

1 *Approved August 8, 2007*

2
3 **Library of California Board Meeting**
4 **April 18, 2007**

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

9
10
11 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

12 President Paymaneh Maghsoudi convened the Library of California Board Meeting on April 18,
13 2007 at 2:00 p.m., by asking Member Steinhauser to lead those in attendance in the Pledge of
14 Allegiance. President Maghsoudi then welcomed Board Members, staff and audience members to
15 Sacramento and called for introductions.

16 **Board Members Present:** President Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Anne Bernardo, Victoria Fong, Susan
17 Steinhauser, and Judy Zollman.

18 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Susan Hildreth, Tom Andersen, Chris
19 Berger, Rushton Brandis, Ira Bray, Jacquie Brinkley, Suzanne Flint, Sandy Habbestad, Susan Hanks,
20 Carla Lehn, Kathy Low, Gerry Maginnity, Kevin Saunders, Jon Torkelson and Cindy Tackett.

21 President Maghsoudi noted that there was not a quorum of the Board present. Susan Hildreth
22 remarked that a quorum had been anticipated when the meeting date was selected, however, several
23 members recently responded that they were unable to attend the meeting. She stated that the Board
24 meeting would proceed as planned and that action items on the agenda would be ratified by the full
25 Board at its fall meeting.

26 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

27
28 *It was moved, seconded (Steinhauser/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the*
29 *Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the April 18, 2007 meeting as*
30 *presented.*

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Steinhauser) and carried unanimously that the*
4 *draft minutes of the September 14, 2006 Library of California Board meeting be*
5 *approved as presented.*
6

7 **RESOLUTIONS**

8
9 **Prior to the adoption, Board members read the two resolutions for the record.**

10
11 *It was moved, seconded (Steinhauser/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
12 *Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution 2007-01*
13 *for Sonia Levitin. (See Attachment A)*
14

15 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the Library*
16 *of California Board adopts library of California Board Resolution 2007-02 for*
17 *Cameron Robertson. (See Attachment B)*
18

19 Hildreth announced that a reception was being held on Wednesday, April 25, 2007 from 2:00
20 to 4:00 p.m., in honor of Cameron Robertson who would be retiring at the end of April. She
21 invited anyone who would be available to attend.

22 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

23
24 **Board President's Report**

25
26 President Maghsoudi stated that she did not have a report to make, other than to report the great
27 support that was shown at the 2007 California Library Association (CLA) Legislative Day at the state
28 capitol.

29 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

30
31 Hildreth began her report by sharing a bit of history about National Library Week. She stated that
32 National Library Week was first recognized in 1946 at the San Francisco Public Library. The idea
33 spread to northern and central California in the late 1940's, eventually becoming a statewide
34 celebration in 1952. The California Library Association (CLA) coordinated Annual Library Week,
35 which was celebrated during the second week of March. According to numerous articles in the

1 California Librarian, CLA distributed bookmarks, posters, TV slides and one-minute movie trailers, to
2 be shown in movie theaters during double-feature intermissions. The program was so successful that
3 the American Library Association (ALA) adopted it in 1957, and the first National Library Week was
4 celebrated in March 1958.

5 Hildreth continued by sharing that a Senate resolution was presented to CLA by Senator Torlakson
6 in honor of National Library Week, along with comments at the opening session of CLA Legislative
7 Day.

8 Hildreth further noted that in honor of library week, a Library Week Proclamation was presented
9 from the Governor, for which she thanked Bessie Condos (CSL), who helped to draft the proclamation
10 in conjunction with the Governor's Office. She stated that the wording that staff suggested was not
11 adopted by the Governor's Office; instead, for California, the Governor's Proclamation was in honor
12 of "Library Week," instead of "National Library Week." Hildreth read a portion of the proclamation,
13 and then concluded her report by thanking Governor Schwarzenegger.

14 **CLSA/LOC PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

15

16 **New Statewide Reference Model Presentation**

17 Hildreth introduced Ruth Metz and stated that she has been doing great work for the State Library.
18 Hildreth commented that the work Metz has provided is a step in a process—a journey, which the State
19 Library believes will be very successful. Hildreth stated that there are two documents related to the
20 presentation, one is a very good background summary prepared by Metz, which is a synopsis of her
21 work to date. The second is her slideshow presentation. Both documents were reproduced for the
22 Board and audience.

23 Metz thanked Hildreth for the opportunity to work on the reference project, as she has learned a
24 great deal working with the people in the field and across the nation. She was excited about the

1 proposed design because it does what the State Library hoped it would achieve. It puts California first
2 in leadership, in providing cooperative library systems with reference services and in establishing
3 national trends. Metz stated that this is an opportunity for California to leverage what it has and take it
4 to the next level, and to be a leader in reference services throughout the United States and even the
5 world.

6 Metz believes that the major challenge in her proposal will be the willingness, capacity, and ability
7 to continue to morph the model chosen into ever-relevant, evidenced-based new iterations of service.
8 Metz stated that at the September 2006 Board meeting she provided the background to the project
9 methodology. The outcome was to design a new model for statewide reference, with a time frame,
10 which began in August 2006 and would end in June 2007. She stated that the project was currently on
11 time, on budget, and on target.

12 Metz stated that today she would be looking at three things: proposal, presentation and feedback.
13 The supplemental background handout that Hildreth mentioned references other documents posted on
14 the State Library's Website. Metz stated that the main goal today is to make the presentation and get
15 feedback.

16 Metz then talked about what the library environment would look like tomorrow. She stated that
17 users are currently moving from a Web 1.0 to a Web 2.0 environment and beyond. People are now
18 talking and dreaming about Web 3.0. To illustrate, she stated that in the Web 1.0 environment,
19 emailing, websites, search engines and surfing are being done. In the Web 2.0 environment, the theme
20 is interactivity, conversations, interpersonal networking, personalization and individualism. She stated
21 that we are now beginning to slide into Web 3.0. Although we don't know what Web 3.0 will provide,
22 some of the characteristics of it will be more distributed in form. For example, from California, Metz
23 could interact with her refrigerator located in Portland if she needed to. Furthermore, Web 3.0 includes

1 the provision of web services, and the semantic web, which is essentially enabling different platforms
2 to communicate with one another, and to manipulate things in a way we have yet to figure out. Metz
3 stated that Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 and beyond have implications for libraries. Librarians are currently
4 trying to do something in the area of Web 2.0, and are looking to the State Library to provide
5 leadership and help.

