gunning said that mobile digitization had been one of her passionate concerns, and she and others had been working to make it happen for the last 15 years. There had been logistical issues with it, but they were getting closer to a solution.

Lucas expressed that at this point it was difficult to discern where to begin. Huguenin said that the beginning was in having this current conversation. McGinity said that it sounded as though Lucas had been talking with the right people, and that perhaps after a year a strategy would have emerged. If money was a concern, perhaps a partnership with Google, UC and others could be worked out. In the end, it would probably come down to whether the governor and the Legislature were willing to put money into it.

Lucas pointed out that everyone at the Board meeting has said that a big part of the ball game was raising the awareness of libraries. Public decision makers needed to be reminded that an essential part of the state's education system was public libraries. California has Pre-school, K-12, Libraries, Community Colleges, C.S.U. and U.C. One way of getting to what the Board was suggesting about raising awareness would be to introduce a bill to start a conversation and begin the momentum.

Huguenin stated that once there was something like a bill, there was an opportunity to sit down with the big funders in California, like Microsoft, Facebook and Costco, and to discuss funding for this project.

Before the December meeting, it would be helpful to Lucas to provide to the Board, an assessment about where matters stood generally with digitization. Again, Kastanis urged Lucas to take the leadership role with this and provide the Board with some first steps.

Gunning informed the Board that one of CSL's consultants, Janet Coles, had gone to a meeting in Washington D.C. this week to talk about digitization of newspapers around the country. The California Digital Newspaper Project is one of the leading efforts among the states. California has microfilmed many of its newspapers, and they were one of the top items requested to be digitally accessible by public libraries. That and city directories.

Maghsoudi reported Whittier had received private funding over $250 thousand to digitize local newspapers. Williams indicated that once items were digitized, the next step was to ensure that they were accessible. She hoped these kinds of digitized collections would be promoted, so schools could have access for their educational purposes. Lucas said it was not worth doing if it was not being promoted and accessed. Williams continued by pointing out that easy access to political content was very important to political discussion and accountability.

Ibanez asked who funded Digital Public Library of America. Gunning responded that DPLA had multiple funding sources including IMLS, NEH and large foundations like Gates, Knight, Mellon and Sloan. Initially, they had begun working with institutions that had large collections. Also, they had worked regionally with other large collections, those with over 250 thousand items. In California, USC, the Getty and California Digital Library, which were the UC System, were the two that had signed contracts with DPLA to begin putting up their images. Los Angeles Public Library and San Francisco Public Library were currently in conversation with CDL. There were not many other collections, but there were a few in California who could be eligible for DPLA. But there were many collections in California under the 250 thousand items minimum that deserved to be included in the future. That was where the previously referenced "service hub" piece came into play. CSL had been in regular conversation with CDL and DPLA, as part of

that effort, with someone coming out about once each year to meet and discuss ways of going forward. There had been a number of people at the table including Maginnity and Gunning.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Maghsoudi had spoken with Laura Seaholme, Chair of the California Library Association Legislative and Advocacy Committee. They were putting together some priorities and funding requests for the next Legislative Council, which was in draft form, requiring approval of the Board before it could be forwarded to this Board. Maghsoudi would get the CLA priorities to Board members as soon as she had them. The committee wanted the Board to know they were working to exempt libraries from the proposed CPUC one-year moratorium, for all new applications.

Lucas reported on SB 1455 by Senator De Saulnier, which began as a library facilities bond act, but in congress became an assessment bill, requiring the State Library to study the facility needs of libraries around the state. The governor vetoed it yesterday afternoon, saying a study was un-necessary, but libraries could continue their informal discussions with the State Librarian. Lucas stated that a couple of calls had been made to see if there was any way to assess library facilities needs in the state. He believed it would be beneficial to collect this information, albeit informally.

