

1 *Approved as corrected August 7, 2008*

2
3 Library of California Board Meeting
4 February 28, 2008

5
6 California State Library
7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
8 Sacramento, California
9

10 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

11
12 President Penny Kastanis convened the Library of California Board Meeting on
13 February 28, 2008 at 9:05 a.m., by asking the Board Members and those present to say
14 the Pledge of Allegiance. President Kastanis then welcomed Board Members, staff and
15 audience members to Sacramento and called for introductions.

16 **Board Members Present:** President Kastanis, Anne Bernardo, Tyrone Cannon,
17 Victoria Fong, Linda Jewett, Jane Lowenthal, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Susan Steinhauser
18 and Judy Zollman.

19 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Susan Hildreth, Stacey
20 Aldrich, Bessie Condos, Tom Andersen, Gerry Maginnity, Sandy Habbestad, Rush
21 Brandis and Ira Bray.

22 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

23
24 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
25 *Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the February 28, 2008*
26 *meeting as presented.*
27

28 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

29
30 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the*
31 *draft minutes of the August 8, 2007 Library of California Board meeting be*
32 *approved as corrected.*
33

34 *It was moved, seconded (Cannon/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the*
35 *draft minutes of the October 31, 2007 Library of California Board meeting be*
36 *approved as presented.*

1
2 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

3
4 **Board President's Report**

5
6 President Kastanis reported that she attended a California Library Association (CLA)
7 Legislative Committee meeting for Board representative Susan Steinhauser who was
8 unable to attend. Although there had been other meetings, they were mostly concerned
9 about how cuts could be made during this time of tight budgets.

10 **Board Vice President's Report**

11
12 Member Cannon reported that since his election as Vice President, most of his
13 activities had been focused within the American Library Association (ALA). He was
14 now serving on the *ALA Budget Analysis and Review Committee*. He was also chairing
15 the *ACRL Dr. E. J. Josey Spectrum Scholars Mentor Committee*, which sought to
16 increase underrepresented ethnic groups into academic libraries. He also began his
17 second year on the *Friends of the San Francisco Public Library Board*. He was now
18 Chair of the *Library Support and Evaluation Sub-committee*.

19 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

20
21 Hildreth reported that there had been some ups and downs at the State Library since
22 the Board had last met in August and teleconferenced in October. Some good news was
23 that 98 percent of the public library systems that had applied for Public Library
24 Foundation (PLF) funds qualified. Out of the 181 public library systems in California,
25 179 applied, leaving only two libraries that did not apply. But out of the 179 that applied,
26 only two of those were ineligible. This indicated to Hildreth that at least the funding for
27 maintaining operations was stable.

1 Hildreth reported on some good news for the California State Library (CSL). In the
2 2008/09 Proposed State Budget, Hildreth was surprised that two of the submitted Budget
3 Change Proposals (BCPs) had been funded. Both were one-time expenditures. The first
4 was for CSL's new on-line library system. The massive library collections, both
5 electronic and print, would have been inaccessible without it. Also funded were the
6 relocation costs to facilitate the renovation of Library and Courts I (LC I).

7 The State had been funded to renovate and restore LC I to its historical significance.
8 The move of State Library staff and collection out of LC I was anticipated for early in
9 2009. The library would have a storage facility, with some staff and minimal public
10 access somewhere in the area of the collection. Most of the staff would regroup with their
11 colleagues in Library and Courts II (LC II). The Board should still be able to have its fall
12 meeting in LC I, but it might need to identify a new location after that session.

13 The challenging news was the proposed 10 percent reduction in the State Library
14 Operating Budget and in Local Assistance. That included the Transaction Based
15 Reimbursement (TBR) Program which was of special concern to the LoC Board. Also
16 slated for a 10 percent reduction was PLF. The Literacy Program, which had been funded
17 at about \$5 million, was slated for a \$500,000 reduction. Two other lesser known local
18 assistance programs administered by the State Library were also reduced: the *California*
19 *Civil Liberty Public Education Program* (CCLPEP), which focused on education and
20 activities surrounding the Japanese internment, and the California Newspaper Project.
21 Everything across the board had been reduced by 10 percent.

22 One of the most challenging budget reductions was the \$1.6 million reduction for
23 State Library operations. It was challenging because the CSL used federal funding to

1 manage some of its functions, primarily Library Development Services and the Braille
2 and Talking Book Library. Some State Library functions, along with the Administrative
3 Services Bureau and the California Research Bureau, were completely funded by the
4 State General Fund, whereas other parts of CSL had some Federal and some General
5 Fund alliance. The State Library had been unable to pass through all the library units
6 with completely equitable cuts and still meet the budget requirement. Some positions had
7 to be completely abolished. Once a position was gone, it would be very difficult to get it
8 back.

9 Reduction in library operating budget would effect everything, including training,
10 travel, technology and in particular, materials. The materials budget for the year 2008/09
11 was anticipated to be about \$850,000. By way of comparison, the book budget in
12 1999/2000, which had been a good year, was at \$2.7 million; \$850,000 would barely
13 support electronic databases and some of the standard serial subscriptions, things that
14 continued from year to year. Although the Technical Services staff have said that there
15 was a backlog of work to be done, at some point the library would no longer be able to
16 serve its primary clientele, the state customers, i.e., the legislators and state employees.
17 For now the focus would continue to be on electronic resources, because getting
18 information at their desk tops seemed to be the most useful service to state employees.