6 **Librarian 2.0**

7 Metz then asked, “What does Library 2.0 and beyond mean for the librarian?” She responded by
8 saying Librarian 2.0—the librarian of the future—must understand the end users, and must be where
9 the user is, when the user is there. She stated that Stephen Abram, a futures thinker, is Vice President
10 for Innovation for SirsiDynix. He speaks around the world and presents quite a long list of
11 characteristics of the Librarian 2.0 and beyond in his book, *Out Front with Stephen Abram: A Guide*
12 *for Information Leaders*, ALA, 2007. One of the characteristics is connecting people and technology
13 and information in context (i.e., in the context of what is happening in the world today). Another
14 characteristic is connecting users to expert discussions, to communities of practice, and participating
15 there as well. Metz stated that one of the points she heard in Abram’s talks was that the librarian’s core
16 skill *is not* answering questions; rather it is or should be improving the quality of the question and the
17 user experience. A third characteristic on Abram’s list is embracing non-textual information and the
18 power of pictures, moving images, sight and sound.

19 **Proposed Design**

20 Metz then spoke about the proposed design for a Statewide Reference Model for California. She
21 sees the design as a pathway. It’s getting you out of the box you are in and into a transitional model
22 that does two things: 1) it improves service now; and 2) it repositions California for future reference,
23 whatever that may be. It also moves toward an evidence-based package of services that serves

1 Californians well into the future. This will be more of an enterprise model, rather than the fixed model
2 which we have now.

3 **Out of the Box**

4 Metz stated that the following are a few comments she has heard from the field and across the
5 country when referring to the term “out of the box”:

6 • **There is a pattern of declining volume of CLSA reference questions over the last ten**
7 **years.** The number of reference questions reached its peak in about 1996/97, with the 15 California
8 reference centers handling about 24,000 questions. By 2006/07, the projected number will have
9 declined to somewhere around 8,000 reference questions. What Metz has heard, anecdotally, is that the
10 questions received are harder to answer. Other reference staff has said that the questions are either
11 really easy or really difficult.

12 • **There is a perception in the field that “reference is dead.”** Metz stated that reference, as we
13 know it today, is probably dying; but as we redefine it, then reference is not dead. There is also the
14 issue of what to do about CLSA Reference Centers and staffing.

15 • **If reference questions are diminishing, and the 15 Reference Centers are consolidated by**
16 **half, what is to be done about the decline?** There is virtual reference in the product of AskNow,
17 which California was the leader by setting the trend in this state-of-the-art virtual reference model in
18 1996/97. Metz stated that there are 20 states that have state-level virtual centers. There are more virtual
19 services than twenty, because consortia and individual libraries also provide virtual reference services
20 in some way. Most of these twenty state centers are using one of three vendors for their virtual
21 reference software, and most those are using OCLC’s QuestionPoint. She stated that when we talked to
22 those using QuestionPoint, Docutech or Tutor.com, we found that the software was not doing the job-
23 there were definite chips in the armor. Metz continued by reporting that Caleb Tucker Raymond, the

1 Virtual Reference Coordinator in Oregon, and a leader among his peers, recently launched a survey.
2 One of the questions he posed for local, state and regional virtual reference services was “What are the
3 biggest problems?” It isolated several problems: 1) software, 2) marketing, and 3) sustainability, which
4 was the biggest issue of all, meaning everyone is scrambling for ways to provide virtual reference
5 services. For example, California heavily relies on libraries as partners to handle questions. Metz stated
6 that many of the state centers are using the librarians in their cooperatives and networks to answer
7 questions. Those that are not may be contracting with Tutor.com, OCLC or some other service
8 provider, or some combination of service providers. Metz could not find any instance of state funding
9 being provided for virtual reference service. Many states are using federal LSTA funding, but even
10 federal funding has limits.

11 • **There is the issue of database cost vs. use.** Metz stated that a lot of money is going into
12 databases, but are they being used? Local, regional and some CLSA reference funds are collectively
13 providing money for library databases. The State Library is providing about \$313,000 for FirstSource,
14 contributing to Los Angeles Public Library databases so as to enable AskNow librarians and CLSA
15 Reference librarians to use those databases. The statistical data indicate that the actual use of these
16 resources is abysmal.

17 • **There is a leadership void at a time when so much is changing regarding the web-based**
18 **service development environment, Web 2.0 and beyond.** Metz stated that CLSA Systems, in terms
19 of reference leadership, have been pretty much on their own to invent, reinvent, and to hold down the
20 fort. They are in a holding pattern that continues to decline. Metz believes there has been an erosion
21 of the systems reference structure. There was a time when the System Coordinators got together and
22 the Reference Coordinators got together to discuss issues concerning them, but that just isn't

1 happening now. Today, reference centers are doing a lot of different things, and many are under-
2 staffed. The point is that there is a leadership void at a key time when so much is changing.

3 **Transitional Model**

4 Metz stated that we want to get out of the box and get into a transitional model. The transitional
5 model is an improvement over what California has now. It establishes a platform for fashioning
6 successive model iterations and it repositions California libraries for an enterprise model, in contrast to
7 a static model. It delivers service as well as planning and leadership. Planning must be in the equation.
8 She stated that there is not much data about question handling in California or from around the country
9 for that matter. This customer-driven model would provide a means of doing the data collection, the
10 analysis, the benchmarking, the needs-assessment, and the market research. Metz reported that in the
11 transitional model, it finds that intersection between what libraries do really well and what the public
12 wants, and it validates the data. It takes better advantage of the opportunities that are presented now
13 and into the future.

14 **Evidence-Based Package of Service**

15 Metz stated that the goal of the repositioning, once we are out of the box, is to arrive at an evidence-
16 based package of services. She explained that an evidence-based package of service meant conducting
17 ongoing market research; clearly defining the niche; making data-driven choices; properly packaging
18 those services that are viable; emphasizing customer-centered outcomes; creating tools that help the
19 consumer be independent with their searching and the use of library resources; consistently delivering
20 professional-level work; making the information usable and focusing on high profile targets (i.e.,
21 childhood development, gang prevention, health and wellness).