Maghsoudi referenced federal legislation issues on the radar, such as LSTA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, bonds and copyright. Williams pointed out there was important language in the schools legislation, with mention of the State Librarian.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

McGinity welcomed Lucas as the new State Librarian. Ibanez wished to announce the Annual Archives Bazaar on October 25th at USC. Bernardo welcomed and congratulated Lucas and new Board Members. She thanked CSL staff for their service. California Special Libraries were glad to

participate, collaborate and be a part of public libraries in any way they could. They were open, ready and willing to receive Board questions. Access to legal information was what they were all about. Christmas was pleased to be a new Member of the Board. He congratulated Lucas upon his appointment. He found the orientation very useful, CSL staff impressive, and the tour exceptional. During the latter he saw some of the collections which needed to be digitized. Schockman said it was great to be at his first Board meeting. He congratulated Lucas, wished him the best, and said that he would be there to support him. He had been overwhelmed with welcomes and new information about the library. Kastanis had seen quite a few State Librarians, and she welcomed Lucas. It was not an easy job. He would be learning a lot and she wished him well. She first came to the Board in 2003, but it now seemed like only yesterday. She commended CSL staff to Lucas, saying they would provide him great support. Huguenin was very happy to be here, although for many years she had driven and walked past the LC I building, had attended memorials outside of it, but not until recently had she ever gone inside. She had spent several days exploring the CSL collection, finding that it contained some incredible things. She strongly recommended other Board Members to do the same. She found the CSL staff to be smart, pleasant and welcoming. She wished Lucas the best of luck. Williams was overwhelmed and honored to be here, but did not yet know what she did not know. She had been a school advocate since 2008, was currently president of CSLA, and was thankful for the opportunity to serve and work together on the Board. Murguia wished to reiterate what the other Board Members had said, and welcomed Lucas and the new Board Members. She appreciated the great and lively discussion that they had today and looked forward to meeting more frequently and becoming more engaged.

Maghsoudi was in accord with the welcomes that had already been expressed. She was looking forward to working with Lucas, and to having one or two Board meetings more than had been customary. Lucas added that if the Board would like to meet personally more often, he was committed to making that happen. Huguenin would like the Board to discuss some talking points and a visit to the capitol. Maghsoudi continued that they would be working on scheduling more meetings.

OLD BUSINESS

Habbestad said the Board Strategic Planning Sessions would continue on the agenda as a placeholder for old business, or until a planning session as scheduled.

AGENDA BUILDING

President Maghsoudi invited Habbestad to enumerate the December 3rd agenda. The Board Secretary interview was primary. In addition, an update on broadband and a report on system audits. McGinity asked if the library could take on digitization and have something for the Board by the December meeting. Lucas replied in the affirmative, stating it could be done before that.

ADJOURNMENT

President Maghsoudi adjourned the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-06

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

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to honor Tyrone for his outstanding public service representing Academic Libraries since his appointment by the Governor on November 11, 2003; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board would like to recognize that while Tyrone was a member of the CLSB, he maintained active membership in several library organizations, including the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium, where he serves as Chair of the Board of Directors; the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), where he served as president and on many ACRL committees; and the Black Caucus of the American Library Association, just to name a few; and*

WHEREAS*, the Board wishes to honor Tyrone for his distinguished service as its Vice-President from 2008 through 2010; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to recognize him for serving on the Resource Sharing Committee in 2005; and*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

DR. TYRONE H. CANNON

for his distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 19 September, 2014

California Library Services Board Resolution 2014-07

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

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to honor Victoria for her outstanding public service representing both Special and Public Libraries since her appointment by the Governor on April 3, 1996 and her subsequent reappointments in April 1998 and January 2003; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that while Victoria was a member of the Board she maintained active membership in several library organizations, including the Peninsula Library Foundation where she was Director from 1993 to 2012; the Belvedere-Tiburon Library Agency Board of Trustees from 2001 to 2007, and as its President in 2006; and the Council of Friends of the Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley from 1996 to 2003; and*

WHEREAS, *Victoria served in school libraries as a volunteer in elementary and high schools in Marin and San Francisco; and*

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to honor Victoria for her distinguished service as its President in 2002, and as its Vice-President from 1999 through 2001;*
and

WHEREAS, *the Board wishes to recognize the committees she served on, including Young Adult Services Committee, Access Committee, Literacy Committee, Nominating Committee, just to name a few; and*

WHEREAS, *it should be noted that during the course of her career, Victoria worked as a public librarian, law librarian, and special librarian for institutions such as The Free Library of Philadelphia, Clark County Law Library in Nevada, Bringham McCutchen of San Francisco, and The Foundation Center in San Francisco; and*

NOW, THERFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

VICTORIA F. FONG

for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 19 September, 2014

Document 2

ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Closed Session Interview Panel

ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider the board's chief executive officer on the interview panel for the appointment of an Administrative Assistant II.

RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD: I move that the California Library Services Board include its Chief Executive Officer on the interview panel for the exempt Administrative Assistant II position.