19 Hildreth next reported some good news concerning one of the initiatives being
20 developed using federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. The State
21 Library had formed a partnership with a non-profit organization, *Libraries for the Future*,
22 which provided new services, new service models and advocacy for libraries. They had a
23 particular interest in developing services for the boomer population. CSL was partnering

1 with them to remake services to the boomer population, which included not only seniors,
2 but engaged older adults. This collaboration had led to some other partnerships with
3 them, particularly regarding consumer health issues, volunteering opportunities and some
4 specialized early learning programs. *Libraries for the Future* had been around for ten to
5 fifteen years. Although they had been headquartered in New York City for a number of
6 years they were creating offices all over the country. They were adept at identifying
7 private sources of funding. Some of their funders really wanted to support activities in
8 California. It was hoped that the partnership would be very strategic in channeling to
9 California some of the private and corporate money to which they seemed to have access.

10 Andersen added that along with the ten percent reduction in 2008/09, a 1.5 percent
11 reduction had been required from the current fiscal year budget. Hildreth clarified that
12 the 1.5 percent reduction was required across the board for fiscal year 2007/08 and not
13 just from the remainder of the budget.

14 Member Cannon asked whether the State Library was at the point of having to cancel
15 databases. Hildreth responded that CSL would have to look at that very closely and be
16 very careful in its spending over the 2008/09 fiscal year. However, she was not inclined
17 to cancel the databases. Many things had been cancelled over the years, but if some of
18 the publications were not maintained they would lose their value.

19 Member Fong wondered what State Library positions might be considered for
20 elimination. Hildreth declared that the topic had not yet been discussed publicly with
21 library staff. Federal funds were being redirected to three positions in the Braille and
22 Talking Book Library that were formerly funded from the General Fund. Three positions
23 in the California Research Bureau (CRB), two or three positions in Administrative

1 Services (ASB) and four positions in State Library Services (SLS) were being considered
2 for abolishment.

3 Hildreth explained how each state department had to achieve a certain percentage of
4 salary attrition every year. The mandate was six percent. Even though CSL had to go
5 into 2008/09 with a reduced position level, still it had to come up with six percent
6 attrition. The library had about 190 authorized positions, but with the attrition savings it
7 had about 173 that were filled. So, about eleven positions would be either redirected or
8 abolished. Andersen remarked that the good news was that a lay-off mode was not
9 anticipated.

10 **Resource Sharing Report**

11 12 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

13
14 Sandy Habbestad reported that Merced County Library requested a change of System
15 membership from the 49-99 Cooperative Library System to the San Joaquin Valley
16 Library System, effective July 1, 2008. It also requested that the State Board waive the
17 filing date requirement, since the notice was received after the legally required,
18 September 1, 2007 deadline. Some background information was given. Last year, the
19 City of Stockton made it known that it no longer wanted to be the fiscal agent for 49-99.
20 In order to contract with another agency for those services, the System needed to rescind
21 its joint powers agreement. They have done so and have reestablished themselves as the
22 49-99 System, an organization by joint resolution. They are now contracting with MCLS
23 to provide administrative services. Instead of continuing with 49-99, the Merced County
24 Board of Supervisors approved to terminate the agreement with 49-99 and authorized the

1 affiliation with SJVLS, which borders three member library jurisdictions: Madera,
2 Mariposa and Fresno counties.

3 President Kastanis invited comment from Jacque Meriam, Merced County Librarian,
4 who was in the audience. Meriam stated that one of the major reasons Merced Library
5 wanted to switch affiliations was the resource sharing that went on through the San
6 Joaquin Valley Library System. Many Merced residents worked in Madera and Fresno
7 counties and even went up to Mariposa County to work. She considered it a wonderful
8 and beneficial resource to her patrons that they could go to all these different places and
9 share items.

10 Hildreth then invited Jeff Crosby, Administrative Librarian at the San Joaquin Valley
11 Library System (SJVLS), to speak. Crosby stated that because many of the SJVLS
12 members were some of the poorest funded libraries in the state per capita, SJVLS had
13 been heavily involved in resource sharing for a very long time. For example, the entire
14 card catalog was shared in common. Anyone in the six-county area could log into any
15 library and borrow materials. Responding to Hildreth's question, Crosby affirmed that
16 Merced would be participating in SJVLS's circulation consortium. The migration had
17 already been priced and scheduled to tap in within the first week of July.

18 President Kastanis called for the motion but first asked for comments from the Board.
19 Member Steinhauser offered that given the very lean financial situation that LoC funding
20 was in, she was very delighted that the LoC statute had not been eliminated. She
21 applauded SJVLS that even in tight financial times their area seemed to be the most
22 active of any of the regions and that poverty had brought them together. President
23 Kastanis remarked that the changes initiated during the time of the LoC had been positive

1 for the library users and she thought this move had been a healthy move for the library
2 System.

3 Member Bernardo commented that as a member of the SJVLS area she was very
4 happy to see her colleagues actively coordinating their efforts. Member Steinhauser then
5 asked what impact the change of System membership would have on 49-99. Rosario
6 Garza, Administrator for 49-99, answered that currently Merced accounted for about 15
7 percent of the entire population for the 49-99 libraries. On that basis, a 15 percent budget
8 reduction was expected, with additional reductions expected based upon the state budget
9 crisis.

10 Andersen reported that Systems in three areas of the state had been considering
11 consolidation into a larger CLSA System. This began in the Bay Area about one and
12 one-half years ago, and although the State Library has been in favor of it happening, it
13 had been a completely local decision. The law stipulated that small grants should be
14 made to Systems going through consolidation. Even though there was no CLSA funding
15 available, some LSTA dollars had been given for planning assistance. Some of the
16 outcomes of this had been increased resource sharing activities. In the Bay Area, three
17 out of the four Systems had agreed to the consolidation.