22

23

1 **Model Components**

2 The transitional model components being recommended by Metz are as follows: there will be a
3 single virtual Portal for the public and librarians in California to have question “sessions.” The virtual
4 reference librarians prefer to speak about sessions, not questions, because many questions may be
5 answered in a session. As Abrams pointed out, a good librarian is skilled at helping define the
6 questions and make the session a good customer experience. What people are looking for in Web 2.0
7 to Web 3.0 and beyond is the social interaction experience. In her presentation, Metz phrased the
8 reference sessions “*California (CA) Answers*,” and was not necessarily recommending that the Board
9 call it by that name. She then gave the reason she came up with the name, *CA Answers*.

10 Another model component would be a single CLSA reference service plan; a
11 manager/administrator for the cadre of services that this transitional model would provide, so the
12 sessions would include document delivery and product development; and a designated leader or leader
13 team to steer the development agenda.

14 Metz then discussed how we get to the transitional model. She stated that first we have to start by
15 analyzing whether state funding for CLSA Reference could support the transitional model. Metz
16 believes that it can be supported, but stated that was for someone else to work through. She stated that
17 our thinking has to be in terms of a three to four year time horizon. During this time it is a constant
18 evolution into the thing we need it to be. Next you use LSTA and public/private corporate funding
19 partnerships to also fund the reference service. Metz restated her previous quote, “You bring to bear
20 the willingness, capacity, and ability to continue to morph in ever-relevant, evidenced-based new
21 iterations of service.” She stated that the ability to morph is what protects the investment! The ability
22 to change is what protects the service.

23

1 **Transitional Model Essentials**

2 Metz then stated that what lies beyond the three to four year transitional model is an enterprise
3 model, something which is much more nimble than the current model. It would be customer driven in a
4 Web 2.0 and beyond environment, recognizing that libraries are but one part of the information
5 equation; and it would be based on professional judgment rather than rigid procedures. The essential
6 parts of the transitional model are:

7 **Leadership:** We need a leader, whether it is an individual or a team of individuals, to undertake the
8 responsibility for planning, data-gathering assessment, benchmarking and market research. A leader
9 would be needed for coordinating, integrating, evaluating, and reintegrating the marketing research
10 data into the program; and drive the agenda for development and to form the partnerships for the
11 additional development funding.

12 **Management:** The transition would have to be constantly managed. Part of that is quality assurance,
13 customer care, marketing and publicity; but the key part of the transition would be helping the people
14 who are currently in the CLSA Reference Program make the transition.

15 **Research and Development (R&D), Innovation, Experimentation and Incubation:** These must be
16 an intentional part of this transitional program. It would be another area of development that we would
17 be moving into, which itself would be folded in again to the ongoing iterations of service.

18 **Reference Services:** Metz stated that the word “reference” does not tell the whole story but it is the
19 word used. She defines customer sessions as involving question defining, coaching, guidance, answers,
20 follow-up and follow-through. Good customer service also involves accuracy, timeliness and cost-
21 effectiveness. She commented that the turn-around time that Systems are required to achieve by CLSA
22 law is just too old for today. It should be immediate turn-around or defined to meet the customer’s

1 need. Lastly, the reference service would include database support (i.e., databases and database help
2 for customers), and document delivery.

3 **Training:** Metz stated that training must be a part of the transitional model. California is well
4 positioned for training because it already has Infopeople in place, which could meet the training needs
5 for this model.

6 **The New Model**

7 Metz continued her report, stating that *CA Answers*, or whatever the model is called, would provide
8 a single portal for the California public and librarian sessions. These sessions would be initiated by
9 email, chat, instant messaging (IM), telephone, fax and whatever other means it needs to be in the
10 future. Metz suggested that the OCLC QuestionPoint software be continued for now. She stated that
11 even though it could be better, it seems to be as good anything out there. There are a number of
12 statewide virtual center coordinators who are working together to experiment with an open source
13 software product, which should be kept in mind. Metz said that we should track the developments of
14 what other vendors are doing and what products are coming on the market.

15 Metz reported that questions needing more research would be referred to a complex question team
16 for a 24-hour turn-around or a deadline dependent on the client's timeline. It would coordinate protocol
17 for questions requiring the collections of LAPL, San Diego, Fresno, San Francisco, etc. She stated that
18 these relationships that the CLSA System structure has enabled in California are assets that we need to
19 hold onto.

20 Metz commented that a recent study conducted in another state submitted twenty questions to three
21 different virtual reference centers on the eastern seaboard. They responded well to the simple
22 questions, scoring around 90%. But none of them did very well on the harder questions, ranging from
23 65% to 40% right answers. The researchers surmised that the reason for the poor outcomes was

1 because it was a virtual interaction and that the people were still limited as to what can be accessed.
2 The localized collections are not codified anywhere, and so remain available at the local level only.

3 Metz stated that the proposed model would use any and all means to provide the desired
4 outcomes—nothing is off-limits. The answer may be at hand or in the collection at a local public
5 library, or available at a commercial service. However, it's not always just about answering a question,
6 but also defining a question well and providing a good customer experience.

7 Metz pointed out that desired outcomes are good customer service, accuracy, timeliness and
8 customer care. The customer wants an answer not a lecture. She stated that *CA Answers* would use
9 various staffing options to achieve the desired outcomes. The core staffing would be all the CLSA
10 Reference personnel. The Reference staff would handle AskNow questions as well as those referred by
11 the libraries. They could be supplemented with contract personnel. Metz commented that
12 approximately 130 hours are being contributed by California libraries to the worldwide network of
13 24/7 reference service. Some of the libraries are eager to provide the service and some of them are not.
14 Metz suggests allowing the library staff and library directors who want to provide the service to do so,
15 and those who don't to be off the hook. Metz suggests the continued use of successful CLSA
16 Reference practices. For years, CLSA Systems have been using subject and location stringers. North
17 Bay has been very resourceful using San Francisco, UC Berkeley and subject experts, such as Pat Guy
18 from Washington, to provide answers. Metz stated that the structures and resources we currently have
19 in place should not be jettisoned, but rather integrated and built upon into something that is more
20 enterprise oriented.

