# An Independent Evaluation
of
# Connecticut's Implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States Program
# 2008 – 2012



Prepared by
Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants
March, 2012

INSTITUTE *of* **Museum** and **Library** SERVICES

# Table of Contents

**Appendices**

**INTRODUCTION**

The period of time covered by the evaluation of the Connecticut State Library's (CSL) implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States program (2008 – 2012) marks what has been arguably the most volatile period in the history of libraries in the United States.  The sharp economic downturn combined with rapid technological advances and exceptionally high customer demands presented all state library administrative agencies (SLAAs) with a daunting challenge in their efforts to make progress.  As this evaluation documents, Connecticut has met or surpassed all of its goals and has reached a vast majority of the objectives and evaluation measures that were outlined in its 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan in spite of these difficult circumstances.

On October 9, 2007, just over one-week into Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008, the Dow-Jones Industrial Average hit an all-time high of 14,164.  By March of 2009, it had lost more than half of its value and closed at 6,547.  As we all know, the factors leading to this collapse and the recession that followed have had profound and lasting effects on local, state and federal budgets.

The crisis had a direct impact on the CSL.  At the time Connecticut's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan was written, CSL had 124 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff.  As this evaluation is being written, that number has been reduced to 94; a reduction of almost twenty-five percent (24.19%).  Staff devoted to library development functions has been reduced from 25 FTE to 20 FTE; a reduction of twenty percent (20.0%).   It is to the great credit of the CSL administration and staff that so much has been accomplished and that outstanding program evaluation has been ongoing in spite of a loss of capacity to serve at the SLAA.

Concurrently, libraries of all types were presented with amazing new opportunities.  New technology products that directly impact the ways in which libraries deliver content to the public were bursting on the scene.  Steve Jobs unveiled the first generation iPhone in January 2007 and the original Amazon Kindle was released in November of that year.  The Barnes & Noble Nook was released in 2009; the original iPad went on sale in April 2010 and, in September 2011, the Nook broke the $100 price barrier.

Simultaneously, increasing unemployment and cuts to social service agencies drove record numbers of people into libraries seeking everything from job retraining to a place to escape the heat or cold. Library staff, often stretched even thinner than before by local budget cuts, struggled to keep up with increased demands.  It is within this environment that the Connecticut State Library and other SLAAs worked on realizing the goals they had set forth in their respective 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plans.


**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Connecticut's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan included nine goals.  They were:

**Goal I:**    **All residents of Connecticut will have access to robust public access computing environments that feature reliable, high-quality library and information resources including statewide database programs, interlibrary loan, and delivery services. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 and 3)**

**Goal II:**   **Enhance access to quality library services for persons with disabilities. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 5)**

**Goal III:**  **Improve the quality of life of the target population by providing services and materials that help libraries address the literacy, citizenship, and English as a Second Language needs of patrons.  (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 5)**

**Goal IV:** Enhance literacy programs in libraries for children and their families. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 6 and 5)

**Goal V:** Enhance and improve library service to young adults. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 6)

**Goal VI:** Enhance and improve library service to older adults. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 6)

**Goal VII:** Enhance the ability of libraries to plan for and develop successful services that address the changing demographics of Connecticut's population. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 4 and 5)

**Goal VIII:** Expand the availability of information and educational resources of Connecticut's libraries through digitization. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 and 2)

**Goal IX:** Build capacity of libraries to meet the needs of their communities, including helping them partner with public and private agencies and community-based organizations. (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 4 and 1)

The LSTA Grants to States program had six identified "priorities" when the Connecticut State Library's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan was written. Components of the Connecticut State Library's LSTA Plan address all six to some degree. A short version of the LSTA Grants to States priorities follows:

- Priority 1 – Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources,
- Priority 2 – Developing services that provide access to information through state, regional, national and international networks,
- Priority 3 – Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries,
- Priority 4 – Developing public and private partnerships,
- Priority 5 – Targeting services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills and,
- Priority 6 – Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty line.

The extended table (Table 1) that appears on the next three pages offers a summary of how the Connecticut State Library's Goals align with the LSTA Grants to States Priorities, provides a listing of LSTA-funded programs that have been carried out during the three-years examined for this evaluation and presents both an internal/self-assessment of progress toward the State Goals and the evaluators' assessment of that progress. Please note that the absence or scarcity of LSTA-funded programs listed under a given goal may not tell the whole story in regard to progress that has been made. For example, the "Capacity Building" program carried out by the State Library appears under Goal IX (Build capacity of libraries to meet the needs of their communities); however, the activities carried out under this program have resulted in actions undertaken by local library staff that directly impact progress related to services to children and families (Goal 4), young adults (Goal 5) and older adults (Goal 6). This same effect holds true in several other areas.

Also note that the self-assessment ranking often offer more than one response. This is because multiple individuals contributed to the self-assessment conducted by the evaluators.

Table 1
Summary of Goals, LSTA-Funded Programs and General Assessment

| State Goal | LSTA Funded Programs | State Agency Self-Assessment/ Evaluators' Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal I: All residents of Connecticut will have access to robust public access computing environments that feature reliable, high-quality library and information resources including statewide database programs, interlibrary loan, and delivery services.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 and 3) | • Administration ('08, '09, '10)<br>• Connecticar ('08, '09, '10)<br>• ICONN ('08, '09, '10)<br>• Willimantic Library Service Center ('08, '09, '10) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Surpassed Goal** |
| **Goal II: Enhance access to quality library services for persons with disabilities.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 5) | • FAIR @ Your Library (sub-grant '10)<br>• Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped ('08, '09, '10)<br>• Project Virtual Vision (sub-grant '10)<br>• Webster's Bridge (sub-grant '08) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Surpassed Goal** |
| **Goal III: Improve the quality of life of the target population by providing services and materials that help libraries address the literacy, citizenship, and English as a Second Language needs of patrons.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 5) | • TAP (The Americans' Place) (sub-grant '08) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Met Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Met Goal** |

| State Goal | LSTA Funded Programs | State Agency Self-Assessment/ Evaluators' Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal IV: Enhance literacy programs in libraries for children and their families.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 6 and 5) | • Collaborative Summer Reading Program ( '09, '10)<br>• Community Book Bags (sub-grant '10)<br>• Read, Rock and Rhyme (sub-grant '08)<br>• Plymouth LEAPS (sub-grant '09)<br>• Picture Book Science, Picture Book Math (sub-grant '10) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Met Goal** |
| **Goal V: Enhance and improve library service to young adults.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 6) | • Get Your Game On (sub-grant '09)<br>• Outreach Collections for Children ('08, '09, '10)<br>• Roping Up with Young Adults (sub-grant '08)<br>• Teen Gaming Initiative (sub-grant '08) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Surpassed Goal** |
| **Goal VI: Enhance and improve library service to older adults.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 6) | • Arts & Archives: Master Classes (sub-grant '10)<br>• Audio & Large Print Collection ('08, '09, '10)<br>• Cognitive Fitness and Creative Wisdom Center (sub-grant '08)<br>• Middletown Service Center ('08, '09, '10) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Met Goal** |

| State Goal | LSTA Funded Programs | State Agency Self-Assessment/ Evaluators' Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal VII: Enhance the ability of libraries to plan for and develop successful services that address the changing demographics of Connecticut's population.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 4 and 5) | • Community Needs Assessment (sub-grants '08, '09, '10)<br>• Long Range Planning (sub-grants '08) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Surpassed Goal** |
| **Goal VIII: Expand the availability of information and educational resources of Connecticut's libraries through digitization.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 and 2) | • NOTE: Connecticut History Online activities are included as part of the ICONN program which is shown under Goal 1 | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Surpassed Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Met Goal** |
| **Goal IX: Build capacity of libraries to meet the needs of their communities, including helping them partner with public and private agencies and community-based organizations.** (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 4 and 1) | • Capacity Building/Capacity Building Opportunities ('08, '09)<br>• Continuing Education ( '10)<br>• Leading Libraries ('08, '09, '10) | **Self- Evaluation Assessment: Progressing Toward Goal/ Met Goal**<br><br>**Evaluator's Assessment: Met Goal** |

The evaluators believe that the Connecticut State Library has met (5 Goals) or surpassed (4 Goals) all of the State Goals that were established in its 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan.  In some instances the attainment of these goals has been largely as a result of LSTA expenditures; however, in most instances, progress has been made through the strategic expenditure of a combination of local, State and LSTA dollars.

The Connecticut State Library has successfully employed three different strategies for using their LSTA allotment that, together, have enabled CSL to address all six LSTA Grants to States Priorities.  The strategies include:

- Direct Service (e.g. ICONN, LBPH)
- Capacity Building/Enabling (e.g. Leading Libraries, Connecticar)
- Sub-Grants (e.g., Read, Rock and Rhyme, Picture Book Science, Picture Book Math)

The "Direct Service" strategy has been particularly effective in enabling CSL to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 (Expanding access to information and educational resources), Priority 2 (Developing services that provide access to information through state, regional, national and international networks) and 5 (Targeting services to individuals with disabilities). The Sub-Grant strategy has allowed CSL to have impact related to Grants to States Priority 6 (Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty line).  In addition, the Sub-Grant program has had a significant positive impact related to LSTA Priority 4 (Developing public and private partnerships).  Sub-grants that focus on literacy or information literacy directly address the portion of Priority 5 that targets individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills.