18 In the Los Angeles area there was an unusual situation in that it was the only place
19 where two Systems sat on top of each other. The South State Cooperative Library
20 System and the Metropolitan Cooperative Library System share the same geographic
21 borders of Los Angeles County. South State had four members, so it was the smallest in
22 terms of jurisdictions. But in terms of outlets, those four members included Los Angeles
23 County. L.A. County Library and L.A. Public Library were by far the two largest library

1 systems in the state. Because it took a lot of work to do a consolidation, South State was
2 carefully considering whether it wanted to go through with it. It would mean that the
3 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) would disband and a new one would be formed. Since an
4 infrastructure was already in place, it would be just a matter of affiliating with MCLS,
5 but that would be decided at the local level. Twelve out of the fifteen Systems were
6 organized by JPAs. The other three Systems had Agreements by Joint Resolution. All
7 three had been going through various planning sessions with some outside consulting
8 assistance. Requests to consolidate could be expected by next fall.

9 President Kastanis asked Andersen whether more consolidation activity could be
10 expected, considering the present budget constraints. Andersen thought that the economy
11 of scale that might be achieved by consolidation would be another incentive for change.
12 He explained that the North Bay System now administered the North State and the
13 Mountain Valley Library Systems. North Bay members had already agreed to
14 consolidate and were now actively courting North State and Mountain Valley. Andersen
15 and Habbestad attended one joint meeting of all three Systems, in which they agreed to
16 move fairly quickly in their decision. Should any formal notice of intent be submitted to
17 the Board prior to its meeting in August, the earliest the proposed consolidation could
18 take effect is July 1, 2009.

19 *It was moved, seconded (Jewett/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the*
20 *Library of California board approves the proposed change in System*
21 *membership for the Merced County Library from the 49-99 Cooperative*
22 *Library system to the San Joaquin Valley Library System; and further moves*
23 *to accept the request to waive the September 1, 2007 filing date for 2008/09*
24 *affiliations so that this request becomes effective July 1, 2008.*

25
26 **LoC Regional Library Network Development**
27

1 Habbestad reported that the Gold Coast Library Network had forwarded one new
2 application for Library of California membership from the Antioch University, Santa
3 Barbara. The Gold Coast Board of Directors continued to meet annually to provide a
4 multitype dialog, although no services were provided to their members. Although
5 funding was no longer available to support LoC activities, the State Board must continue
6 to approve the memberships, whenever requested.

7 Member Fong asked whether Golden Gateway and Sierra Valley were still Network
8 members even though they had suspended their operation. Habbestad responded that
9 Golden Gateway's Board of Directors had suspended all operation, but the non-profit
10 entity had not dissolved. As for Sierra Valley, the Board of Directors would decide in
11 2008 whether to dissolve as a non-profit entity. Andersen added that the law was still
12 active about the formation of the regional networks and membership in them. Suspension
13 of operations was a local decision.

14 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously*
15 *that the Library of California Board approves the request for network*
16 *affiliation for the member listed in Table A, with member services to begin*
17 *immediately. (See Attachment A)*

18
19 **Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and Direct Loan Programs**

20
21 Habbestad reported that the transaction levels for both Interlibrary Loan and Direct
22 Loan programs continued to increase. In fact ILL activity showed the highest transaction
23 levels in the history of the program. In the first two quarters of this year, it was estimated
24 that 2.8 million interlibrary loans would be made during the year. That was an increase
25 of about 18 percent from 2006/07 levels. Net imbalance direct loan transactions were
26 estimated to increase by 8 percent. Staff was projecting that the TBR appropriation would
27 reimburse participants at about 43 percent this fiscal year, which was the lowest in the

1 program's history. Hildreth commented that even at 43 percent reimbursement, people
2 continued to use the services. A CSL investment was made in the California Libraries
3 Catalog (CalCat), where the holdings of all participating academic, government, public,
4 special, and school libraries may be accessed; however, it might not be possible to do
5 analysis to see if the CalCat effort had anything to do with the increase in ILLs. It is
6 possible that the increase in the ILL actually may have come from the fact that a number
7 of Systems were now working together and doing a lot more resource sharing. The more
8 library holdings were made available on the Web the more customers were taking
9 advantage of them.

10 Andersen updated the Board on the new software being developed to calculate
11 transactions for ILL and Direct Loan reimbursements. The new software would replace
12 the current database that had been functioning on a very old operating system. Currently,
13 library participants submitted claim forms by U.S. mail or fax. The new operating
14 system would allow online reporting by both the library participants and the State
15 Library, making for a seamless process with improved tracking mechanisms. He stated
16 that the software was being paid for with LSTA dollars as part of a networking grant,
17 since it obviously helped promote resource sharing. Hildreth said that it was going to
18 help the State Library manage those programs with reduced staff. Streamlining what is
19 now a laborious, paper-driven process would not only make it easier for CSL but also for
20 the local libraries to submit their data.

21 Member Steinhauser inquired whether, given the serious reduction in the
22 reimbursement to participating libraries, there had been any indications that certain
23 libraries would pull out of the program? She heard city managers or supervisors saying

1 from time to time that in these lean budget times they could barely take care of their own,
2 and they really could not take care of individuals who worked in the area but did not pay
3 taxes. Andersen remarked that there were occasional inquiries about what the effect
4 would be if a library pulled out of the System in order to charge non-resident fees, but
5 there were no indications at present that any library was actively pursuing such a course.