21 Metz stated that *CA Answers* will train and select personnel for the desired outcomes. *CA Answers*
22 would use selected databases, such as those at the LAPL, to provide document delivery. California will
23 need to stay apprised on what is happening with federated searching and what will happen worldwide

1 with the volatile area of databases. Metz suggests continuing with the databases at LAPL and the
2 resources to support it until the landscape changes and it becomes very obvious that something
3 different should be done. She stated that the new model would begin with the public accessing *CA*
4 *Answers* (or whatever it will be called) by telephone, fax, email, chat, IM, etc. California librarians
5 would go through the Web Portal for access. Reference sessions would include clarifying, consulting,
6 guiding, answering, referring, follow-up and follow-through. Sessions with clients through the Portal
7 would be managed virtually with QuestionPoint software.

8 Metz stated that the library staff would be resourcefully improvising. They would have a “toolkit”
9 which would include the option to use online services. They would exercise professional judgment
10 within an established framework. Metz believes that the staff within the reference centers is the right
11 choice for establishing the next generation protocols, although it would not have to be the reference
12 staff exclusively. Anyone else in the state who was interested could get involved, but the existing
13 reference center staff would be a tremendous resource. She stated that staff would continuously
14 improve the framework following its original establishment.

15 Metz stated that complex questions would be handled by the “*CA Answers Follow-up Team.*”
16 Questions that come in which cannot be immediately answered would be handed off to somebody who
17 could begin working on them. *CA Answers* staff would continue to have access to First Source
18 databases.

19 **Transitional “Agenda”**

20 Metz then described the meaning of her term, “Transitional Agenda,” stating that there would be a
21 focus during the transitional period that would include:

- 22 1) better understanding and incorporation of user needs, preferences and behaviors;
- 23 2) quality improvement across-the-board, such as Ask Now and second-level questions;

- 1 3) development in a Web 2.0 environment; and
- 2 4) service development priorities.

3 She stated that California was the right state to be addressing English language learners, print-
4 impaired, and underserved populations. California is also the right place to gather customer input and
5 to do market research. Metz has found that researchers with whom she has spoken are very excited
6 about the possibility of California taking leadership in the area of multiple languages and translation
7 into and from English.

8 **Organizations Structure**

9 Metz stated that for the organizational structure there would be a consultant leader, or a leader
10 team, who must be able to do three main things: 1) change management, which is very important; 2)
11 provide planning, evaluation and research; and 3) provide advocacy, development and funding
12 partnerships. She stated that options are available if all three can't be found in one person. The
13 organizational structure would need to have an external sounding board group. Metz prefers not to call
14 it an advisory board, and believes that it should not be a political board, but rather a community-based
15 board. The State Library would contract with a provider to manage *CA Answers*, which she believes
16 some CLSA Systems are very well positioned to take on that role.

17 CLSA Systems would continue to pay their Reference Center personnel. An entire team would be
18 assembled and a single service plan would be formed with that group working as a team, but from their
19 respective locations. She stated that the new structure would need a real cadre of personnel that would
20 be specifically applied to this effort. It cannot be someone functioning as a system coordinator and
21 doing a little reference, among other things.

22 **Funding the New Reference Model**

1 Metz stated that the use of LSTA funds would enable the leadership and development of a
2 multiyear commitment, perhaps a three-year window. There would need to be time for this reference
3 model to become established, as it would take time for people to know what they are working with.
4 Grants and partnership could be used to advance the development agenda. There would be at least
5 three main sources of funding. She stated that sustainability is the issue everyone in the country is
6 concerned about, but if the choice were made to try this model, California would not have that
7 problem.

8 Metz reported on the source of funds budgeted for reference, stating that for 2006/07 there is a total
9 of about \$2.1 million going into the current reference model. Of that, about \$1.3 million is funded
10 through CLSA, \$300,000 through local libraries, \$513,500 in LSTA funding (of which \$200,000 is
11 budgeted for OCLC QuestionPoint software and network), and \$313,500 for the LAPL First Source
12 database.

13 Metz stated that in this transitional model, over time, the *CA Answers* staff would be right-sized.
14 That might mean adding or cutting staff, as it is unclear now what the question volume would be. She
15 was reasonably assured that 13–16 FTE would be able to handle the volume of questions. Metz
16 stated that local contributions could continue to go into the system at the CLSA System level, or to the
17 statewide program, or go back to local libraries.

18 **Wrap-Up: Opportunity**

19 Metz stated that she sees this as an opportunity for California public libraries. Reference may be
20 dead, but the possibility of transforming it into what it needs to be is very much alive. A new reference
21 agenda in this state could refocus and re-energize everyone. The proposed approach leverages the long-
22 term gains of the CLSA Reference Program. Current reference staff could play a pivotal transitional
23 role in transforming services. CLSA funds may be repurposed to do this, along with other funding. She

1 state that while moving ahead, the model/cost would continue to be examined, rethought, improved,
2 and morphed.

3 **Project Status**

4 Metz reported on the work that still remains to be done. In April and May she will redefine the
5 design and in June there will be a final design.

6 **Board Member Comments and Questions on the New Reference Model**

7 President Maghsoudi invited questions from Board members.

8 Member Steinhauser thanked Metz for the work she had done and for incorporating into her
9 proposal what is already in place. She voiced her approval for making the model dynamic, and Metz's
10 concept that "it's got to morph." She questioned how the new model would incorporate existing local
11 and second-level reference. Would reference as we know it still remain in place, or would it morph
12 into the *CA Answers* concept? Metz responded that local libraries would still have a place to send their
13 second-level questions. That was clearly heard from most of the library community. However,
14 librarians in different regions of California express different needs, but generally they wanted a next
15 level reference as part of the portal. For example, a local librarian would fire off a question from their
16 computer to be handled by a staff member at one of the CLSA systems.

17 Member Steinhauser stated that during her time on the Board there has never been a funded
18 statewide reference level. She asked whether Metz's proposal would merge the second-level reference
19 with the new concept of a statewide reference level. Metz responded that the new model would be a
20 one-step reference model that would go from the local library into the virtual portal where one of the
21 CLSA reference staff would answer the question at whatever level of difficulty.

1 Member Steinhauser then asked whether the user would be librarians, or resident user. Metz
2 responded that both groups would use it. To further clarify how the new model would work,
3 Steinhauser posed a couple of scenarios.

4 Metz responded by saying that any question a citizen might have would be sent to this one portal,
5 just as they would send it now to AskNow, where the reference staff would determine who would
6 answer the question.