The programs that are part of the Capacity Building/Enabling strategy crossover all of the LSTA Priorities.  The Capacity Building program is particularly interesting because it was actually structured to address all six of the LSTA Priorities individually.  Of the six LSTA Grants to State Priorities, the Priorities least impacted by LSTA funding are Priorities 3 and 4 (Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries) and (building public and private partnerships).  The Connecticar delivery program is reported under priority 3 later in the evaluation because it clearly links libraries; however little LSTA funding has been invested in the digital infrastructure.  While there are certainly elements of LSTA-funded programs that are related to Priority 3, CSL is addressing infrastructure issues primarily from State and private funding.  For example, the Connecticut State Library is a leading partner in the statewide, fiber-optic Connecticut Education Network (CEN); every CT K-12 school district, higher education campus, and public library benefits from CEN. CT was also aided by participating in The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Staying Connected Challenge Grant.  No programs are reported under LSTA Priority 4.  This is not because there is a lack of partnership activity taking place.  It simply reflects the fact that no program had building public and private partnerships as its primary focus.

**In short, in addition to meeting or surpassing all of the State-level goals presented in the 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan, The Connecticut State Library is addressing 5 of the six LSTA Priorities in a significant way with LSTA funds and the State Library is impacting the remaining LSTA Priority through participation in State and Gates Foundation funded initiatives.**

**EVALUATION REPORT**

### *Background*

**Audiences.**  This report is intended for use by several audiences:

- The U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS).  IMLS called for this evaluation as part of the reporting requirements when it awarded Library Services and Technology Act funding to the Connecticut State Library as required by Section 9134 of IMLS's authorizing legislation.  That legislation directs state library administrative agencies (SLAAs) to "independently evaluate, and report to the [IMLS] Director regarding, the activities assisted under this subchapter, prior to the end of the five-year plan."
- State of Connecticut elected officials and policy makers.
- The Connecticut State Library, which requested the evaluation, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for receiving LSTA funding from IMLS.
- State Library Administrative Agency and local library staff, as well as state-level and local-level partners involved in designing, implementing, and assessing LSTA-supported projects.
- Recipients of services supported by LSTA funding at the state, regional, and local level. In Connecticut recipients included patrons of local libraries of all types, library employees, and partner agencies.

**Key Evaluation Questions.**  This evaluation attempts to answer key evaluation questions outlined by IMLS that are designed to address effective past practices; identify processes at work in implementing the activities in the plan including the use of performance-based measurements in planning, policy making and administration; and, to develop findings and recommendations for inclusion in the next five-year planning cycle.

Retrospective questions include:

1. Did the activities undertaken through the state's LSTA plan achieve results related to priorities identified in the Act?
2. To what extent were these results due to choices made in the selection of strategies?
3. To what extent did these results relate to subsequent implementation?
4. To what extent did programs and services benefit targeted individuals and groups?

Process questions include:

1. Were modifications made to the Connecticut State Library's plan?  If so, please specify the modifications and if they were informed by outcomes-based data.
2. If modifications were made to the plan, how were performance metrics used in guiding those decisions?
3. How have performance metrics been used to guide policy and managerial decisions affecting the Connecticut State Library's LSTA -supported programs and services?
4. What have been important challenges to using outcome-based data to guide policy and managerial decisions over the past five years?

Prospective questions include:

1. How does the Connecticut State Library plan to share performance metrics and other evaluation-related information within and outside the agency to inform policy and administrative decisions over the next five years?

2. How can the performance data collected and analyzed to-date be used to identify benchmarks in the upcoming five-year plan?
3. What key lessons has the agency learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other states could benefit from knowing?  Include what worked and what should be changed.

Optionally, IMLS asked states to address three additional prospective questions to assist the states in jump starting their five-year planning process:

1. What are the major challenges and opportunities that the Connecticut State Library and its partners can address to make outcome-based data more useful to federal and state policy makers as well as other stakeholders?
2. Based on the findings from the evaluation, what recommendations does the Connecticut State Library have for justifying the continuation, expansion, and/or adoption of promising programs in the next five-year plan?
3. Based on the findings from the evaluation, what recommendations does the Connecticut State Library have for justifying potential cuts and/or elimination of programs in the next five-year plan?

**Values and principles**.  As evaluators, Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants embraces the "Guiding Principles for Evaluators" – systematic inquiry, competence, integrity/honesty, respect for people, and responsibilities for general and public welfare – adopted by the American Evaluation Association.

### *Methodology*

Himmel & Wilson employed a variety of different methods to assess the progress that Connecticut has made in pursuing its goals for the LSTA Grants to States program.  The evaluation began with a reading of the State's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan and a review of the State Program Reports (SPRs) submitted to IMLS by the Connecticut State Library.  An initial one-day site visit was made to the Connecticut State Library offices in Hartford, Connecticut on September 8, 2011.  During that visit, the consultants reviewed the 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan with the State Librarian Kendall F. Wiggin, Director of Library Development Sharon Brettschneider, and LSTA Coordinator Douglas Lord.

Himmel and Wilson also used a multifaceted research protocol, including interviews with library community leaders, a focus group with members of the Digital Library Advisory Board and one with LSTA sub-grantees and a web-based survey targeting the broader Connecticut library community.  Individual tools are described below.

The strengths of the evaluation methodology derive from:

- Objective, external evaluators not associated with the state in any capacity.
- Varied approaches and tools, allowing analysis and comparison of program data collected by staff and quantitative survey results with comments from librarians and sometimes from end users.
- Credible data, including output and outcomes, thanks to strong efforts by the Connecticut State Library to identify desired outcomes and design and implement ongoing data collection methods.

Methodological weaknesses are associated with several factors:

- Ex post facto evaluation design, which only allowed for review of program data after the fact, resulting in inconsistent data in some areas and sometimes unrecoverable gaps in information.

---

- Difficulty in identifying trends, with only two full years of data available at the time of this evaluation.
- The online survey dissemination method did not allow collection of responses from a random sample of library staff (it was a self-selected sample); consequently results are biased toward individuals most interested in LSTA.

**Review of existing documents**. The consultants conducted an extensive review of all background documents, including the Connecticut State Library's *LSTA Five-year Plan 2008-2012*, annual reports to IMLS for 2008 and 2009 (2010 report was not yet available at time of the initial evaluation; however 2010 data that became available in December 2011 has been included in the evaluation to the extent possible.), results of surveys of iCONN users, the Connecticar turnaround study, and preliminary results of a survey of users of the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. See Appendix E for citations.

**Web-based input on key questions from Connecticut State Library personnel.** Himmel & Wilson created a web-based tool to solicit comments from the state library agency head and the LSTA Coordinator regarding the SLAA's performance in implementing their plan. The web-survey asked the key Connecticut State Library staff to provide a self-assessment of the agency's performance in pursuing each of the goals in their plan (little or no progress toward goal, progressing toward goal, met goal, surpassed goal). Respondents were also asked to indicate why they believed that assessment was accurate.

Respondents were also asked to respond to each of the key questions posed by IMLS. While only general information could be offered on the optional prospective questions, substantive input was received on the other questions that were applicable.

**Focus groups**. Only two focus groups were held. Both were facilitated by Bill Wilson. Two others that were scheduled were cancelled due to the massive snow storm/power outages that shut down the state on November 1, 2011. Attendance on November 2 was about half of what was originally anticipated because tens of thousands of households and libraries in Connecticut were still without power. Of the two sessions that were held, one was of "sub-grantees" and the other was with members of the Connecticut Digital Library Advisory Board. In order to compensate for the low number of people having input into the evaluation through focus groups, the consultants conducted a larger number of personal interviews that included some of the people who had originally planned to attend the focus group sessions. . A summary of the focus groups is included as Appendix A. The focus group discussion guide is included as part of Appendix H. Notes from focus groups were analyzed using content analysis techniques recommended by Graham Gibbs[1]. Coding sheets are included in Appendix F.

**Interviews with key stakeholders**. Ethel Himmel conducted telephone interviews with 20 Connecticut library leaders between December 7 and 16, 2011. A summary of the interviews and a list of participants are attached in Appendix B; the interview guide in Appendix H. Notes from interviews were analyzed using content analysis techniques recommended by Graham Gibbs. Coding sheets are included in Appendix F.

**Web-based survey**. Himmel & Wilson hosted a web-based survey using SurveyGizmo. This software was selected because it is superior to SurveyMonkey both in its features and in its accessibility for individuals with special needs who may be using screen readers. An email

---

[1] Gibbs, Graham. *Analyzing Qualitative Data* (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2007)

containing an invitation to participate and a "hot-link" to the survey was distributed using existing library email lists and listservs. Survey results are provided in Appendix C.

**Qualitative methods**. Evaluators included two qualitative methods – individual interview and focus group – in order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the context and descriptions from stakeholders about successes and challenges related to the projects undertaken. Qualitative methods excel at providing detailed descriptions of how individuals use a product or service and add information that helps evaluators understand the quantitative data included in usage statistics, surveys, etc. Because these qualitative methods involve individuals, they are susceptible to bias in selection of participants, as well as in interpretation. In order to minimize bias in analysis, Himmel & Wilson carefully designed open-ended questions that would not lead participants in interviews and focus groups and used standard content analysis techniques to guide analysis.

**Development of evaluation report.** Evaluation team member Sara Laughlin analyzed notes from focus groups and personal interviews using content analysis techniques. Team members Ethel Himmel and Bill Wilson collated and analyzed results from the web-based survey.

Laughlin, Himmel and Wilson reviewed other documents (both print and web-based) and State Program Reports. Laughlin synthesized the data and information collected and created a draft report in the format provided by IMLS in the "Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation Report" document. Himmel and Wilson revised and added content to the draft report and shared it with State Librarian Kendall F. Wiggin and LSTA Coordinator Douglas Lord to make sure that it would fully meet the expectations of the Connecticut State Library and comply with IMLS requirements. After incorporating feedback, they provided the resulting document to the Connecticut State Library in print and digital formats. Finally, the evaluators submitted the evaluation report in a format suitable for forwarding to IMLS.