6 **Statewide Reference Model**

7
8 President Kastanis called on Stacey Aldrich to update the Board on the Statewide
9 Reference project. Aldrich reported that for the past two year the State Library had done
10 many studies and focus groups and a Statewide Reference model had been designed by
11 Ruth Metz. After a complete review of all documents developed to date, Aldrich had
12 many questions, such as:

- 13 • What were we actually trying to do?
- 14 • What was the total information ecosystem that we were trying to address with
15 statewide reference, and thinking more broadly?
- 16 • How did we work with academic and school libraries?
- 17 • How did all of that, including our other information resources, fit together?

18 Aldrich stated that the first step was to find out how we could best serve our
19 customers and their information needs, and how people were actually using information.
20 In order to collect data the State Library began working with Zogby International to get
21 demographic information on California. We began looking through a stack of studies
22 from PEW and IMLS on information behaviors so that we could determine what kind of
23 information people were looking for, how they were finding that information, and where
24 they were having problems finding it.

1 Aldrich met with library directors and system coordinators around the state and
2 became aware that many felt uninvolved in creating the new statewide reference model.
3 It was then decided to build in the capacity for involving more people in the process. A
4 Zogby poll was conducted. Zogby kept a huge database of information, broken down by
5 state, from people who had participated in their previous surveys. These people were
6 asked whether they would like to participate in further surveys. Zogby selected a pool of
7 people to get a cross-range of demographics and then put out an email message to elicit
8 responses to their online poll. They received 706 responses and the results were
9 compiled in the report included in the Board packet. Participants were asked how often
10 they searched for information. Nine out of ten said “often,” with eight out of ten saying
11 “very often.” Ninety-two percent started their search on the Internet, and 92 percent
12 began with Google. Only .5 percent began their information search with their local
13 library. When asked whether they had trouble finding information, 71.2 percent reported
14 that they had no trouble finding what they wanted. Of the 25.2 percent reporting some
15 trouble finding information, 3.2 percent reported “very often” having a problem finding
16 what they wanted. Participants responded that they were using their local library as a
17 complementary information source, looking for more specialized information to
18 supplement what they had found on the Internet.

19 With respect to the AskNow service, 81 percent did not know what it was. Of those
20 who did know, six of ten had never used it. Of those who interacted with a library, email
21 was the first preference for interaction and online live chat was the second. Of those who
22 indicated that they had visited their local library, 75 percent would look online for local
23 library resources when unable to find information on the Internet. The poll indicated that

1 for the most part the local library was not the first choice for finding information. People
2 were asked if they would like to see more multi-lingual materials in their library; a split
3 was found between those saying “yes” and those saying “no.” Sixty-two percent said
4 they would like to see their local libraries expand their online services via the Internet.

5 A second Zogby poll would be conducted during the week of March 10th via library
6 websites statewide. It would be the same survey as before but the question, “what kinds
7 of services would people like to see?” would be expanded. The poll would offer people
8 some choices like e-books, audio-books, full-text articles, or others, should they have
9 different ideas to contribute. Public libraries would be invited to encourage people to
10 take this survey by putting a link to the poll on their websites. The survey would yield
11 data not only for use at the state level, but also for use at the local level. Local data
12 would be given to the libraries so that they would have some idea how people in their
13 community were responding to these questions. Aldrich thought that this would be very
14 beneficial for the local jurisdictions.

15 Other library demographic studies had shown that California was on track with other
16 states in the nation with respect to how people were searching for and using information.
17 The next stage would be to create a think-tank of people from around the state to look at
18 all the data we collected, to consider how the world had changed and to consider what
19 kind of services would benefit the people of California in their information searching
20 needs. To begin that process, a small group of librarians were selected called the Think
21 Tank Creators. Librarians from around the state would come together in April with two
22 futurists, Michelle Bowman and Sandy Berkstead, who would be working with us to
23 design a statewide reference process and to create the larger think tank group. The

1 Creators would take all the data and reports, and begin to mash up and combine the
2 numbers to look at different ways of tying the information together.

3 In August or September there would be a one and one-half day Think Tank event.
4 The group would be invited to come up with three statewide reference scenarios. After
5 that there would be several other opportunities for input. Then, at CLA, those scenarios
6 would be shared and feedback would be requested. After the feedback had been
7 gathered, a Builders Group would be established. They would come together and take all
8 the input and the scenarios and actually design the statewide reference model that would
9 be used. Then we would look at how to support that model.

10 Member Fong asked for more detail about the selection of the Creators and Builders
11 groups. Aldrich responded that the State Library had selected a small group of five or six
12 people who had demonstrated leadership or innovation within the library community.
13 The Think Tank itself would consist of about eighty-plus people, but the Creator Group
14 would decide how the Think Tank members would come in. An application process had
15 been discussed. It would be important to involve academic libraries and different people
16 in the process. Hildreth interjected that often there would be activities where an open
17 invitation would be extended. However, this group would be by an invitation only,
18 and/or of a competitive nature where people would write their thoughts or give an idea
19 about how they would design a new reference system. This was going to be a great
20 opportunity to bring minds together to try and move us forward.

21 Hildreth shared information about a new system being developed called
22 *Bibliocomments*. It was a tool that would allow reference librarians to mount their

1 information searches on an interface in the library system catalog. Also, individuals who
2 found information about the same thing from another source could add it there as well.

3 President Kastanis asked if the library community was positive about the development
4 of a new reference model. Aldrich responded that there had been a mixed response. A
5 lot of people who were comfortable with the current model might not have considered all
6 the other possibilities. Some people were not sure they wanted to be involved, and other
7 people were very excited.