7 Member Fong asked, “As a customer, would I just skip going to my local library, and go directly
8 into the portal using my cell phone? If so, how would that change local library services?” Metz
9 responded that however libraries changed, the portal would accommodate them. Users would have the
10 portal available on their hand-held and could go to it at any time; whether it would diminish attendance
11 at the public library she did not know. In order to clarify, Hildreth interjected that having the new
12 model would not preclude local public libraries from continuing their same variety of formats for users
13 to have access to local library staff. Visits to the local library and online interaction with the local
14 library would not necessarily have to change. She further stated that the current referral process with
15 the local as the first level, the CLSA System as the second level, and then some other higher power as
16 the third level of referral, just does not fly anymore. What we’d heard from the public libraries is a
17 desire for some other reference service—from beyond the local level to a “next” level. Hildreth stated
18 that’s what the design proposal was addressing, by making something accessible to the general public
19 should they happen to stumble onto the service; but that would not preclude the public from using the
20 library.

21 Metz apologized for not getting her proposal to the Board in advance, but she really wanted the
22 Board and audience to hear it at the same time.

1 Fong commented that the model included the public libraries but did not mention academic and
2 special libraries. Metz replied that a portal, indicated by an icon on the public libraries' and the State
3 Library's web pages, would be available to anyone, although authentication for access had yet to be
4 determined. Steinhauser asked whether the service would be open to anyone, and whether a library
5 card or bar number would be required to gain access. Hildreth responded that would need to be
6 addressed. Metz commented that decisions might need to be made along the way about other types of
7 libraries' access to the service. With respect to non-resident use, authentication issues would need to be
8 sorted out.

9 Fong asked whether funding would be required and available for a transitional period? If so, should
10 the Board be thinking about it? Hildreth responded by reminding the Board that the presentation is the
11 first introduction to the proposed reference model and that no decisions would be made today.
12 Analysis could be done to see if existing CLSA Reference funds could be re-purposed. She stated that
13 the transition period would be funded with LSTA. Some of the models we create may lead us to
14 approach the Board with a request to submit a BCP (Budget Change Proposal), or we may use a
15 combination of state and federal funds.

16 Metz stated that many things must happen such as determining the legality of re-purposing money
17 for this proposal and getting buy-in from the administrative councils of the CLSA systems. She stated
18 that if the proposal were deemed possible and people could be persuaded to get on board with it, then
19 prompt action would be needed because there was a window of opportunity to do something very
20 powerful and to show leadership. Member Steinhauser asked what would happen after June. She stated
21 that at the last Board meeting, one of the critical issues raised was getting input from the field about
22 this proposal. She asked if there would be enough time to gather input from the field and incorporate it
23 into Metz's final design proposal. Hildreth responded that action on this proposal should not be

1 deferred, and that during the months following Metz's final proposal, a clear data-gathering process
2 could be in place. At the same time, she advocated going ahead with a transitional plan to get a project
3 leader or manager. Hildreth said she would work with staff to try and identify a leader or project
4 manager who would have the time, which she and her staff do not have, to make this proposal happen.
5 Hildreth thinks this is a very good proposal, but an individual or a team needs to be in place before
6 attempts can be made to gather information and start massaging and right-sizing the program.

7 Steinhauser expressed her admiration for this proposal in that it takes reference services to the
8 customers. This is the way people are getting information today, and the bottom line is that even with
9 Google, Yahoo and the accessibility of on-line databases through the library, people still need help
10 from librarians. She thanked Metz for her proposal that put librarians in the position of the customer
11 and the up-and-coming, technologically savvy next generation.

12 Member Bernardo asked Metz whether the infrastructure could be built upon the second-level
13 reference centers we have now, with their current services, or should we clean house before new steps
14 are taken? Metz responded that California Library Systems are beautifully positioned to go to the next
15 level. She stated that CLSA Reference Centers would face problems along the way to implementation
16 of the new model, but she reiterated the importance of change management, as the Reference Centers
17 would need assistance finding solutions. The first thing to do would be to regroup the reference staff
18 and begin working as a team on a service plan. The work of reference librarians handling questions
19 would continue, but the new model could be implemented alongside regular duties, where problems
20 would begin to emerge and solutions would be found.

21 Metz stated that she would have the Systems start ramping up the change management process in
22 July so that staff would be able to schedule time to begin implementation. She stated that System Plans
23 of Service are currently being developed for next year (07/08). Metz stated that it might take a full year

1 for the CLSA Systems to work out how they would proceed with implementation of the new reference
2 model with available staff. She stated that would not mean that Systems would go away, but rather
3 how each System would deal with reference in this state.

4 **Audience Comments and Questions on the New Reference Model**

5 Kathy Gould, Palos Verdes Library District, stated that, although she didn't fully understand the
6 model, she was concerned about a process that was largely based upon feedback from the library
7 community itself. The most successful innovations that she could think of, outside the library
8 community, do not come from customer research. Rather, they come from some sense of where the
9 wide space is between what we have not even thought of yet, and finding a solution. She wondered if
10 in trying to find the intersection of what the customer needs and what the library is good at, as Metz
11 pointed out, we find that the model we are looking for is not reference. She did not want to spend a lot
12 of money on a model based on an assumption that library reference is where the intersection lies.

13 Janine Goodale of Los Angeles Public Library stated that she liked the citizen entry into the portal
14 of the new reference model because of their presence in My Space, rather than having the mysterious
15 invisible third level of reference. She asked whether on a practical level patron access would result in a
16 large increase in database costs. Metz responded by saying that she did not anticipate increased costs,
17 except in development, experimental, or incubation projects, whose funding would come from LSTA.
18 CLSA costs should not increase, but would be re-directed. Metz clarified her position by stating that
19 she is not proposing in her model that the public have direct access to the databases.

20 Andersen clarified that LSTA does not fund access to all of the databases at LAPL with respect to
21 the reference centers and AskNow. Rather, it funds access to all of the unique databases that LAPL has
22 developed based on their collections and some of their commercial databases. Database funding is re-
23 negotiated each year according to available monies. Metz followed up with some numbers. First

1 Source includes about 50 databases; LAPL has about 186 databases. It is the subset of databases that
2 allows this other kind of access. LAPL spends about a million dollars on its databases, so the \$313,500
3 helps buy them and make them available to other Systems and AskNow.