### *Findings*

In this section of the report, findings are organized around each of the LSTA Grants to States Priorities. Some statistics are reported for programs in an effort to indicate the volume and nature of activities undertaken; however, the data shown in the tables represents a very small sampling of the data that is collected by CSL. Note that 2008, 2009 and 2010 are used as program years. In fact these years reflect LSTA dollars awarded to the State for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2008, 2009 and 2010. Often the statistics reported are for a subsequent year in that FFY 2008 funds are used primarily in calendar year 2009, FFY 2009 funds are used in 2010 and so forth.

**LSTA PRIORITY 1:  Expanding services for lifelong learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.**

**Leading Libraries** (LSTA expenditure 2008 -2010: $796,661 or 12.13% of total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period)  This project funded the consulting and outreach activities of the State Library's Division of Library Development. Specific areas of consultation included policy development, collection management, resource sharing, board and Friends relationships, programming to a variety of target audiences, planning, and facilities construction. A large number of activities carried out related to gathering, compiling, reporting, and filling information requests for statistics. Division staff also traveled to libraries for individual

consultations, planned and presented workshops on a variety of topics, and reviewed library technology plans pursuant to libraries' applying for e-rate discounts.

Many outputs are detailed elsewhere.  For example, see LSTA Administration later in this section (LSTA Priority 1)  and see Capacity Building Opportunities later in this section (LSTA Priority 1).  A few specific outputs from the Division of Library Development are reported below in Table 2.  Note that CSL has endured a 20% staff cut in its Library Development area since 2007.  Other duties performed by the consults included overseeing LSTA sub-grants, registering participants for WebJunction sessions and interacting with the library community through listserv, blogs and social media.

| Table 2 | Leading Libraries Participation and Usage, 2008-2010 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| E-rate funding received by libraries | | $147,063 | $179,648 | $184,353 | 25.36% |
| Libraries submitting data for annual report | | 181 | 182 | 179 | -1.10% |
| Specialized statistical reports created in response to queries | | 6 | 5 | 97 | 1516.67% |
| Number of Workshops/Capacity Building Sessions Planned and Presented | | 161 | 226 | 160 | -0.62% |
| Number of Attendees | | 2,512 | 2,979 | 1,433 | -42.95% |

Interviewees praised the consulting services:

> *"We use the consulting a lot; they're very encouraging.  They help us analyze data."*

> *"We're doing a renovation here and used the building consultant service."*

> *"We have occasional questions… about board issues, etc.  [Consultant] helps with those."*

> *"Special needs – [the State Library staff] came to speak to our staff…"*

Two of those interviewed did not know about the consulting services.

The State Library's statistics service received nine mentions in focus groups and interviews, many of which provided descriptions of how the statistics were used.  Two interviewees referred to the listservs maintained by the State Library.  Participants in interviews also reported that the State Library coordinates its capacity building efforts with other organizations.

> *"We have three groups that meet regularly to coordinate our activities: the Connecticut Library Consortium [does round tables]; the library association does a fall and annual program on broader topics and in shorter sessions; the State Library does nitty-gritty things.  We've carved out areas for continuing education."*

**Willimantic Library Service Center** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010:  $728,549 or 11.10% of total expenditures for the three-year period)   The Willimantic Library Service Center supplies public libraries and school media centers, especially those in rural and high-poverty areas in eastern Connecticut, with print, audiovisual and multimedia materials for use by their patrons, as well as continuing education and consulting for library staff members.

A second Library Service Center funded with LSTA, in Middletown, is included under LSTA PRIORITY 6 because of its emphasis on materials used to reach targeted populations.  The Middletown Center could as easily be categorized in LSTA Priority 1.

An additional grant for collection development at both of the service centers, the Audio and Large Print Collection program, is also categorized under LSTA PRIORITY 6; some outputs related to the service centers are included there.

In 2008, the Willimantic Center added a total of 4,881 items, including 3,700 children's items, 234 audio materials, 332 large print books, 201 books-on-CD, 286 young adult books, and 128 professional titles. In 2009, the Center added a total of 3,199 items, including 1,891 children's items, 409 large print books, and 256 books-on-CD. In 2010 the Center added 3,311 new items including 257 board books, 478 large print, 399 picture books and 600 children's book discussion titles.

Outputs are summarized in Table 3. Capacity building sessions and attendance are reported under the Capacity Building Opportunities project in LSTA PRIORITY 2.

| Table 3 | Willimantic Library Service Center: Usage, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2009* |
| Circulation | 49,106 | 40,768 | 47,521 | -3.23% |
| Interlibrary loan requests filled | 2,820 | 2,629 | 946 | -66.45% |

Library Service Centers in Willimantic and Middletown were frequently mentioned in focus groups and interviews with library leaders. Comments for both are summarized here. For many, the Service Centers are synonymous with professional development sessions and one-on-one consulting:

> *"The Middletown Service Center is only three miles away; continuing education classes there are very convenient."*

> *"We go to the Service Center. We were able to do a web page because of a workshop there."*

Others referred to the loan collections:

> *"I've also used the Service Centers – borrowed the board book kits, professional materials, large print materials. Helps us cater to our users' tastes."*

> *"Willimantic Service Center is a big help to us, especially for children's materials. We do outreach to HUD housing using materials from the Service Center; also use the Service Center for classes and bulk loans once a month."*

Interviewees from larger libraries reported that they don't use Service Centers.

> *"… We don't borrow large collections from them like the smaller libraries do."*

> *"We don't use the Service Centers."*

Two expressed concerns about the Service Center model:

> *"The State Library has tried to answer the Service Center question – needs to get new things done."*

**Capacity Building Opportunities** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2009: $74,328 or 1.13% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three year period. This program was only funded in 2008 and 2009. The program represented 2.12% of LSTA funding for 2008 and 1.36% of LSTA funding for 2009. 2008 and 2009) The goal of this project was to provide a skills infrastructure so that Connecticut library staff could advance their awareness, knowledge, skills, and behaviors related to the six LSTA Priority areas.

Although all funding for the Capacity Building project is reported here under LSTA Priority 1, Capacity Building projects included in this total had impacts on all six LSTA Priorities. Outputs and outcome results are reported here for all LSTA Priorities.

LSTA PRIORITY 1. This sub-grant supported sessions on Microsoft Office applications, readers advisory services, statewide databases including iCONN, a variety of other topics related to software for Web 2.0, locating web sites for business and general purposes, digital photography, and information literacy.

LSTA PRIORITY 2. This sub-grant focused on developing knowledge needed to provide users access to information through electronic networks, including collection development, state agency resources on the Web, legal research, statistics, teaching techniques, iCONN, processes, and customer service.

LSTA PRIORITY 3. This sub-grant supported learning related to electronic linkages among libraries, including records retention for electronic records, tools to manage information overload, and high impact surveys.

LSTA PRIORITY 4. Although there was no sub-grant related to this goal, the state reports break out activities related to partnerships as part of LSTA PRIORITY 2 reporting, including sessions for new directors and online outreach and marketing.

LSTA PRIORITY 5. This sub-grant focused on increasing knowledge related to serving individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, individuals with disabilities, and those with limited functional literacy or information skills, including sessions on the Americans with Disabilities Act as applied to libraries, finding financial support, and customer service in multicultural communities.

LSTA PRIORITY 6. Through this sub-grant, sessions focused on residents who are underserved, including low-income children. Sessions covered iCONN databases for children, Mother Goose on the Loose, collection development for children and teens, gaming, Internet safety, and program planning for teens.

Although the number of sessions and participants fluctuated fairly dramatically in individual LSTA Priority areas between the two years, the overall number of sessions and participants remained relatively unchanged from 2008 to 2009, as detailed in Table 4. Similarly, the number of sessions and participants participating in outcomes evaluation did not change much between the two years, although again the percentage changes for each LSTA goal shifted more dramatically.

| Table 4: Capacity Building Session and Participants, by LSTA PRIORITY, 2008-2009 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008 Outputs* | *2008 Outcome* | *2009 Outputs* | *2009 Outcome* | *% Change Outputs 2008-2009* | *% Change Outcome 2008-2009* |
| GOAL 1 Sessions | 65 | 43 | 66 | 41 | 1.5% | (4.7%) |
| GOAL 2 Sessions | 33 | 15 | 32 | 22 | (3.0%) | 46.7% |
| GOAL 3 Sessions | 4 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 225.0% | (50.0%) |
| GOAL 4 Sessions | 6 | 4 | 25 | 3 | 316.7% | (25.0%) |
| GOAL 5 Sessions | 24 | 7 | 16 | 8 | (33.3%) | 14.3% |
| GOAL 6 Sessions | 22 | 4 | 10 | 3 | (54.5%) | (25.0%) |
| **TOTAL SESSIONS*** | **154** | **75** | **162** | **78** | **4.5%** | **4.0%** |
| GOAL 1 Participants | 674 | 378 | 596 | 334 | (11.5%) | (11.6%) |
| GOAL 2 Participants | 376 | 229 | 512 | 251 | 36.2% | 9.6% |
| GOAL 3 Participants | 46 | 15 | 210 | 11 | 356.5% | (26.6%) |
| GOAL 4 Participants | 51 | 37 | 124 | 23 | 143.1% | (37.8%) |
| GOAL 5 Participants | 627 | 91 | 296 | 107 | (52.8%) | 15.6% |
| GOAL 6 Participants | 287 | 17 | 302 | 29 | 5.2% | 70.6% |
| **TOTAL PARTICIPANTS**** | **2,061** | **767** | **2,040** | **755** | **(1.0%)** | **(1.6%)** |
| *Both total session and total participant numbers differ slightly from the summative report for this project in the 2008 and 2009 state report; these totals reflect the numbers in the detailed sub-grant reports. <br> ** Both total session and total participant numbers differ slightly from the summative report for this project in the 2008 state report; these totals reflect the numbers in the detailed sub-grant reports. | | | | | | |

In 2008, State Library staff used 506 valid individual outcome indicators to survey 730 session attendees at 71 sessions regarding changes related to LSTA PRIORITIES 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. They used 24 individual outcome indicators to survey 37 attendees at 4 sessions related to LSTA PRIORITY 4: Partnerships. In 2009, State Library staff used 540 valid individual outcome indicators and surveyed 755 session attendees at 78 sessions (48.4%) in all six LSTA PRIORITY areas.