8 Rosario Garza, MCLS, Santiago, South State and 49-99 System Administrator,
9 expressed that it was important to create a sense of ownership with the statewide
10 reference project. She thought that had been missing in the past. She wanted people to
11 be considered for the Creators group who were willing to think outside the box, put out
12 risky ideas and take a hit if their ideas were unpopular. She wanted a group of people
13 who were willing to be pro-active and who took such a sense of ownership that they
14 would start to proselytize the statewide reference idea. Change was needed because
15 statistics showed that second-level reference continued to decline. Something needed to
16 be done to reverse that trend.

17 Member Jewett wondered whether the library customer had changed over the years.
18 She was surprised that AskNow was hardly used and that many people were unaware of
19 it. She expressed her hope that when the next model in the library reference process was
20 achieved, advocacy information would be promoted. It seemed to her that the reference
21 service in California's public libraries was something of a best kept secret. There was
22 now a great deal of competition for the services that the public libraries had always
23 offered. The Statewide Reference process was a good time to consider how to integrate

1 library services with the ways people access information. The IMLS study that Aldrich
2 mentioned previously showed that people value people connections. In developing the
3 new reference model, a gradual evolutionary transition should be considered, since
4 existing practices could not be changed over night. Possibilities for all libraries,
5 including those with fewer resources, should be considered. A bridge should be built to
6 enable everyone to share.

7 Member Jewett then asked whether clients had been surveyed and asked what it was
8 they needed. Aldrich replied that the question had not been asked directly, although
9 several questions came close to it. Often the question was hard for people to answer.
10 They were asked questions like: “What is it that you are looking for in terms of
11 information?” “How do you use the library?” “What are you using?” “Are you looking
12 for health resources?” “Are you using it for education?” Member Jewett asked if the
13 demographic information of the respondents was known. Aldrich stated that a list of the
14 demographics was on page two of the study.

15 Member Steinhauser asked about the survey sample size, with Aldrich confirming that
16 only 20 percent of the 706 people sampled were ages 18 to 29 years of age. Member
17 Steinhauser thought that more people in the 29 and younger age range should be
18 interviewed. As the baby-boomer generation receded, it was critical that libraries were
19 relevant to a younger demographic. The younger group would go to college and continue
20 to use the library.

21 Member Steinhauser then asked about the composition of the Creators, the Think
22 Tank and Builders groups. Would there be non-librarians included? If the competition
23 was Google but the library community only talked among themselves, then there would

1 be only the same old ideas. What is wanted is something new and integral. Aldrich
2 responded that the groups would actually be a mix, with some academic librarians and
3 people from the Information Technology (IT) community being invited. Aldrich
4 continued that in the following week she would be going to a conference called *Merging*
5 *Technologies* where she would be meeting IT people. It was very intentional that two
6 seasoned futurists were being brought in from across the country, and it would be very
7 intentional how other people would be selected. So yes, the library was looking to bring
8 in outsiders.

9 Member Zollman had a question about the multilingual component of the Zogby
10 survey. With many school districts having over 181 languages, why were people not
11 asking for multilingual services? Since the state was becoming more multilingual than
12 otherwise, she thought the Board really needed to address that issue and plan for the
13 future.

14 Aldrich replied that she had looked at that data. For people who were asked about
15 multilingual services, the race of the respondent was actually noted. It was very
16 interesting that the people who would want multilingual services were not supporting it.
17 A lot of people responded “not sure.” So the question was shipped back to Zogby to look
18 at the data again and provide an interpretation of it. Zogby was not sure what it meant. It
19 could be that these people were not frequent users of the library; or perhaps library users
20 had not been the target for the survey. They thought the next poll would show different
21 responses.

22 Member Fong agreed with Member Steinhauser about the importance of surveying
23 the younger generation. They would be paying our taxes and social security one day.

1 Aldrich said that the survey numbers showed that California was not that different from
2 the rest of the nation. Other polls and surveys demonstrated that people were changing in
3 the same ways. A study had been done of *Generation Y* in the UK about how they did
4 searches, how it worked and what they were looking for. That group was not that much
5 different than this group. The really interesting thing about young adults was that they
6 were a growing market. Kids were coming back to the library.

7 Member Fong was concerned about the survey's high percentage (82%) of people
8 who began their search on the Internet with *Google.com*. She wondered if this trend
9 would continue after a statewide reference program was developed. It might be like the
10 Phoenix; by letting it go, it might rise again as something else, replied Aldrich.
11 Something interesting Aldrich had seen recently posted by Palos Verdes Public Library
12 was a Meebo. A little widget that could be put on a website to chat with people right off
13 the front page. Palos Verdes saw a spike in usage and they had not even told people they
14 were doing it. Kathy Gould, Director of Palos Verde Public Library District and the
15 Chair of MCLS said that Meebo was an experiment. Palos Verde had put Meebo up and
16 within a day had received twenty questions. The site was only up a couple of hours each
17 day, so Meebo was considered very successful. Previously there had been email and
18 AskNow for reference questions, resulting in maybe one question each month. Now the
19 library was getting seventy, eighty or even one hundred questions each month, depending
20 on the hours and the staffing. Presently, the library was in the process of putting up and
21 trying out something called ChatStat, which was a customer service tool that a lot of
22 businesses were using. It was really low in cost and offered a lot more functionality than
23 Meebo did. If the trial was successful, the library would go live with ChatStat.

1 Gould disagreed with the comment that libraries needed to tell people more about
2 what they do. A lot of talk has been done; but her library put up Meebo on their home
3 page without PR and people found it. If her library went live with ChatStat, it would be
4 on every page. It was not about talking about what the library did, it was about doing
5 something that connected with people. When people got it they used it.