4 Ray Schroff, Tehama County Library, said that second-level reference works very well for his
5 library; however, the number of second level questions being sent has decreased. Many of the simpler
6 questions are answered locally. Many patrons in Tehama do not have internet access from home
7 because they do not have a computer or because they are using dial-up access because they are too far
8 from the switch, and thus they are unwilling to take the greater amount of time that online interactive
9 searches require. He stated that the type of questions Tehama gets might require someone to actually
10 take steps to find the answer for the patron. As long as our patrons get their questions answered, they
11 probably do not care how that is done. Metz added that one of the reasons why the System Reference
12 staff remain in her design was that it became very clear that the various touch points should not be
13 eliminated. Annette Milliron, North Bay, North State and Mountain Valley Library Systems stated that
14 she favored forward change, but in managing three different budgets, as well as reference for the Black
15 Gold System, she was concerned about the CLSA funds that were directed to question handling. In
16 looking at the expenditure report from 2005/06, she cited several examples of smaller portions of
17 CLSA allocations going to question handling, with larger portions going to other reference programs.
18 She asked if CLSA money were re-purposed to question-handling, how would the other services being
19 supported by CLSA funds be maintained? Milliron stated that North State has to contribute more
20 locally for reference. The only way North State libraries could afford a major database is to pool their
21 funds and purchase it as a System.

22 Hildreth responded that the State Library was very aware of Milliron's concerns. She stated that the
23 System Coordinators were also aware of the attempt to get more information about how CLSA

1 Reference money was being spent. The purpose for requesting the additional information was not to be
2 intrusive or dictatorial, but to learn more precisely how those dollars are being spent. Over the years,
3 interpretation of reference has become more flexible than when the programs of CLSA were first
4 developing. She stated that the State Library was well aware of the concerns that CLSA Systems have
5 and will try to be very careful not to adversely impact services that are working well at the local level
6 using reference money.

7 Milliron stated that funding for databases has allowed a better point of service to North State
8 members, who would not have been able to afford them individually. Steinhauser asked for
9 clarification on the effectiveness of online databases. She stated that there is a school library bill for
10 state-funded purchase of online databases. Steinhauser reported that California is one of only three
11 states that do not have databases available statewide; however, Metz has questioned the effectiveness
12 of online databases, although they would be a part of the reference model.

13 Milliron responded that online databases are very effective when the patron is being shown directly
14 how to use them while in the library or on the telephone. Otherwise, she thought that databases were
15 not effective at all with the patron alone at home, or on their own at the library. Metz pointed out that
16 the new reference model does not preclude libraries from spending their local money on databases.

17 Darla Wegener, Lincoln Public Library, affirmed the importance of databases, stating that three or
18 four hundred magazine subscription would not be affordable for her library. She feels that public
19 libraries need to put more funding into information literacy because the user is trying to search for the
20 answer themselves, but going to the wrong websites. Wegener stated that an online service as
21 described in the new model would help to relieve the library staff from taking the added time to teach
22 the user how to search correctly, just to have them go home and use the wrong sites, like
23 Whitehouse.com.

1 Andrea Stevenson, Library Media Teacher in Lincoln, stated that most schools do not have library
2 media teachers, so the public libraries are where children come for information. The way to get good
3 accurate, reliable information in the hands of children today is to bookmark the Internet site that goes
4 straight to the portal onto their cell phone. Lincoln also has a large retirement community that enjoys
5 using the Internet. Both groups could be induced to utilize this proposed reference model.

6 Rosario Garza, MCLS, Santiago and South State Systems, thought that a virtual portal was a very
7 good idea. She expressed her concern about the digital divide, those people who either cannot afford to
8 be online, or whose connectivity is too slow. Garza asked if any consideration had been given to
9 digitizing the many printed resources not yet available in electronic form, upon which System
10 Reference staff around the state heavily rely. Garza then commented that the proposed reference model
11 would require staff to embrace whatever technology comes along. Some librarians love the latest
12 gadget, while others boast that they do not have a computer at home.

13 Metz responded to Garza's first concern by pointing out that people can utilize the new reference
14 model by calling the service from their telephones. In response to her second concern, Metz said that
15 part of product development is finding out where the local resources are which should be digitized and
16 coordinating that with a state digitization project.

17 Laura Mitchell, Escondido Public Library, complimented Metz on her thorough research. She
18 referred to the study mentioned earlier, which found that hard questions were not answered well. In her
19 rural area where the libraries are small and poor, with very limited collections, a short answer will not
20 always work. Sometimes the user needs a longer answer and one or more books on a subject are
21 required. Mitchell stated that part of the mission of the Serra Cooperative Library System is
22 supplementing the collections of libraries with small resources. She asked if the model makes room for

1 the need that some libraries with smaller resources and collections have for the actual physical items,
2 such as books.

3 Metz responded that this was one of the issues raised in the field. Some libraries are really
4 struggling with insufficient resources. She stated that the new model does not solve the dilemma of
5 local library funding, but it hasn't been ignored either.

6 Kathy Aaron, Inland Library System, presented several comments. First, concerning staff and the
7 number of questions received, she stated that if reference is done too well and gets too many questions,
8 it fails, because there is insufficient staff to handle the increased volume. She said that one of the
9 reasons their question levels are down is because Inland does not publicize the reference service to its
10 member libraries. To do so would increase the number of questions without the staff to meet the turn-
11 around objective. Another issue that Aaron raised is that in the proposed model, all reference questions
12 are going to one site, AskNow. Inland Library System would prefer that member library questions
13 continue to be handled at the System Reference Center to which the member belongs. She stated that
14 training was very important, especially Core training at the local level. Lastly, Aaron asked if the
15 statewide reference telephone number would be an 800 number?

16 Metz responded that the telephone number would more than likely be an 800 number. Regarding
17 the reference question volume issue, she stated that if dedicated CLSA Reference staff and other
18 resources (i.e., LSTA), were available for the 3-4 year implementation window, the volume of
19 questions should be pushed as high as possible. If it becomes more volume than can be managed, then
20 after three or four years, another solution could be implemented. On the other hand, if it works well
21 and is an impressive program, hopefully money would become available for question handling.