BACKGROUND:

At its September 19, 2014 meeting the board approved to restore and recruit for the exempt Administrative Assistant II position to act as Executive Secretary to the state board.

Nothing in the CLSA law or regulations states that the CEO acts in an ex officio capacity on the board. Therefore, staff is recommending that the board move the above motion to allow its CEO to sit on the interview panel for the closed session interviews at its December 2014 meeting.

Document 3

INFO/ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: System Audit Reports

ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING: Consider audit reports from the Cooperative Library Systems.

BACKGROUND:

At its September 18, 2014 meeting, the board requested that each Library System submit a copy of the most recent audit and that any findings be reported to the board at its December meeting.

Audit reports have been received by most systems.

State Library staff reviewed the system audits and found nothing awry with respect to CLSA funding. Many of the firms hired to conduct system audits use similar language to express their acceptance of the financial statements provided. Below are typical statements we saw in each audit:

- "We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions."

- "In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all materials respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities and the major fund of [system] as of [fiscal year ending date], and the respective changes in financial position thereof for the fiscal year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America."

Two systems, 49-99 and Serra, did not have current audits but submitted audit reports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010. Both systems have requested that an audit be done for the 2013-2014 fiscal year and will forward copies to the State Library upon completion and approval of their administrative councils. The San Joaquin Valley Library System has not had an audit done since 2006 when they were a part of the Fresno County Library audit. The system is currently in the process of developing a new Joint Powers Authority, of which they say regular audits will be a part. The Santiago Library System was affiliated with the Southern California Library Cooperative in fiscal year 2012-2013 and is included in their audit report as Orange County libraries. The remaining systems submitted audits for either 2012-2013 or 2013-2014.

In some systems, CLSA funds are a relatively small percentage of the total operating budget. The chart below shows each system's total CLSA budget for the current year and the percentage of their total system budget earmarked for CLSA System Administration and Communications and Delivery services.

A detailed summary of CLSA program achievements and expenditures for the 2013-2014 fiscal year will be reported at the board's April 2015 meeting.

SYSTEM	FY 2014/15 BUDGET	CLSA PERCENTAGE
Black Gold	$120,252	8.4%
49-99	$120,319	96.6%
Inland	$307,142	76.2%
NorthNet	$649,462	59%
PLP	$548,748	38.3%
SJVLS	$192,962	5%
Santiago	$158,077	100%
Serra	$217,028	59%
SCLC	$566,010	44.5%
TOTAL	$2,880,000	28.5%

Copies of the system audit reports are available upon request, electronically or by mail. In addition, a complete set will be available at the board meeting for review.

CLA Legislative Priorities 2015

The purpose of the California Library Association's Advocacy and Legislative Committee (CLA/ALC) is to facilitate the monitoring of and action on various proposed and enacted pieces of legislation which impact library services to California residents. To that end, the group works closely with the CLA Board, association members, and CLA's lobbyists.

Much of the work of the committee is done through advocacy in its many forms. Methods may include working with other library organizations such as the California School Library Association (CSLA) and the California Coalition of County Law Libraries (CCCLL), or developing partnerships with non-library organizations on legislative issues of mutual interest.

Of course, the most effective advocacy comes from a first-hand professional relationship between library staff members; library groups such as Friends of the Library, Library Foundation members, or Library Commissioners; the residents they serve; and the legislators themselves.

The committee supports the "Declaration for the Right to Libraries" (attached below) and the positions therein. The CLA/ALC also supports the rights of all to a free public library with full and open access to information and the confidentiality of library user records as ensured by California State Statutes. Further, it supports the American Library Association's positions on federal issues and supports National Library Legislative Day, annually sending well-qualified CLA members to represent California interests at that event.

In addition, in the 2015 legislative session, CLA/ALC will concentrate on the following actions:

The active monitoring of and opposition to legislation that restricts open access to information in any format

The active monitoring of state taxation policies and procedures so that libraries are fairly and adequately funded, thus ensuring long-term sustainability

Supporting efforts to ensure flexible and adaptable library facilities (bond issues, needs assessments, etc.), recognizing that libraries of the future may have needs different from current needs; working toward a future library construction bond; and urging support for the inclusion of libraries in any economic stimulus bond packages

Supporting efforts to lower the voter approval threshold for local library bond measures and special taxes to 55%

Educating the legislature on the life-changing impact of today's innovative libraries in California