Detailed outcomes related to changes in knowledge among participants are reported in "Indicator Measurements for Capacity Building Sessions," found in the Bibliography of Resources Consulted in Appendix E and available online. In virtually all sessions, a large percentage of participants reported substantial increases. For example, after a session on "Online Outreach and Marketing," participants reported substantial increases in knowledge – about new tools for connecting with users on their own online turf, community events calendars, monitoring local blogs and other forums, social review sites, and providing information to the community beyond the traditional library web site.

Many participants in focus groups and interviews spoke favorably about the State Library's capacity building workshops:

> "We have little professional development money. The State Library offers things that are inexpensive, good programs for staff."

*"There's a great variety and terrific instructors."*

*"We use the continuing education for training on some of the products. Also it's a connection for some other educational things they provide… sharing ideas across types of libraries…"*

Some offered suggestions for improvement:

*"Workshops [training for grants] often happen in the dead of winter and they're not available online. Could you meet one-on-one for the training?"*

*"I'm not sure the bang for the buck is there… If there's less money available, the money for continuing education should come instead from the dues of the professional associations."*

**Collaborative Summer Reading Program** (LSTA expenditure 2009 - 2010: $9,312 or 0.14% of total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period covered by the evaluation). The goal of this program was to encourage children to read, maintain or improve their reading skills, and enjoy libraries, books, and reading during the summer.

The State Library coordinated a summer reading program for children and one for teens, using materials developed by the Collaborative Summer Library Program, a national effort of State Library Agencies, for any Connecticut library that wished to participate. Each participating library received a planning manual, posters, reading logs, bookmarks, and certificates, as well as access to an enhanced website with additional resources. The State Library hosted orientation and training sessions.

Outputs included:

- 45,406 children participated in summer reading programs in 111 libraries in the year funded with FFY 2009 funds; circulation totaled 1,789,599. 40,943 children participated from the 102 libraries that reported statistics (111 libraries participated); circulation totaled 1,645,382.
- 4,090 teens participated in summer reading programs in 64 libraries; circulation totaled 188,200 in FFY 2009. 5,981 teens participated in the 2010 program; circulation totaled 473,343
- An unknown number of adults participated in summer reading programs in 37 libraries

In 2010, 42 libraries (41% of the total) provided a link on their library's web site to the One World Many Stories Kid's page created by the State Library.

Two librarians who were interviewed described the value to their libraries:

*"The summer reading collaboration is big for us too. Saves us time and money."*

*"The statewide summer reading. Having the marketing and branding for that is important and it's a uniform program. It puts a professional stamp on the state library programs. It's a quality program."*

**LSTA PRIORITY 2: Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks.**

**iCONN** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010: $1,008,320 or 15.36% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period.)   iCONN is a joint project of the Connecticut State Library and the Connecticut Department of Higher Education that supports access to 32 databases, the statewide library catalog ReQuest, and 25 groupings of specialized web resources.  Because of the gateway to the ReQuest System, the ICONN project could be reported under LSTA Priority 3; however its largest impact is in relation to LSTA Priority 1 (expanding access to information and educational resources) and Priority 2 (provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national and international electronic networks).

In 2008, usability improvements were the focus.  To render search results screens more manageable for users; staff reduced the number of databases searched by default; created separate menus for federated searches for elementary, middle, and high schools; and added a Spanish language classic menu.  Competitive bidding yielded substantially better pricing, more content, and a foundation for more fundamental usability improvements.  Improvements to ReQuest included integration of holding locations with Google maps, a "remember me" function that made it easier for users to complete online forms, and ability to create specific persistent links to catalog items and e-mail text of bibliographic records along with library locations.  Five databases were added and one was discontinued.  Some additional changes were made to meet budget shortfalls.

In 2009, iCONN page views declined precipitously due to two changes – substantially improved usability, making it easier to find relevant materials, and a reduction in available databases due to mid-year budget cuts.  The Connecticut State budget reduced funding for ReQuest by $181,437 and for iCONN by $461,722.  Through a rigorous bidding process, iCONN shaved $100,000 from iCONN costs by dropping several databases and substituting different one; restored What Do I Read Next?, Biography Resource Center, and Discovering Collection; and added 50 new e-reference books.  Content was consolidated into a single database with an easy, one-button interface, resulting in a unified search experience which improved performance, relevancy, and usability and saved money.

In a new initiative in partnership with the Connecticut Library Connection consortium, it linked to three digital collections of Connecticut information – Connecticut History Online, Connecticut State Library's Digital Collections, and Treasures of Connecticut Libraries – with content from 26 libraries and cultural institutions.

iCONN piloted an online, multistate interlibrary loan system with Auto-Graphics partners and launched a statewide collection of 2,100 downloadable audiobooks.

Key outputs are summarized in Table 5.

| Table 5 | iCONN Participants and Usage, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| reQuest item records | 21,900,000 | 22,410,025 | 22,687,325 | 3.60% |
| reQuest searches | 1,674,652 | 2,312,183 | 1,365,140 | -18.48% |
| reQuest lending libraries | 207 | 207 | 200+ | 0.0% |
| reQuest interlibrary loan requests | 123,227 | 130,448 | 134,731 | 9.34% |
| | | | | |

| Table 5 (Continued) | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | % Change 2008-2010 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| iCONN page views – total | 9,656,642 | 8,311,540 | 7,567,938 | -21.63% |
| iCONN page views – public libraries | 2,943,289 | 2,105,363 | 1,572,586 | -46.57% |
| iCONN page views – school libraries | 1,837,580 | 1,615,621 | 1,204,976 | -34.43% |
| iCONN page views – college libraries | 4,875,773 | 4,437,188 | 4,790,376 | -1.75% |
| | | | | |
| iCONN training sessions | 29 | 40 | 36 | 24.14%% |
| iCONN training session participants | 203 | 424 | 275 | 35.47% |

At the end of 2008, staff implemented a short, ongoing user satisfaction survey, which found:

- 81.0% successfully searched iCONN to find information that was useful to them for personal research, completing homework, work, or to meet another information need.
- 70.2% reported success in finding information quickly and easily.

Return-on-investment analysis in 2008 showed that the value of iCONN databases to local communities exceeded $81,000,000, while actual costs of both iCONN databases and statewide catalog were $5,000,000, yielding a return on investment of $16.20 for every $1 spent. In 2009, the value of all iCONN databases was $27,000,000 and investment less than $2,000,000, with return-on-investment of $13.50 for every dollar spent.

The Connecticut State Library took advantage of an offer from vendor Gale Cengage to gather outcome data from patrons who used iCONN databases. Gale Cengage conducted surveys of iCONN users from August 28, 2009, to April 25, 2010 and again from April 26 through December 16, 2010. Over the combined periods, 97% of respondents said their use was task-driven; 54% cited school assignments, while 23% said use was personal, and another 23% said use was professional. In 2009 62%, and in 2010 64% said iCONN was a primary resource. Forty-four percent of use was by students (high school and college). Adult patrons (Other and Other professional) accounted for 36% of use, higher than in Gale survey data overall. The report concluded that, "Connecticut librarians are highly successful in outreach efforts targeting adult patrons."

From the first period to the second, overall satisfaction with iCONN increased in every area. Scores for look and feel rose from 67 to 75, content from 73 to 82, and site performance from 76 to 80. Scores for navigation improved from 62 to 68 and for search from 61 to 66, largely due, according to the report, to Gale Cengage's effort to improve search and navigation based on feedback from librarians, teachers, and end-users. The percentage of those who said they were likely to return increased from 76% to 80%; the percentage of those who would recommend the site to someone else rose from 71% to 77%.

By an overwhelming margin, librarians attending focus groups and participating in interviews rated iCONN number one in impact among LSTA-funded services. They described daily use of databases:

> "iCONN would be first. We use the databases daily. It would have a severe impact on our budget if it weren't available."

> "The databases are paramount to our success and our accreditation."

They noted that LSTA funding offset local costs:

> *"iCONN [databases are the] only databases that we have."*

> *"Even in Hartford, the databases are essential.  We have some other databases, but the LSTA-funded databases are the core."*

They confirmed the access improvements cited by Gale Cengage:

> *"There were some issues with Gale's Power Search.  iCONN struggled for a couple of years to decide how to get at it.  They kept working on it, and they've come to a really good place."*

Librarians made suggestions for improvement to the databases:

> *"If there was a formal database audit, it would help us in making decisions."*

They also said they depend on the ReQuest catalog and would like more integration:

> *"Some small libraries use the ReQuest catalog as their library catalog."*

> *"Would like a statewide circulation system."*

They questioned whether current interlibrary loan practices would be appropriate in the increasingly digital future:

> *"My concern is what does ILL mean in the digital age.  It's free and easy now, but what does it mean in a digital environment?"*

> *"… ReQuest is important, but we could manage without it."*

## LSTA PRIORITY 3:  Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries.

**Connecticar (C-Car)** (LSTA expenditures 2008 - 2010: $885,488 or 13.49% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period)  $901,618 match was contributed by participating libraries, which paid $8.40 per stop per week during each of the two years).  Connecticar is the courier delivery system, supporting interlibrary loan among 227 academic and public libraries. Items may be dropped off at any library for return to the owning library.  The State Library's goal is to provide next-business-day delivery.