6 Regarding the report, Member Fong noted that 75 percent of the people seemed to be
7 satisfied with how they were getting their information. So, in terms of the study, could
8 the State Library do a two-pronged approach? One prong could be on how to increase
9 the understanding and the use of the 75 percent who were satisfied. The second prong
10 could be about increasing better service to the 25 percent who were dissatisfied. Aldrich
11 answered that the intent with this data had not been focused in that direction. The
12 attempt was made to find out how many reference questions were being asked, what the
13 population of a region was, and what were the white spaces where people were not
14 getting what they needed. The hope was to see things in a more comprehensive way.
15 Member Fong was concerned about the longer term when funding would be needed one
16 day but it would have been read that 75 percent of constituents were getting their
17 information needs met. So why would anything else need to be done? Hildreth thought that
18 one of the goals was to find ways to inform people about what was available to them and
19 to add value to what they had found on their own. In fact, she thought that it was all
20 about trying to add value.

21 Member Lowenthal asked Aldrich about the income reference in the survey. She did
22 not think that 33 percent of Californians earned \$150 thousand per year or more. The
23 survey appeared to show a highly skewed percentage of wealth to the average in

1 California. She questioned whether the wealthy looked at the databases in the same way
2 that other folk might. Aldrich responded that that was very possible, but she reminded
3 the Board that the survey was only a sample. The results corresponded with people who
4 did have internet access. But these were intended to be snapshots of data only. The next
5 survey would pass through libraries, which would yield completely different data. It was
6 known that people who use libraries were using the Internet a lot. Hopefully, they would
7 come from all ranges of income.

8 Hildreth spoke to reiterate that the email survey produced just one piece of the puzzle;
9 it was a way Zogby could collect data for the library. She was fascinated that CSL was
10 working with Zogby, who was doing presidential polling. As one piece of the puzzle, the
11 survey data was being looked at with care, but more information would be forthcoming.
12 CSL wanted to show that what was happening in California was not unique; the same
13 thing was happening nationally and internationally.

14 President Kastanis asked about what other states were doing and whether they were
15 going in the same direction. Aldrich responded that from the conversations she had
16 heard, other states had *Ask us Now*. In the case of the more rural states, they were just
17 trying to raise the bar for the many small rural libraries. Hildreth added that some of the
18 smaller states had established a priority to provide statewide databases from their general
19 funds or through LSTA funds. That is how they have addressed providing reference
20 services or enhanced information services. California and the bigger states were not able
21 to do that.

22 Hildreth commented that statewide funding for System Reference was \$1.6 million.
23 In the scheme of things, that was not much funding. She did not want libraries to be

1 concerned that their portion of the CLSA allocation would be eliminated. That was not
2 what the State Library was going to do. Hildreth hoped that something would be built
3 that was so valuable and so exciting that people would say, “Wow, we want to buy even
4 more of that than we are getting from the state.” Then they could decide whether they
5 were going to use their reference money in that way. Ultimately, if enough value could
6 be added, people in the state would talk with their legislators and tell everyone how great
7 library reference service was, and then the funding would come. Aldrich added that
8 whatever reference system was designed, a high priority would be given to ensure that
9 people knew that it was there and available.

10 Kathy Aaron, Inland Library System Director, stated that she thought current
11 statewide reference was not provided directly to the customer, but to the member
12 libraries. It was through them that help was provided to the public. It seemed to her that
13 what was being talked about as statewide reference was where the public was coming
14 directly to libraries to ask their questions. Hildreth responded that it was not yet known
15 what reference would be. Second-level reference was developed so that all the libraries,
16 big, small and in between, would have a place to bump up their questions.

17 **CLSA System Reference, Communications and Delivery, and Advisory Boards**

18 President Kastanis reported that the System annual report summaries were included in
19 the Board packet and asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the
20 reports. Member Jewett commented that after reading the reports, she had tremendous
21 admiration for everything the Systems were doing, but she was very discouraged at how
22 much less they were able to do now.

23 **Budget and Planning Report**

1 Hildreth called attention to the document Recommended 2008/09 CLSA Baseline
2 Budget by Program. She wanted to make sure that everyone knew that after much
3 internal discussion, as well as discussion with the Department of Finance (DoF), the
4 intent of DoF with respect to the 2008/09 reduction was that SAB, Reference, and
5 Communications and Delivery Programs would remain at 2007/08 levels. That was why
6 the budget showed a 12.35 percent reduction to Transaction Based Reimbursements
7 (TBR). DoF used the entire amount funded for TBR (\$11,616 million), plus the funding
8 for Systems (\$1.434 million), to determine the ten percent reduction amount and directed
9 it to come entirely out of TBR. After the State Library clarified that this was DoF's
10 intention, there was some internal dialogue about whether that was fair, equitable, and
11 appropriate. The State Library would have had the opportunity to submit a Finance
12 Letter asking that the cuts be made completely across the board. But an informal poll of
13 some members at a CLA Legislative Committee meeting suggested that because Systems
14 serve every library, regardless of whether they were a net borrower or a net lender, DoF's
15 recommendation was accepted.

16 President Kastanis asked whether there had been an opportunity to reject the reduction
17 coming entirely out of TBR, and for another proposal to be put forward. Hildreth replied
18 that another proposal could have been submitted, but thought its acceptance was highly
19 unlikely. Two other necessary internal proposals had already been submitted and she did
20 not want to submit more since DoF's intent regarding TBR was already known.
21 Habbestad said that other budget scenarios were examined, but there was only a one
22 percent difference compared to just taking the ten percent cut out of TBR. Hildreth

1 remarked that an attempt was made to be very strategic and get more money available to
2 Communication and Delivery, but that was not DoF's intent.

