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California Library Services Board Meeting
February 4, 2020

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

BOARD OPENING

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

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

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

Adoption of Agenda

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

Approval of September 2019 Meeting Minutes

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

Board Meeting for Fall 2020

Annly Roman reported that the Board had already selected April 2, 2020 as the date for their spring 2020 meeting but wanted to have further discussion on coordinating the fall meeting with the California Library Association’s annual conference at the end of October 2020. Multiple Board members expressed support for this option.
Monica Rivas brought up that if the Board met that late in the year it could impact the Systems’ checks. Rivas stated that the Systems normally received two checks, one after the fall meeting and one later in the fiscal year. Since board meetings had been held later in the last few years so the first check had been going out later. The Systems had expressed that it was a hardship because they had to cover costs from the beginning of the fiscal year in July until they receive the first check. Rivas said those payments would be even later if the Board held their meeting in late October unless the Board released the first payment before they met in fall. This would mean the State Library would release funds before the Board had seen and approved the Plans of Service.

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

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

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

**Nomination of Board Vice President**

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

Florante Ibanez stated that he would be willing to serve as Vice President.

There were no other nominations from the floor.

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

**REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

**Board President’s Report**

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

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

**Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

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

Lucas stated the proposed budget also contained an additional $170,000 that related primarily to broadband. There was a Public Utilities Commission ruling that
would have cost libraries more in participation fees for broadband. The State Library turned in a budget request to have the state cover that amount so there would be no additional cost to libraries. The most significant change from the previous fiscal year was $2.5 million for additional online content for California’s 6.2 million public school kids. As part of the K-12 Online Content Project, the State Library helped provide access to three suites of content Britannica, Teachingbooks.net, and ProQuest. The Governor stated that he wanted to provide more STEM and STEAM information. The additional funding was to provide resources that allowed deeper subject matter dives for kids then the Britannica and ProQuest offerings.

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

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

Lucas stated that the funding was first made available in 2017 and the online content was made available to school kids at the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year. Within a year it was accessible to 84% of public school children. The remaining 16%, just like the libraries that still needed to be connected to faster
broadband, were the more difficult ones to reach. Member Martinez asked if they had seen a growth in usage from one year to the next. Lucas replied that the resources had only been in schools for one year so the State Library would have a better idea of the growth after the current year. Based on the first six months of usage in the last school year versus the first six months of usage in this school year there had been an increase.

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

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

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

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

The California Library Association lobbyists had been approached by two legislators. Senator Tom Umberg from the 34th district wanted to do legislation around a free library card for all students. His office heard about the Student Success Initiative, which was a statewide grant program dealing with providing library cards to student, as well as a program the Nashville Public Library was doing offering all students library cards. The Dillons and the Committee thought a good
approach would be to ask for a line item in the budget to support collaboration between schools and libraries. So the committee was just watching for right now.

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

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

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

The other request related to an audit made in 2016 which determined that there were statewide issues surrounding violations of California code of
regulations, Title five on teacher credentialing, concerning the number of teacher librarians available to students and teachers in various school districts.

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

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

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

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

Member Martinez stated that in the letter the Board sent to the Governor they had seven potential budget items that they outlined. She asked if they would add
the two items Member Williams brought forward to that list. She thought that the
Board should prioritize down to three or five items that they thought were the most
important for the lobbying effort in April. Martinez asked if the Board thought they
wanted to have a list of seven or potentially eight items.

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

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

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

Member Murguia asked if the California Library Association or the State Library
knew how much the line item amount for the Student Success Card bill would be.
State Librarian Lucas stated that he did not think that the Senator was proposing
a line item. His understanding was that was what CLA was suggesting in lieu of a
bill. Lucas stated that he was asked by the Senator’s staff to provide information
on programs in California to put library cards into the hands of school children.
The State Library created a memo that cited the Student Success Card program,
and some of the efforts that LA Unified and the LA Public Library did together. That
information was provided to Senator Umberg’s office. There was nothing in the State Librarian’s conversations with the Senator that suggested he was going to request a budget item.

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

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

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

Member Martinez asked if the Board’s ongoing requests for $3 million for literacy programs and $4 million to provide online and phone based tutoring would go through the Department of Education. State Librarian Lucas stated that there was a library literacy program that the State Library administered which received $7.3 million in on-going funding. The $4 million program was something the Board had recommended but did not currently exist. There were several companies that provided online or over the phone tutoring services in English and Spanish from 10:00am until 10:00pm that could do a statewide contract so that every kid had access for something under $4 million. BrainFuse was one of the companies and Tutor.com was another. Lucas stated that some libraries had these programs independently however, all the individual contacts in the state
added up to more than it would cost for a single statewide contact for everyone. Member Martinez stated that it sounded like the item with the highest cost was the one without a proven track record. State Librarian Lucas stated that it was not a statewide program but was used in a number of localities around the state.

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

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

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

State Librarian Lucas stated that of those priorities online databases, Lunch at the Library and Zip Books were already in the Governor’s budget. He advised starting by thanking the Governor for including those very important investments then proposing funding the other programs they knew had an impact on local communities and made fiscal sense because they were one-time. Both the technology grant and the Innovation Lab programs had a high number of applications and there were still people who were eager to participate after the money went out the door.
President Bernardo stated that she thought Member Martinez’s suggestions about focusing their requests in April were very thoughtful. Member Murguia clarified that the Board was considering a letter to the Governor thanking him for the items he included in the budget and asking him to include technology grant and Innovation Lab support in the May revision. The Board was also considering coordinating that letter with their legislator meetings in April. Bernardo confirmed that was what they were discussing.

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

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

President Bernardo asked if the Board was in agreement that they would continue to support the three items that the Governor had included in his introduced budget and support an additional budget ask, both in a letter and when visiting legislators in April, of $1.5 million in one-time funding for new technology, $1 million in one-time funding for Innovation Labs, $3 million increase in literacy services funding, and $4 million in on-going funding for online and phone tutoring. Multiple Board members expressed support.
Member Williams asked if State Librarian Lucas could talk to the California School Librarians Association about talking points to take with them related to the School Librarians’ requests. Lucas stated that he would be happy to do that.

Public Comment

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

Comments from Board Members/Officers

There were not comments from Board members.

Old Business

There was no old business brought forward.

Agenda Building

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

Adjournment

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