In 2008, delivery was provided through a combination of State Library operated service to 101 libraries and contractor-operated service to the remaining 124 libraries; most libraries received five deliveries each week.  The State Library maintained a listserv to communicate delivery news quickly.  In 2009, delivery through State Library operated service reached 97 libraries and contractor-operated service covered the remaining 128; most libraries continued to receive five deliveries a week.

Outputs are reported in Table 6.

| Table 6 | Connecticar Participants and Usage, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| Libraries participating | 225 | 225 | 227 | 0.89% |
| Delivery stops per week | 883 | 883 | 873 | -1.13% |
| Items delivered | 2,165,280 | 2,087,017 | 3,032,151 | 40.04% |

The State Library estimated Connecticar saved $7,307,000 in postage costs for participating libraries.

The State Library completed a turnaround time study in April 2010. 190 of 225 libraries participated.  Results were calculated using three different methods.  "Connecticar Schedule" discounted days when delivery was not scheduled for the receiving library; using this method, average turnaround time was 1.51 days, with a median of one day.  "Business Day" calculations discounted weekend days; using this method, the average was 1.66, up slightly from the 2008 average of 1.60, with a median of one day.  "Calendar Day" results were calculated using the actual number of calendar days for delivery, with no discounts for schedule or weekends; the average was 2.34 days, with a median of two days.

Connecticar courier delivery ranked second behind iCONN among library leaders in interviews and focus groups and was included by many in their definition of "access" – iCONN, Connecticar, Connecticard, and ReQuest.  Comments from focus groups and library leader interviews describe the critical role played by the delivery service to all types of libraries, large and small:

> "Huge impact in a small library.  C-Car – we can get things from any library in the state."

> "All the universities depend on C-Car."

> "[member of 25-library consortium] People place holds, so C-Car is very important to us. We get about 250 items coming in daily and about the same number going out.  Some items are just being returned to their home library."

> "C-Car is crucial, saves money.  It's a wonderful thing!"

**LSTA PRIORITY 4:   Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations.**

Although no programs are formally categorized under LSTA Priority 4, many LSTA-funded programs exhibit healthy partnerships.  Some are partnerships between and among libraries and are represented by major programs in which libraries share costs with the State and LSTA. The largest and most prominent programs of this type would be iCONN and Connecticar. However, many other program also reflect a strong interest in collaboration.  The sub-grant programs are rife with partnerships ranging from school and public library partnerships to collaborative efforts with social service agencies, academic institutions, museums and local businesses.

**LSTA PRIORITY 5:   Targeting library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills.**

**Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010: $2,091,152 or 31.85% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period)   This program distributed Braille books and magazines, large print books, books on tape, digital media as well as cassette and digital players to qualifying individuals in Connecticut and provided readers advisory and reference services.  The Connecticut Library for the Blind and Physically

Handicapped is an affiliate of the National Library Service (NLS) for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress.

In 2008, staff prepared for the conversion to digital format, including converting the integrated library system from one vendor (Sirsi) to another (Consortium of User Libraries). In 2009, staff participated in training from the National Library Service in preparation for the transition to Braille and Audio Reading Download (BARD) digital format. Outputs are summarized in Table 7.

| Table 7 | Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped: Participants and Usage, 2008-2009 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| Individuals served | 9,208 | 9,152 | 8,887 | -3.49% |
| Institutions served | 231 | 171 | 88 | -61.9% |
| Items circulated | 245,932 | 181,538 | 192,337 | -21.79% |

In 2010, the LSTA Coordinator conducted a pilot survey of end-users of the LBPH service. While there were only 37 responses to the survey, the expectation is that LBPH will be able to begin to use some outcome-based assessment tools to monitor progress in the future.

Among other findings, the survey results reported that:

- 55.6% of respondents strongly agree that "Using LBPH improves the quality of my life."
- 50% agreed with the statement "LBPH supports my lifelong learning."
- 61.1% strongly agreed that "LBPH makes it easier for me to continue to read."
- 58.3% strongly agreed with the statement "I read more because of LBPH."

A number of librarians in focus groups and interviews supported the services:

> *"We direct our patrons to Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped when there's a need."*

> *"We have several blind people using the library, and I get good feedback from them."*

Others were not familiar with it:

> *"Don't know… There's large print at the Service Centers. They do some Braille too, but I don't know much about this."*

> *"… We don't use LBPH. That has to go through the State Library."*

Finally, two commented about the large percentage of LSTA funds required for the service – nearly one-third of the total available:

> *"Perhaps too much LSTA goes into supporting LBPH."*

> *"Special needs is a higher priority. They might need the library and have difficulty getting it. But be careful of costs. It's too much for too few."*


**Webster's Bridge** (2008: $13,660, 0.3% of total LSTA expenditures; $7,996 match). New Caanan Library undertook this project to increase awareness of the prevalence of special needs families in the community and understanding of the challenges they face and to foster the idea that these children and families are just one of many unique subsets of patrons. Staff worked with a group of parents and professionals and decided to focus on children with learning disabilities and autism, with materials related to social skill building and behavior intervention, inclusion strategies, and language development and reading methods. The library purchased

books for children and parents, software, educational games, and two assistive technology workstations.  An expert led sensitivity training for staff.  The library launched a Webster's Bridge web site and a bibliography.   Program planners were disappointed in low participation, after substantial promotional efforts and in the face of the need having been identified as a community priority.  The library presented five programs for 97 children, siblings, parents and caregivers; served 23 educators and library professionals and circulated 131 items.

Two outcomes were reported:

- 59% of staff reported an increase in knowledge following sensitivity training.
- 45% of staff attending sensitivity training rated the program "very good" or "excellent."

No outcomes for the target audience of children with disabilities and their families were documented.

**Your Space** (2009: $24,996, 0.6% of total LSTA expenditures; $14,264 match).  Willimantic is Connecticut's third neediest city, designated as a "distressed municipality" with 17% of the population and 25% of children living below the poverty level.  Student educational attainment levels are well below state averages.  In this project in partnership with Windham High School, the Willimantic Public Library offered engaging educational activities to teens and encouraged them to read for pleasure.  In a survey at the start of the school year, 52% said they would read more if they could find books they liked at the public and school libraries.  The Library opened a satellite young adult library at the Kramer Teen Center, open three days a week after school hours, managed by a young adult librarian. Twenty students hired as Book Ambassadors recommended books, wrote book reviews, and help create, promote, and implement programs.

In the first ten weeks, 312 patrons visited Your Space, and young adult circulation at the Library surged 124%.  A series of barriers kept the project from being totally successful.  Students hired to review books and plan programs proved unreliable and the librarian ended up with these tasks.  The Library experienced delays in communicating with the school and a planned blog and MySpace page were not feasible due to school Internet blocking.  The school switched from a student-centered Sustained Silent Reading model to a scripted, direct instruction model that didn't allow for pleasure reading.

The library issued or updated 231 library cards and hosted 973 visits to Your Space, while 158 teens used extended hours at the high school.  153 teens participated in 12 programs.  Circulation at Your Space, the library and high school totaled 922, a 106% increase over the same period a year earlier.

Three outcomes were reported from a survey of program participants (Table 8).

| Table 8: Your Space Outcomes, 2008 | |
|---|---|
| Teens reporting they spent more time reading for pleasure now than a year ago | 73% |
| Teens reporting an increase in enjoyment of reading after the program | 62% |
| Teens agreeing they would like the program to continue | 100% |

In addition, the Library and high school developed a strong relationship and plan to continue working together.  Budget limitations kept the Library from continuing the young adult librarian position or the space, but the furnishings were incorporated in the main facility.

**Community Needs Assessments – Bloomfield, Chester, Plainville, and Tolland Public Libraries** (2008: $6,000, 0.1% of total expenditures; $8,368 match - Bloomfield $2,089, Chester $2,862, Plainville $2,109, and Tolland $1,308).  Four public libraries participated in community needs assessments:

- In Bloomfield, the Prosser Public Library and Wintonbury Branch Library led a local literacy movement, in partnership with local service providers, which identified community issues regarding literacy levels of non-native English speakers, generated discussion, identified needs, and shared information. The libraries hired a consultant, who contacted service providers, facilitated two focus groups and analyzed results, and met with the Library's Equal Access Patron Advisory Council to plan the project's next phase. A core group of library volunteers helped as the adult literacy initiative took shape. The consultant and library staff and volunteers contacted 175 local service agencies and sent 280 invitations. Sixteen people participated in the two focus groups. Eleven community members volunteered and ten became tutors. Four student intake sessions were held. No outcomes were documented.
- In Chester (population 4,000) a committee of community members conducted a multiple-format survey and facilitated four focus groups. Using local experts "resulted in sensitivity to the community" and demonstrated fiscal constraint. In 201 survey responses, most frequently mentioned needs included more weekend and weekday hours, expanded adult collections and programs using local residents, more movie and museum passes, more involvement of children in materials selection, more collaboration with local organizations, and up-to-date technology. Facilities priorities included a more appealing space for children and families and universal accessibility. Some results confirmed, while others challenged, Board and staff opinions. The Library made some immediate changes – juggling hours and adding museum passes – and continued to review results as it compiled long-range and facilities plans. "Chester residents," wrote the library director, "are passionate about their town. They were vocal about the importance of keeping Chester's identity and quality reflected in the library through its physical space, programming, and collections."
- In Plainville (population 17,300) a consultant who conducted focus groups, with help from community partners, with five target audiences – community stakeholders, senior citizens, business representatives, young adults, and adults to find out why some did not use its services. Attendance totaled 84. The consultant also designed an online and a paper survey. Over a period of six weeks, 621 responses were collected. The survey revealed that 93.6% of community members were extremely or very satisfied with services. The Library gathered many useful suggestions and discovered that it needed to publicize basic service more. The project director noted that the process had many unexpected benefits. Residents were flattered to be asked for their opinions.
- In Tolland, the grant allowed the library to hire a consultant to determine needs of people new to the community, reaffirm usefulness of service to long-time residents, and identify needs of underserved members of the community as a step toward long- range planning. The consultant conducted interviews, four focus groups with 46 attendees, and study circles with four constituent groups – senior citizens, working people and business owners, mothers of pre-school children and those with free time during the day, and library staff. Print and online surveys were completed by 337 respondents. The Library Board, Friends, and Foundation, as well as 11 community groups offered input. Results were compared with current services and usage to identify priorities for action, which were shared broadly.