3 After much discussion, President Kastanis suggested that the Board approve the
4 budget and recommended that a letter of clarification go forward to the Governor, stating
5 that there were issues that needed to be addressed.

6 As members continued to address the budget reduction issue, Hildreth pointed out that
7 Interlibrary Loans in the first quarter of 2007/08 were at the highest levels in history.
8 People were using the service and thereby proving its value. However, she was worried
9 that if that were pointed out it would just be said that the program was going to continue
10 whether it was funded by the state or not.

11 Member Jewett urged that the letter contain not only text, but visual material, such as
12 a color bar graph chart. It would be very effective for people to see easily what was
13 going on. Member Steinhauser asked whether it was possible to show how the budget
14 cuts would impact the ability to reimburse participating libraries. Andersen stated that
15 that was done every year. Member Jewett wanted to show also that the user demand was
16 up, thereby demonstrating its importance. Member Steinhauser thought that a small
17 group should work on charts, one showing the 12.3 percent cut versus the 10 percent cut
18 and one showing no cut and \$7 million versus \$14 million. She thought that an important
19 point to be made, as was earlier pointed out by Aldrich, was that people were using
20 libraries more, although as a remotely accessed, complementary resource.

21 Member Steinhauser requested that the letter and visuals be prepared in order to
22 distribute in advance of meetings of the Finance Committee, CLA Legislative Committee
23 in March, and the Day in the Capitol event in April; and be made available for any Board

1 member who was going to participate. Andersen agreed and asked for clarification as to
2 whom this letter would be sent. Member Steinhauser replied the Budget Sub-Committees
3 and the two chairs of the respective Education Committees. President Kastanis declared
4 that she would work with the staff to prepare the letter. She advised placing the names of
5 the LoC Board Members at the bottom of the letter.

6 *It was moved, seconded (Cannon/Bernardo) and carried by a vote of 8-1*
7 *(Steinhauser opposed) that the Library of California Board adopts the*
8 *proposed 2008/09 CLSA budget, reduced by \$1.434 million in the preliminary*
9 *state budget, as displayed in the chart entitled "Recommended 2008/09 CLSA*
10 *Baseline Budget by Program" and that the chart be included in the minutes of*
11 *this meeting. (See Attachment B)*
12

13 At this time in the agenda, President Kastanis excused herself from the business
14 meeting and turned the direction of the meeting over to Vice-President Cannon.

15 **LEGISLATIVE**

16 Member Steinhauser, Chair of the Legislative Committee, reported that for fiscal year
17 2008-09 there was roughly \$60 million available for LSTA. California would receive an
18 allocation of about \$17 million. Hildreth commented that she and others from California
19 would be attending the Federal Legislative Day in Washington D.C. in the middle of
20 May. Every year letters were prepared for all of the federal officials concerning LSTA
21 projects in their districts. They were carried to Washington and distributed and were
22 found to be very effective. Officials were very interested in seeing what was going on in
23 their particular district and a lot of good feedback was returned. Bessie Condos and LDS
24 staff were preparing those letters. Andersen added that the letters tried to show how the
25 LSTA money impacted the constituents.

26 Member Lowenthal said that the bill was up for re-authorization this year, and the
27 letters and the amount of money given to each congressional district were really critical

1 when asking for signatures on the re-authorization act of the bill, which allowed President
2 Bush to give money away to projects like this one.

3 Member Steinhauser called attention to the fact that Senator Simitian had stepped up
4 again to carry a library construction bond bill, SB 1516. In this bill, the amount of money
5 authorized by bonds was reduced to \$4 billion. Should it pass, it would go to the people
6 in the primary election of 2010. She believed that the rationale was that the economy
7 would have improved by then. If it passed the legislature, one of the issues would be
8 whether a better turnout could be had in a primary election or in a general election.

9 Member Steinhauser wanted supporters of public libraries to be aware that the PLF
10 had also taken a budget reduction. She also thought it was important to know that *Day in*
11 *the Capitol* was scheduled for April 16th, and that it would be coordinated by CLA and
12 the California School Library Association (CSLA). Unfortunately, due to the financial
13 situation, the State Library could not reimburse Board Members who attended, although
14 their presence was very useful. She thanked Hildreth and Ira Bray for producing a sheet
15 very similar to the one for LSTA that reported state monies that were going to libraries.
16 It could be found on the CLA website.

17 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

18
19 Vice President Cannon next invited public comment, an opportunity to bring any item
20 of issue to the Board that had not been on the agenda. No one from the audience rose to
21 address the Board.

22 **BOARD COMMENT**

23
24 Vice President Cannon expressed that these were very tough budget times. He very
25 much appreciated the opportunity for the Board to come together, especially for the

1 discussion regarding research. To the extent that the Board was financially strained,
2 there was the alternative of teleconferencing. He thanked Aldrich for bringing new
3 energy to the reference project. Although the State Library was a public agency, very
4 often it needed to think like private enterprise. He thanked staff for their hard work and
5 looked forward to seeing what Aldrich brought to the Board next time. He was very
6 pleased with the use of the surveys, which he thought was a step away from information
7 only and worked toward integration.

8 Member Fong thanked staff for all the hard work that had gone into preparations and
9 the agenda packet. She reiterated the Board's commitment to good library service even
10 during lean times. She appreciated all those library workers in the field doing battle for
11 libraries. She pointed out that on the good side, several libraries had opened, especially
12 some branches in San Francisco. She looked forward to working on the reference
13 program to see how the people of California could be better served. She thanked Hildreth
14 for her great leadership.

15 Member Zollman thanked staff for all their hard work in preparing for the Board
16 meeting, and Hildreth for dealing with the seemingly insurmountable budget issues. She
17 complimented Aldrich for a great report and hoped she did not feel the Board was
18 challenging her in any way with all of their questions.