22 Barbara Pearson, Altadena Library District, stated that there appeared to be a consensus for the state
23 to change to a virtual reference model. She expressed concern that data was insufficient to support the

1 assumption that reference was the primary concern of the user, versus other kinds of library services.
2 Furthermore, she thought that details of the model should be discussed in the library community before
3 redirection of funds to support it took place. Pearson felt that before implementation, some mechanism
4 should be developed to train the library user in this model, perhaps a demonstration project of some
5 type.

6 Janet Sporleder, Arcadia Public Library, addressed the Board by saying that managing change is
7 difficult for everyone. The changes proposed in the new model are significant but it was clear that
8 reference services really do need to change. Sporleder stated that although a great deal of detail
9 remains to be developed, she applauded Metz's first step in providing a pathway, a flexible plan with
10 new directions and great possibilities.

11 Connie Corcoran, Tuolumne County Library, stated that Metz presented a great idea with
12 tremendous opportunity. Based upon her years of experience as a reference librarian and library
13 administrator, the findings of research and intuitive evidence watching what people do, she felt that the
14 proposal may be the last opportunity for libraries to show the public that they have anything to do with
15 finding information. Corcoran stated that the Tuolumne Library has die-hard library customers that
16 bring in all their questions; but it has been an uphill battle to convince most people to search for an
17 answer to their questions at a library. She stated that when it comes to implementation and naming the
18 design, she does not want to see the word "*California*" as the first word in the name. Corcoran strongly
19 felt that the first word in the name should be "*Answers,*" and the first words in the description should
20 be "*Coming to you from your Public Library.*" The Portal should advertise itself as authenticated by
21 librarians. This would indicate that it is a cut above other avenues the customer may be using. She
22 stated that if that message is effective, it may also spur customers to come into the library as well. She
23 is eager to see the new reference model go forward. Corcoran reported that her library system is on the

1 verge of not spending all its reference money this year. She wished that the design phase was further
2 along so that the 44-99 System could support the new model with this year's funding.

3 Metz stated that the term "reference" does not work well for her, but it is the current term that has
4 been in use. The word "reference" is not enough and it frames us into a certain way of thinking. What
5 we are developing is virtual library reference services, not just reference services. Second-level
6 question handling through the CLSA Reference Centers is virtual reference. Nothing is changing on
7 that score. She stated that when questions are coming in through a portal, transcripts of data could be
8 analyzed to find out what is being done and what customer services need to be provided. Metz
9 suggested that the attendees look at some of Marie Radford's research. She's doing a project called,
10 "*Seeking Synchronicity*," working with OCLC and funded through IMLS and other grant providers,
11 looking at the human side of Web 2.0 and beyond. One of the points made by Radford was by the year
12 2012, the 12-20 year old population will outnumber the Boomers. Her research shows that they would
13 not go to a librarian to ask a question, but would go to the library to find out about reading materials
14 and seek that personal interaction.

15 Loren MccRory, Yuba County Library, stated that four years ago she came from Pennsylvania,
16 which had statewide paid subscription to databases. She wondered why databases have not been made
17 available through state funds for California. MccRory stated from her experience that she knows it
18 would not be enough to just fund and make them available to the public, but that they would need to be
19 promoted by letting the public know that a library card is needed to access this rich resource.
20 Andersen commented that an *OCLC Perceptions* report showed that only 1% of people surveyed
21 thought of databases when they thought of libraries. There is a lot of customer training that has to be
22 done to educate the public.

1 Metz cautioned the state about purchasing databases for statewide access, especially for the size of
2 California. She said to look at the federated searching that is going on in other states and see if this
3 tool is increasing customer use at the library.

4 **Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

5 Sandy Habbestad reported that the annual cost studies that determine the proposed reimbursement
6 rates for the Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and Direct Loan programs were completed and sent to the
7 Department of Finance for consideration as part of the May Revise. The studies showed an increase in
8 the base rate for both programs for FY 2007/08. The recommended rates were proposed at \$5.29 per
9 eligible ILL transaction and \$.97 for net imbalance Direct Loan transactions. She stated that following
10 the Board's approval, the rates would be sent to the Department of Finance for consideration.

11 *It was moved, seconded (Bernardo/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of*
12 *California Board adopts, subject to the concurrence of the State Department of*
13 *Finance, reimbursement rates for the 2007/08 fiscal year as follows: for CLSA*
14 *interlibrary loans, a reimbursement rate of \$5.29 per eligible transaction; for CLSA*
15 *direct loans, a reimbursement rate of \$.97 per eligible transaction; and that the Chief*
16 *Executive Officer inform all participants of the 2007/08 reimbursement rates as soon*
17 *as Department of Finance concurrence is obtained.*
18

19 **Library of California (LoC) Regional Library Network Development**

20 Habbestad stated that although funding was no longer available to support the Library of California
21 (LoC) and Regional Library Networks, the Heartland region brings forward two applications for
22 membership. She stated that Heartland continues to provide service to its members through pre-paid
23 workshops and training sessions.

24 **It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the Library of**
25 **California Board approves the two requests for network affiliation for the members listed**
26 **in Table A, with member services to begin immediately. (See Attachment C)**
27

28 **CLSA System Reference, Communications and Delivery, and System Advisory Board programs**

29

1 Habbestad stated that the written report for the three System-level programs contained summaries
2 of the 2005/06 System Annual Reports including achievement of performance objectives and annual
3 expenditure of funds.

4 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

5 Habbestad provided the Board with an update on the three new library jurisdictions that were
6 approved for System membership at the Board's September 2006 meeting. The City of Moorpark in
7 the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System (MCLS) submitted all the documentation necessary for
8 CLSA participation and System membership. She reported that city/county arrangements with the City
9 of Redding have become clearer since the Board took action accepted Redding Public Library as a
10 member of North State. The City of Redding has taken possession of the new library building in
11 Redding and the County of Shasta is now contracting with Redding for library services. Habbestad
12 stated that an error was made in calculating the preliminary allocations for North State for the three
13 System-level programs; however, the final allocations to North State, and all other Systems, for FY
14 2007/08 would reflect the corrected amount. She also stated that documents were received from the
15 Inland Library System accepting Victorville Public Library into System membership.