**Long Range Planning – Fairfield, Beacon Hills, and Plumb Memorial Public Libraries**
(2008: $29,984 –Fairfield $10,000, Beacon Hills $10,000, Plumb Memorial $9.984, 0.7% of total expenditures for the two years. Matching funding of $40,445 – Fairfield $30,839, Beacon Hills $3,082, and Plumb Memorial $6,524 – was contributed. Three libraries followed the Public Library Association planning process:

- At Fairfield Public Library, located in a prosperous town of 58,400 on the I-95 corridor, a consultant guided a committee through gathering data about the community and the Library and conducted six focus groups. The committee drafted a community vision and discussed how the library could help achieve it, then completed a strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats (SWOT) analysis. The committee selected service responses from those developed by PLA, crafted a mission statement, and created a detailed action plan. They used Web 2.0 capabilities to engage young people.
- At Beacon Hills Public Library, located in a former industrial center that is now a rapidly growing upscale suburban area, a consultant facilitated the work of local stakeholders, interviewed community leaders, studied community and library data, and conducted three focus groups to elicit ideas about the community's vision and consider library service responses. Following a SWOT analysis, staff met to craft a mission statement, service goals, objectives, and measures. Results were communicated to stakeholders through special meetings, newspaper articles, and via the library newsletter and website. The process increased awareness of library needs and centralized community support for moving ahead with plans to build a new, larger facility. Adult volunteerism has increased.
- Plumb Memorial Library in Shelton created a long-range plan in response to community sentiment that the Library be a prominent landmark. Both the Main Library and the branch in Huntington were involved. After the planning committee conducted a SWOT analysis, a consultant conducted six focus groups with library staff, senior citizens, individuals representing the disability community, parents, general public, and teens. A comment form was available at the Main Library for ten days and a survey at Huntington Branch for six weeks. A new mission statement, two goals – improving facilities and increasing awareness, nine objectives, and a motto were adopted by the Board at the end.

**TAP (The Americans' Place)** (2008: $23,066, 0.5% of total expenditures; $7,844 match). Hartford Public Library developed a structured program to address the needs of immigrants at three key stages of the process: determining eligibility, filing applications, and preparing for citizenship. The Library hired a part-time outreach specialist, expanded citizenship collections, provided continuing education for staff and others, offered special orientation and citizenship classes, onsite immigration counseling, and gave library cards and immigrant resource packets to all students. A "Gateway Advisory Group" included 33 representatives from immigrant and faith-based organizations, government agencies, businesses, and neighborhood organizations. The Group hosted an immigrant resource fair.

To accommodate a continuous, large flow of citizenship applicants, the Library modified the citizenship class component into a brief curriculum repeated monthly. The Library discovered a number of Spanish speakers who met language requirements and a sizable community of deaf immigrants. A number of West Indians were failing the written portion of the test, so the curriculum was strengthened in that area. Immigration counseling was not as successful as expected, as nearly 40% of those who made appointments did not keep them.

Outputs from the project included:

- 3 continuing education session for librarians and other providers attended by 126
- 2 forums on how to become a citizen attended by 148
- 4 application workshops attended by 40 participants
- 99 appointments for immigration counseling

Outcomes for participants are summarized in Table 9.

| Table 9: The Americans' Place: Outcomes, 2008 | |
|---|---|
| Participants demonstrating 70% increase in knowledge of becoming a citizen | 81% |
| Participants demonstrating 90% improvement in knowledge of citizenship application process. | 70% |
| Participants demonstrating 70% improvement in knowledge of citizenship test. | 90% |
| Participants who became citizens after attending citizenship classes. (others pending) | 11% |

**LSTA PRIORITY 6:  Targeting Library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty line.**

**Middletown Library Service Center** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010: $370,562 or 5.64% of total expenditures for the three-year period)   The Middletown Library Service Center's alternate format materials supplement collections of local libraries, especially for those who have difficulty using traditional print materials and rely instead on large print books and audio materials in multiple formats.  The Center houses materials for library professionals and for children (see Outreach Collections for Children project below).  Center staff members provide leadership, capacity building and consulting services.  The Center provides office space for iCONN staff and three State Library consultants and offers centrally-located, free meeting space for library staff and supporters.

Outputs related to circulation are summarized in Table 10.  No outcomes related to circulation were reported.

| Table 10 | Middletown Library Service Center: Usage, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| Items circulated | 26,512 | 21,471 | 18,601 | -29.84% |
| Interlibrary loan requests filled | 3,316 | 3,770 | 2,422 | -26.96% |
| Institutions borrowing from Center | 390 | 190 | 202 | -48.21% |

Capacity building outputs and outcomes are reported under the Capacity Building Opportunities project in LSTA PRIORITY 2.  Comments from focus groups and interviews are included under Willimantic Library Service Center in LSTA PRIORITY 1.

**Audio & Large Print Collection** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010: $70,169 or 1.07% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period).  Middletown and Willimantic Service Centers purchased, cataloged, and processed audio and large print materials to supplement collections of small and rural libraries and meet the needs of their patrons, especially those who require alternate formats, live in underserved communities, have disabilities, or are of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds.  Outputs are detailed in Table 11.

| Table 11 | Audio & Large Print Collection Participants and Usage, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2009* |
| Unique library borrowers | 390 | 520 | 493 | 26.41% |
| Circulation | 29,597 | 23,353 | 27,244 | -7.95% |
| % total Center circulation | 42.6% | 37.5% | 41.2% | -3.29% |

No patron outcomes were reported for this project.  Comments from focus groups and interview participants are included under Willimantic Library Service Center project in LSTA PRIORITY 1.

**Outreach Collections for Children** (2008 and 2009: $14,895, 0.3% of total expenditures; no match).  This project funded purchase of materials for the children's collections housed at two Library Service Centers.  Although the collection is available to any library, the targeted audience is school and public libraries serving low-income families.  Programming resources promote literacy development.  Materials are delivered via Connecticar.

Staff at the center selected, acquired, cataloged, processed and circulated materials, often in duplicate to support classroom wide activities and the State Library's two children's services consultants.

Outputs are summarized in Table 12.

| Table 12: Outreach Collections for Children: Usage, 2008-2009 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *% Change 2008-2009* |
| Items circulated | 38,558 | 36,996 | (4.1%) |

No outcomes were reported.

**Get Your Game On** (2009: $15,503 in 2009, 0.4% of total expenditures for the two years; $5,234 match).  Booth and Dimock Memorial Library in Coventry designed a program combining entertainment and education in an after-school program for middle and high-school students. The Library invited teachers, parents, and area librarians to a workshop with a gaming expert focused on how computer and video gaming can promote traditional and non-traditional literacies.  The Library planned weekly gaming club meetings, where gamers could earn points toward prizes.

An average of 8-12 teens attended; some became involved in setting up and putting away equipment.  After sessions, they browsed the collection and began recommending titles for purchase.  The 24 members of the Get Your Game On Club earned 1,895 incentive points. Statistics showed increases in other library usage: circulation of young adult books 15.5%, young adult magazines 91.4%, and young adult movies 13.3%; number of young adult programs 34.4% and events and meetings 66%, overall young adult program attendance 7%, and total young adult visits to the library 33%.

Outcomes for adults and teens in the Get Your Game On initiative are detailed in Table 10. Surprises for the library: The teens enjoyed the card and board games as much as video games.  They wanted library staff to be involved with them.  Teens got along well, even though there were often age differences.

**Table 13: Get Your Game On: Outcomes, 2009**
**Adults after Get Your Game On Workshop**

| |
|---|
| 83.3% knowledge increase: how computer and video games promote traditional literacies |
| 79% knowledge increase: how adults can use gaming to attract/teach youth |
| 101% knowledge increase: how gaming builds developmental assets of children and teens |
| 106.7% knowledge increase: developing a library gaming program |
| 100.0% knowledge increase: selecting and purchasing materials for library gaming collection |
| 46.7 knowledge increase: cataloging and circulating materials for library gaming collection |
| 200% Change in library use |
| 75% Change in checking out books |
| 66% Change in checking out magazines |
| 66% Change in checking out movies |
| 75% Change in Internet usage at library |

**Cognitive Fitness and Creative Wisdom Center (2008:** $13,682, 0.3% of total expenditures for the two years. $13,462 in matching funds). Through this project, the Hartford Public Library developed a Cognitive Fitness Center and programs designed to "build brain power" and tap the "creative wisdom" of active older adults.

The Library created two websites, added brain-stimulating books, Playaway titles, realia pieces, and games to its collection, and hosted 11 "Creative Wisdom" programs and five "Building Brain Power" sessions. Attendance at sessions totaled 349, an average of 22 participants per session.

Based on pre- and post-questionnaires from 56 of 64 participants in Building Brain Power sessions, 87.5% reported learning gains of at least 20% and 100% reported positive changes in attitudes about aging. On similar questionnaires returned by 99 of 111 participants in Creative Wisdom sessions, 85% reported positive changes in the way they feel about aging and creativity. All returning questionnaires reported using at least one other library service over the course of their participation in the sessions. Comments included in the state report confirm that participants changed their attitudes:

> "Opened my mind to new ways of thinking."