19 Member Bernardo thanked staff for all their hard work and Hildreth for leading the
20 way. She congratulated her colleagues for sticking together during the past difficult year.
21 She was encouraged to see all of the activity in the libraries and to see that people were
22 interested in keeping the libraries together. She volunteered the participation of the

1 special libraries in any surveys done concerning statewide reference. She was fascinated
2 by the efforts, activity and initiatives of the State Library.

3 Member Lowenthal thought that one of the most important things the Board could
4 offer to all of the folks out in the field was the opportunity for collaboration. She hoped
5 the Board was providing light in a sometimes gloomy environment. The message to be
6 conveyed to the administration was not that libraries were somehow getting by each time
7 their budgets were cut, but rather imagine what could be done if libraries received all the
8 money they were supposed to be getting. She congratulated Aldrich on her new
9 reference project, which sounded wonderful and was much needed. She expected great
10 outcomes to follow.

11 Member Jewett reported that on December 31st, 2007, she had retired as Executive
12 Director for the California School Library Association. She now functioned solely as
13 California School Library Consultant. She also reported that as of January 1st, 2008, the
14 official term for the credentialed librarian in a school library in California was *Teacher*
15 *Librarian*. It was no longer *Library Media Teacher*. It would appear on all new
16 certificates for those who had already completed their teaching credential and had gone
17 on to complete their library work. One of the reasons for this was that many people did
18 not realize that the teacher in a library had to be a credentialed teacher prior to receiving a
19 library credential. The designation *Teacher Librarian* clarified the matter.

20 Member Jewett went on to point out that with every spring there came the annual pink
21 slip to Teacher Librarians and Library Technicians. They always seemed to be on the
22 chopping block. Information literacy lessons after school was an important part of the
23 school environment but she wondered if there would ever be monies for it. In the

1 community of Davis, home of the University of California, Davis, the Board had
2 suggested budget cuts that would leave a Teacher Librarian at the high school level only.
3 Before, their district always had credentialed teachers and librarians at elementary
4 schools, middle schools and high schools, but not any more.

5 Member Maghsoudi congratulated Member Steinhauser. She thanked Hildreth for
6 being everywhere. All the council members knew her and felt comfortable visiting with
7 her or calling her. She thanked the CSL staff and looked forward to Aldrich's leadership
8 for statewide reference.

9 Member Steinhauser expressed that not only did the Board love having Hildreth
10 representing the State Library throughout California, but they loved having her designees
11 everywhere, as well. During the years of the LoC, Member Steinhauser and Bessie
12 Condos had the opportunity to work together on the Young Adult legislation. Now she
13 understood that Condos was out in the field cutting ribbons and opening doors to the new
14 public libraries that had opened with the last round of library construction bond money.
15 She stated that that was a little bit of sunshine in an otherwise gloomy sky, and thanked
16 Condos for her good effort.

17 **Agenda Building**

18 Vice President Cannon introduced the next item which gave an opportunity for the
19 Board to consider topics for upcoming meetings. Member Fong requested time be set
20 aside to discuss ways of promoting LoC. She and Lowenthal had spoken previously
21 about proclamations or certificates from the State Librarian that could be taken to local
22 events. Perhaps, in addition to Hildreth and her appointed designees, some local
23 representatives could help get the LoC name out there.

1 Member Jewett expressed interest in a joint use concepts discussion. She referred to a
2 report completed some years ago. Condos stated that the Bond Act libraries were
3 currently listed on CSL's website. They were categorized by those that were funded as
4 joint venture and those that were joint use. Condos stated that another report had been
5 completed about seven years ago when she was working in Library Development
6 Services. Hildreth asked whether there was enough history on the Bond Act libraries to
7 learn how they were doing. Condos responded that some of the libraries were still under
8 construction, but that she might be able to get some information on the cycle libraries.
9 Member Jewett requested that the information be provided just before the next Board
10 meeting packet went out, with an up-to-date printout of the website information.

11 Andersen reminded the Board that in August they would be meeting as the LSTA
12 Advisory Council. The deadline for the competitive proposals had been December 31st.
13 The staff reviews had been completed already and advice letters would be sent out soon.
14 Staff review of the priority proposals would be completed in a couple of weeks and
15 letters mailed out. Final proposals were due in late April and early May, with the awards
16 being out by the end of June, subject to whenever the budget passed.

17 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Fong) and carried unanimously that the***
18 ***Library of California Board adjourn its business meeting of February 28,***
19 ***2008 at 12:10 p.m.***

Table A
Requests for Network Affiliation for New Members

GOLD COAST LIBRARY NETWORK

Member

Antioch University Santa Barbara

Participating Libraries

Antioch University Santa Barbara Library

RECOMMENDED 2008/09 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET BY PROGRAM

| PROGRAM | 2007/08 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET | 2008/09 REDUCTION | 2008/09 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET | PERCENTAG E REDUCED |
|---|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Transaction Based Reimbursements | \$ 11,616,000 | (\$1,434,000) | \$ 10,182,000 | 12.35% |
| Consolidations & Affiliations | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Statewide Data Base | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| System Advisory Boards | 27,260 | -0- | 27,260 | 0% |
| System Reference | 1,608,340 | -0- | 1,608,340 | 0% |
| System Communications & Delivery | 1,090,400 | -0- | 1,090,400 | 0% |
| System Planning, Coordination, & Evaluation | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Statewide Communications & Delivery | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| State Reference Centers | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Total | \$14,342,000 | (\$1,434,000) | \$12,908,000 | 10.0% |