Supporting all efforts to ensure creativity, innovation, and growth by restoring lost revenues; for example, those diverted from the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund and Transaction Based Reimbursement

Supporting efforts to provide high-speed, high capacity broadband provision for all libraries to ensure full, equal electronic services

Protecting and maintaining the operating budget of the State Library to allow for better support to the Legislature and the library community

Supporting provision of literacy skills at all levels: emergent, early, adult, financial, technological, health and others

Ensuring that funding and support for technology are present for workforce development efforts, individual learning, entrepreneurial/business centers, and lifelong learning

Supporting such federal efforts as adequate funding and reauthorization of Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA), universal services provision (Telecommunications Act of 1996), the Government Printing Offices, and the Library of Congress

Actively working for strong funding for California's libraries. Specific to the 2015-2016 Legislative Session, the committee endorses the following request:

2015-16 STATE BUDGET: Minimum Funding Requests

- $1.88 million -- On-going appropriation for the California Library Services Act.
- $2 million -- Continue the 2014/2015 appropriation for the California Library Services Act. Money is being used to: 1) shore up the regional library systems after the recent drastic recession-related cuts and help to guard against libraries leaving the system to charge non-resident library card fees, and 2) money will be placed into the "communications and delivery" segment of the CLSA to assist libraries in adapting to the broadband/CENIC project.
- $2.25 million -- On-going appropriation to connect public libraries to a high-speed broadband backbone operated by CENIC
- $1 million – One-time request for "hardship grants" to help connect certain public libraries to the high-speed broadband backbone operated by CENIC
- $2.82 million -- On-going appropriation for the California Library Literacy Services Act.
- $1 million -- Continue the 2014/2015 appropriation for the California Library Literacy Services Act to address the substantial wait-list for adult literacy learners.

DECLARATION FOR THE RIGHT TO LIBRARIES

In the spirit of the United States Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we believe that libraries are essential to a democratic society. Every day, in countless communities across our nation and the world, millions of children, students and adults use libraries to learn, grow and achieve their dreams. In addition to a vast array of books, computers and other resources, library users benefit from the expert teaching and guidance of librarians and library staff to help expand their minds and open new worlds. We declare and affirm our right to quality libraries -public, school, academic, and special – and urge you to show your support by signing your name to this Declaration for the Right to Libraries.

LIBRARIES EMPOWER THE INDIVIDUAL. Whether developing skills to succeed in school, looking for a job, exploring possible careers, having a baby, or planning retirement, people of all ages turn to libraries for instruction, support, and access to computers and other resources to help them lead better lives.

LIBRARIES SUPPORT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING. Many children and adults learn to read at their school and public libraries via story times, research projects, summer reading, tutoring and other opportunities. Others come to the library to learn the technology and information skills that help them answer their questions, discover new interests, and share their ideas with others.

LIBRARIES STRENGTHEN FAMILIES. Families find a comfortable, welcoming space and a wealth of resources to help them learn, grow and play together.

LIBRARIES ARE THE GREAT EQUALIZER. Libraries serve people of every age, education level, income level, ethnicity and physical ability. For many people, libraries provide resources that they could not otherwise afford – resources they need to live, learn, work and govern.

LIBRARIES BUILD COMMUNITIES. Libraries bring people together, both in person and online, to have conversations and to learn from and help each other. Libraries provide support for seniors, immigrants and others with special needs.

LIBRARIES PROTECT OUR RIGHT TO KNOW. Our right to read, seek information, and speak freely must not be taken for granted. Libraries and librarians actively defend this most basic freedom as guaranteed by the First Amendment.

LIBRARIES STRENGTHEN OUR NATION. The economic health and successful governance of our nation depend on people who are literate and informed. School, public, academic, and special libraries support this basic right.

LIBRARIES ADVANCE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP. Knowledge grows from knowledge. Whether doing a school assignment, seeking a cure for cancer, pursuing an academic degree, or developing a more fuel efficient engine, scholars and researchers of all ages depend on the knowledge and expertise that libraries and librarians offer.

LIBRARIES HELP US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER. People from all walks of life come together at libraries to discuss issues of common concern. Libraries provide programs, collections, and meeting spaces to help us share and learn from our differences.

LIBRARIES PRESERVE OUR NATION'S CULTURAL HERITAGE. The past is key to our future. Libraries collect, digitize, and preserve original and unique historical documents that help us to better understand our past, present and future.