> "There is more to me than I realized."

They also described increased knowledge:

> "I learned more about how the brain works and stimulated my interest in further study."

> "I learned how to paint on the computer, many thanks."

The Library learned that marketing these programs was more difficult than expected.

**Plymouth LEAPS** (2009: $19,766 in 2009, 0.5% of total expenditures; $14,962 match). Through this project, the Terryville Public Library addressed the need expressed by the community for information on early childhood development, local programming for pre-school aged children, and a space in which to interact with each other and parenting professionals. The library added four new services: pre-walker (birth to one) story times adapted from the

Mother Goose on the Loose model; parenting and Every Child Ready to Read workshops for parents and caregivers; a collection of themed story kits including books, activities; and supplementary props to reinforce learning. A web site with community calendar and resource directory, early literacy information, and tutorials on various topics of interest to parents listed 42 resources and 334 events from 22 organizations by the end of the project.

Outputs included 22 programs attended by 142 parents and caregivers and 175 programs attended by a total of 197 unique participants, with total attendance of 1,644.

Outcomes from Plymouth LEAPS are summarized in Table 14.

| Table 14: Plymouth LEAPS: Outcomes for Participating Parents, 2009 | |
|---|---|
| Parents of children ages birth to 15 months old report increased at-home reading time by at least one hour a week. | 80% |
| Parents report increased use of dialogic reading by 50% after using story kits | 75% |
| Parents report they have attended a program listed in the community calendar within a month of accessing the website. | 75% |
| Parents report increased knowledge by 50% on how to apply discipline and use communication skills that are effective, strengthen adult-child relationships, and sustain positive self-worth in children. | 71% |

Other unanticipated outcomes were reported. The Library found the Mother Goose on the Loose activities so engaging their staff included them in other programs. A local art student painted a mural in the children's area to make it more welcoming. The library found two new partners for future early literacy programming.


**Read, Rock and Rhyme** (2008: $21,137 in 2008, 0.4% of total expenditures for the two years; $6,028 match). Jonathan Trumbull Library implemented an early literacy project based on "Mother Goose on the Loose" to connect babies and toddlers and their caregivers to a variety of learning experiences to increase pre-reading skills and caregivers' awareness of the skills.

After upgrading an existing space and shifting the collection to create an open, inviting environment, the Library introduced this program to an audience previously unserved. Adult participants gained exposure to pre-literacy techniques and had opportunities to interact with the others in weekly programs, then used the activities at home. The children's librarian presented programs at an elementary school for pre-school classes, while school staff observed how the program facilitated early literacy skills and how the skills could be shared with caregivers, teachers, and administrators. The library also attended pre-school screenings, discussed importance of early literacy activities, and shared brochures with families.

The Library added 1,803 items and held 19 programs and 9 pre-literacy support events for 516 children, 425 adults, and 38 families. Sixteen people registered for library cards.

Outcomes reported within six months:

- 98% of caregivers reported an increase in the child's pre-literacy skills.
- 100% of caregivers reported spending an average of 30% more time reading, talking, singing, or rhyming with their pre-school aged child.
- 100% of caregivers reported observing a 30% rise in pre-literacy behaviors in the pre-school aged child.

The librarian reported the 80% repetition and 20% new material formula worked well, and the children exhibited gains in pre-literacy and school readiness skills. Parents continued to ask for new rhymes and other pre-literacy activities to share with their children.

**Roping Up with Young Adults** (2008: $18,413, 0.4% of total LSTA expenditures; $6,656 match).  Responding to community needs and low academic achievement scores, Canterbury Public Library used the framework outlined in the IMLS report *Nine to Nineteen: Youth in Museums and Libraries: A Practitioners Guide* as a design template for offering teens in the small, rural and disadvantaged community a series of programs to increase literacy and technological skills and improve socialization and awareness of the natural environment and of how town government works.

The Library formed a Young Adult Advisory Council and solicited input in designing teen programs, consulted with teachers at two high schools, and publicized programs in the Library through the newspaper, a blog, and word of mouth.  Programs were co-sponsored with the Connecticut Audubon Society, Prudence Crandall Museum, and Killingly Public Library.  Teens turned an existing space in the library into a place for socializing and gaming, leading to more programs on photography, a teen pizza night, an Internet safety workshop, and several craft programs.

A total of 41 teens attended 41 activities.  Average daily attendance of teens at the Library increased from four to 14, a 250% change.

Among the 41 teens participating, outcomes included a 5% increase in amount of time spent performing literary activities and a 14% increase in feeling part of the Canterbury community by the end of the grant period.  The number of teens making suggestions for purchase doubled from start to end of the project.

Building on evidence obtained by the teens during the vernal pool surveys with the Audubon Society, the Library helped the U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service prepare a proposal to restore wetlands damaged by a former landfill, now a Superfund site.  The Department tentatively committed $12,000 for workshops and projects to identify vernal pools and other natural resources.

**Teen Gaming Initiative** (2008: $12,250, 0.3% of total LSTA expenditures; $73,889 match).  Hartford Public Library undertook this program to engage reluctant readers in grades 7 – 12 who were also active gamers in after-school programs designed to build self-esteem and leadership and improve literacy and learning skills.  Staff created booklists for those who enjoyed games (sports, fantasy, logic, and music); purchased gaming equipment and games, books drawn from "Books for Gamers," books recommended for reluctant readers, and gaming magazines.  They conducted two training sessions and refreshers for staff.  Under the leadership of teen employees, teens planned and attended six video game tournaments and "open play" days at three library facilities, after which they selected print materials for the library related to their gaming interests.  By the end of the program, teens were able to discuss their favorite video games using traditional literacy ideas such as setting, characters, and theme.  Staff learned that they needed to play the video games as well, in order to form relationships with the teens.

Outputs included 121 gaming events and book discussions, 153 unique individuals participating, 1,875 participants in programs, and 7,305 young adult items circulated, a 5% increase over the previous year.

Each initiative site conducted pre- and post-participation surveys.  As a result of their participation, teens showed significant increases in reading, ability to locate printed materials related to gaming, and in knowledge and capabilities of being a good team member.  The project coordinator reported that the teen leaders had positive first experiences as "experts." Outcomes are summarized in Table 15.

| Table 15: Teen Gaming Initiative Outcomes, 2008 | |
|---|---|
| Teens who reported never reading for pleasure before who began reading | 66% |
| Teens who demonstrated 20% increase in ability to identify and locate printed materials of interest | 52% |
| Teens who demonstrated 29% increase in knowledge about attributes comprising good team member | 70% |
| Teens who reported 35.3% rise in capabilities as members of a team | 69% |
| Teens who demonstrated 33% increase in ability to identify and locate printed materials related to gaming interests | 73% |

**No Priority Category**

Most States categorize the amount devoted to LSTA administration under LSTA Priority 1 since it is generally seen as the broadest category. We have included the Administrative program below but have not placed it under any particular LSTA Priority. CSL allocates a small percentage of its LSTA allocation to administration of their LSTA program. The CSL Administration category is somewhat unique in that it includes some work that would typically be assigned to a program other than Administration.

**Administration of LSTA** (LSTA expenditure 2008 - 2010: $159,126 or 2.42% of total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period) This project supported all activities related to managing, planning, and promoting statewide and sub-grant projects, including processes related to submission and review of applications, maintenance of official program files, coordination of contracts and grant payments, monitoring completion of formative and summative assessments of statewide and sub-grant projects, and compiling information for annual reporting. The LSTA administration staff members also provide technical assistance and coaching on outcome-based evaluation. They maintain the Connecticut WebJunction site, where they share best practices from grant-funded programs.

Outputs are summarized in Table 16.

| Table 16 | Administration of LSTA Outputs, 2008-2010 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *2008* | *2009* | *2010* | *% Change 2008-2010* |
| WebJunction users added | 221 | 136 | 153 | -30.77% |
| WebJunction unique visitors | 25,537 | 18,682 | 22,647 | -11.32% |
| WebJunction visits | 52,867 | 43,721 | 37,779 | -28.54% |

In 2009, WebJunction completed an annual survey, which provided outcome data related to usage and satisfaction of its services:

- Respondents visited WebJunction monthly (47%), agreed it was available to use when needed (86%), had useful features and functions (75%), and was reliable (75%). They were highly satisfied or satisfied (53%) and were likely to recommend WebJunction services to others (78%).
- Asked how WebJunction helped them perform 21 different activities, more than half of respondents reported they used it to learn more about new technology (63%), develop or improve services for patrons (60%), or increase skills with computer applications (64%).

- WebJunction users gave positive ratings to courses and webinars. They found it easy to locate courses on WebJunction (69%) and to enroll in WebJunction courses (78%), agreed WebJunction webinars were useful (55%), and recommended WebJunction courses to others (73%).
- In open-ended comments, respondents shared appreciation for deep content, classes that supported them professionally and on their own timetable, and free access.

In interviews, librarians described how they used WebJunction:

> *"The State Library provides the Connecticut Library web site and WebJunction Connecticut. They're like a librarian's online reference collection, very helpful. As a new director I'm trying to write policies, etc., and these two online resources are extremely helpful."*

Of the nine respondents to an ongoing survey, 82% indicated that the digital collection in Connecticut Treasures enables them to find useful information.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

### *Retrospective Questions*

**1. Did the activities undertaken through Connecticut's LSTA plan achieve results, as outlined below in sections related to priorities identified in the Library Services and Technology Act?**

Yes. Both the State Goals included in the 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan and the programs undertaken with LSTA funds were well-aligned with the 6 LSTA Grants to States Priorities as they existed when the plan was written. LSTA-funded programs completed over the course of the three years covered by this evaluation very effectively addressed LSTA Priorities, 1, 2, 5 and 6. Impact related to LSTA Priorities 3 and 4, while less dramatic than the results achieved on Priorities 1,2,5 and 6, are nevertheless evident and measurable.