16 **Legislative Report**

17 President Maghsoudi reported that Member Steinhauser, Chair of the Legislative Committee, had
18 to leave the meeting and asked Hildreth to report on Legislative issues. Hildreth reported that Member
19 Steinshouser asked to get Board consensus in support of four legislative bills. First, SB 156, authored
20 by Senator Simitian and coauthored by Assembly Member Wolk, is the California Reading and
21 Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2008, with a cost
22 of \$4 billion.

1 Hildreth stated that Member Steinhauser is also recommending a support position for AB 1030,
2 Libraries, Literacy and English Acquisition Services, which focuses on library literacy services for
3 young adults, 16 years and older, who are not enrolled in school. She stated that the author of the bill,
4 Assembly Member Caballero, former Mayor of Salinas, is very dedicated to literacy and literacy
5 services and is interested in targeting youth that have not completed high school and are at-risk of
6 achieving success in life. She stated that although the bill did not have a dollar amount attached, it was
7 anticipated that the author would be asking for \$2 million to fund this targeted component.

8 Hildreth stated that Member Steinhauser also suggested support for AB 1233, Galgiani, an Online
9 Homework Assistance Program provided to all public libraries through the California State Library.
10 She stated that AB 1233 was put forward because of the initiatives and activities of Tutor.com, who
11 hired a lobbyist to work on finding state funding for a statewide Homework Help Program. Assembly
12 Member Galgiani would be putting forward a request for \$3 million, which is not the total cost for
13 statewide Live Homework Help. Hildreth stated that a Request for Proposal (RFP) to all potential
14 vendors would go out if general fund dollars were allocated for the program.

15 Hildreth stated that Member Steinhauser was also seeking support for an Senate Omnibus Bill on
16 County Law Library locations, which is relieving the county from requiring the county law libraries to
17 be in the County Seat, based on changing populations and demographics.

18 Lastly, Hildreth reported that Member Steinhauser requested Board support for the Hancock bill,
19 AB 333, School Libraries: Online Databases Subscriptions, which brings support for statewide
20 databases. She stated that there would be a statewide purchase through the Department of Education
21 and then school districts could purchase off that contract.

22 Member Zollman asked how AB 1030 would fold into the current Adult Literacy programs.
23 Hildreth responded that it is a piece of the existing literacy legislation. The additional state funding

1 that would accompany the bill would provide an incentive for additional local funding to focus on the
2 target audience.

3 Member Bernardo asked if AB 333 was supported by the California Library Association (CLA).
4 Hildreth responded that the four bills mentioned have the full support of CLA Legislative Committee.

5 Since there was not a quorum of the Board, members present provided the following motion in
6 order for the President to write letters of support on behalf of the Board.

7 ***By consensus the Library of California Board authorizes the Board President to send***
8 ***letters in support the following legislative bills:***

9 ***SB 156, Senator Simitian, Library Construction Bond Act of 2008***
10 ***AB 1030, Assembly Member Caballero, Literacy and English acquisition services,***
11 ***young adult component***
12 ***AB 1233, Assembly Member Galgiani, Homework assistance***
13 ***AB 333, Assembly Member Hancock, School libraries: online databases:***
14 ***subscriptions***

15
16 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

17 No one from the audience rose to address the Board.

18 **BOARD COMMENTS**

19 Board members remaining at the meeting (Bernardo, Zollman, Fong, Maghsoudi) thanked staff
20 for working with Ruth Metz on behalf of the first steps toward a new reference model and looked
21 forward to seeing the program developed.

22 Member Fong also thanked Cameron Robertson upon his retirement from state service and
23 wished him well from the Board.

24 **AGENDA BUILDING**

25 President Maghsoudi stated that she would work with staff on agenda development for the August
26 8, 2007 meeting.

27

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

2 With there being no further business to come before the Board, President Maghsoudi adjourned the
3 meeting of the Library of California Board at 4:25pm on April 18, 2007.

4 #####

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Library of California Board Resolution 2007-01

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Sonia W. Levitin 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 Sonia for her outstanding public service representing Special Libraries since her appointment by former California Governor Gray Davis on January 14, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to acknowledge Sonia for her distinguished service as a member of the Budget and Planning Committee (2003-2006); and

WHEREAS, Sonia has advocated for libraries at the state level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that she brought to the Library of California Board her valuable experience as an author of numerous books, guest lecturer throughout the country and instructor for the UCLA Writer's Program;

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to recognize Sonia's outstanding contributions to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

SONIA W. LEVITIN

*for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 18 April 2007*

Library of California Board Resolution 2007-02

In Honor of Cameron D. Robertson

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Cameron D. Robertson for the many years of dedicated service on the occasion of his retirement on April 30, 2007; and

WHEREAS, Cameron Robertson served the people of California with great distinction, energy and devotion beginning with his appointment to the California State Library Braille and Talking Book Library in 1976, where he designed the library's first automated system which changed the way libraries served their customers; and

WHEREAS, in 1980 Cameron was appointed the Library Systems Specialist in the Library Development Services Bureau to work with a variety of public libraries on their federally funded information technology projects; and

WHEREAS, in 1982 Cameron was promoted within LDS and spent the next ten years as the California Library Services Act Program Manager where he became responsible for developing policy recommendations for the California Library Services Board; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure with CLSA, Cameron helped develop and implement the California Literacy Campaign and Families for Literacy Program, and in 1992 expanded his duties to include the responsibilities of Assistant Bureau Chief for Library Development Services; and

WHEREAS, in October 1992, State Librarian Gary Strong appointed Cameron Robertson to the position of Assistant State Librarian, and because of Cameron's exceptional leadership abilities, in December 1995, Governor Pete Wilson appointed Robertson Deputy State Librarian, a gubernatorial action which State Librarian Emeritus Dr. Kevin Starr encouraged; and

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board desires to honor Cameron Robertson for his many contributions to the California State Library and its services and staff, with good wishes to him and his family for the many years he served to enable Californians to learn and to obtain information through our libraries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

CAMERON D. ROBERTSON

*For his distinguished leadership and contributions
To the libraries and people of the State of California
On this day of 18 April 2007*

Table A
Requests for Network Affiliation for New Members

HEARTLAND REGIONAL LIBRARY NETWORK

Member

UCSF Fresno Medical Library
West Hills College Lemoore

Participating Libraries

UCSF Fresno Medical Library
West Hills College Library Lemoore