**2. To what extent were these results due to choices made in the selection of strategies?**

The Connecticut State Library has successfully employed three different strategies for using their LSTA allotment that, together, have enabled CSL to address all six LSTA Grants to States Priorities. The strategies include:

- Direct Service (e.g. ICONN, LBPH)
- Capacity Building/Enabling (e.g. Leading Libraries, Connecticar)
- Sub-Grants (e.g., Read, Rock and Rhyme, Picture Book Science, Picture Book Math)

The "Direct Service" strategy has been particularly effective in enabling CSL to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 (Expanding access to information and educational resources), Priority 2 (Developing services that provide access to information through state, regional, national and international networks) and 5 (Targeting services to individuals with disabilities). The Sub-Grant strategy has allowed CSL to have impact related to Grants to States Priority 6 (Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty line). In addition, the Sub-Grant program has had a significant positive impact

related to LSTA Priority 4 (Developing public and private partnerships). Sub-grants that focus on literacy or information literacy directly address the portion of Priority 5 that targets individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills.

The programs that are part of the Capacity Building/Enabling strategy crossover all of the LSTA Priorities. The Capacity Building program is particularly interesting because it was actually structured to address all six of the LSTA Priorities individually. Of the six LSTA Grants to State Priorities, the Priorities least impacted by LSTA funding are Priorities 3 and 4 (Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries) and (building public and private partnerships). The Connecticar delivery program is reported under priority 3 later in the evaluation because it clearly links libraries; however little LSTA funding has been invested in the digital infrastructure. While there are certainly elements of LSTA-funded programs that are related to Priority 3, CSL is addressing infrastructure issues primarily from State and private funding. For example, the Connecticut State Library is a leading partner in the statewide, fiber-optic Connecticut Education Network (CEN); every CT K-12 school district, higher education campus, and public library benefits from CEN. CT was also aided by participating in The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Staying Connected Challenge Grant. No programs are reported under LSTA Priority 4. This is not because there is a lack of partnership activity taking place. It simply reflects the fact that no program had building public and private partnerships as its primary focus.

The Connecticut State Library is addressing 4 of the six LSTA Priorities in a very significant way with LSTA funds and the State Library is impacting the remaining LSTA Priorities through initiatives that have a different primary focus. The Capacity Building program funded with FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 dollars is particularly interesting in that it was specifically designed to address all six of the LSTA Priorities.

## 3. To what extent did these results relate to subsequent implementation?

The results achieved were related to the way in which programs were implemented to a large extent. The alignment of CSL's State-level goals with LSTA Grants to States program priorities resulted in LSTA-funded projects and initiatives that were well aligned with the Priorities. Unlike some LSTA Plans that indicate that a given goal addresses 4 or 5 LSTA priorities, most goals in the Connecticut Plan were aligned with only one or two Priorities. Connecticut accomplished this by having a large number of goals (9) that were tightly focused. This framework increased the possibility that results generated by the LSTA-funded programs would generate results closely related to the LSTA Priorities.

## 4. To what extent did programs and services benefit targeted individuals and groups?

Many of Connecticut's LSTA-funded programs targeted populations identified in LSTA Grants to States Priorities 5 and 6. The Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped clearly benefits a targeted audience. However, several sub-grants address the needs of special needs populations as well.

Furthermore, the organization of the LSTA Plan around specific audiences has lent itself to the development of programs that also focus on targeted audiences. Again, sub-grant programs have contributed greatly to this success. The library service center in Middletown and Willimantic also play a role by helping local libraries meet the needs of targeted populations.

### *IMLS Process Questions*

**1. Were modifications made to the Connecticut State Library's plan? If so, please specify the modifications and if they were informed by outcomes-based data.**

*No modifications were made to the Connecticut State Library's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan.*

**2. If modifications were made to the plan, how were performance metrics used in guiding those decisions?**

Since no modifications were made to the 2008 – 2012 Plan, this question does not apply.

**3. How have performance metrics been used to guide policy and managerial decisions affecting the Connecticut's LSTA -supported programs and services?**

Although the Connecticut State Library bemoans the fact that it has not been able to implement a robust outcome-based evaluation program, the evaluators believe that CSL's ongoing program evaluation has been exemplary.

A wide variety of very specific performance metrics are in place that enable CSL to monitor the progress of its programs and to make decisions that are based on solid statistics. It is true that most of the performance measures in use are inputs and outputs; however, CSL doesn't just collect statistics that represent "low-hanging fruit." Data elements in use are relevant to program success and the mechanisms are in place to ensure that the measures needed to provide a longitudinal view are collected and reported.

The evaluators are unaware of any other State that has established an online tool like Connecticut's 5-Year Plan wiki for collecting and reporting performance measures. The evaluators believe that Connecticut has much to share with other SLAAs in regard to the collection of solid statistics that demonstrate successful performance. See http://5yearplan.pbworks.com/w/page/1038433/FrontPage

**4. What have been important challenges to using outcome-based data to guide policy and managerial decisions over the past five years?**

Ironically, one of the impediments in moving toward an outcome-based evaluation model is that Connecticut's **output-based** model has worked so well. Nevertheless, despite Connecticut's assertions that it hasn't fully incorporated an outcome-based assessment model, the evaluators believe that the State's performance in this regard has been exemplary. A few examples of these efforts are provided below

Connecticut has made exemplary progress in putting many elements of outcome-based evaluation into place, including:

- Identifying indicators for workshops presented by State Library staff members and implemented end-of-session evaluations for a substantial percentage of workshops. These results document increases in knowledge.
- Completing a turnaround study of Connecticar which produced data that can be used for improvement.
- Requiring those applying for sub-grants to attend training and incorporate outcome measures in their proposals and in their reporting.
- Working with vendor Gale Cengage to complete satisfaction surveys with end users.

As a result of these collective efforts, Connecticut has begun to create a data-driven culture that will serve it well in improving services and making difficult decisions about priority services in the coming years.

Connecticut has managed to make this tremendous progress in spite of a 20% reduction in the size of its library development workforce. Furthermore, Connecticut's LSTA Coordinator is fully engaged with new effort by IMLS to develop logic maps and results chains (the "Measuring Success" initiative) to aid SLAAs in developing quality outcome driven assessment procedures,

### IMLS Prospective Questions

**1. How does the State Library Agency plan to share performance metrics and other evaluation-related information within and outside the Agency to inform policy and administrative decisions over the next five years?**

The Connecticut Legislature is moving to a results-based approach, so the development of a robust outcome-based evaluation processes should be helpful in meeting these new State expectations that may be tied to funding.

The Connecticut State Library indicates that it will share the results of this evaluation with the CSL advisory council and with the Connecticut State Library Board. The evaluation will be shared with the library community by way of a posting of the document on the State Library's web site.

Monthly staff meetings will keep all DLD staff apprised of OBE developments, and the LSTA Coordinator will continue his involvement in the IMLS Measuring Success initiative.

**2. How can the performance data collected and analyzed to date be used to identify benchmarks in the upcoming five-year plan?**

Some benchmarks that have been established have proven to be unreliable while others have proven to be highly useful. One issue that calls the use of benchmarks into question is the volatility of library service delivery mechanism. An example can be found in the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped program. Benchmarks established for this program proved to be unreliable because of the rapid acceptance of the digital talking book and growth of the Braille Audio Reading Download (BARD) program. Changes in the way in which database vendors report usage data has also created problems with establishing benchmarks that are useful.

CSL will mine the information collected through this evaluation process for data elements that may serve as baselines for ongoing evaluation efforts and the State Library will also adjust established benchmarks as needed to reflect changing market conditions and service delivery mechanisms.

**3. What key lessons has the Agency learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other states could benefit from knowing? Include what worked and what should be changed.**

The Connecticut State Library LSTA Coordinator offered a valuable insight into this question in his response to the self-evaluation survey conducted by the evaluators. He said, "Librarians need to step outside their comfort zone of patron anonymity; OBE can be confidential, but rarely

anonymous. I've learned that librarians have the tendency to turn OBE instruments into satisfaction surveys, which are essentially useless. All of CSL's OBE methods use surveys tailored to the individual program/task to obtain pre- and post- data. Generally these are administered immediately prior to and following a program or service. Results were rarely surprising and though they probably wouldn't hold up to a rigid social science examination, they pointed out the extreme worthiness and value of whatever the programming topic was. "

He went on to say "OBE helps keep the focus of libraries where it should be: on patrons. What needs to change is that there is a real lack of direction/consensus as to what 'results' look like across states or programs.  If we can make OBE general or national, libraries will be able to make a unified, powerful statement for finding support

### *IMLS Optional Prospective Questions*

**1.   What are the major challenges and opportunities that the State Library Agency and its partners can address to make outcome-based data more useful to federal and state policy makers as well as other stakeholders?**

There is a tendency to look at outcome-based evaluation as an all or nothing proposition.  In fact, Connecticut has much to lose if it were to abandon its high quality, output-driven assessment for an outcome-based model that is untested and untried.

It is likely that the best approach to moving toward an OBE approach will be the incremental approach that Connecticut has been following by retaining its output measures and gradually infusing OBE in the particular areas where it seems the most likely to succeed.  Doing nothing is not an option.  However, abandoning something that works on a wholesale basis is not an option either.

The evaluators suggest several steps to take outcome-based evaluation to the next level in Connecticut:

A.  <u>Focus outcome-based evaluation efforts on four service areas that account for 80% of expenditures</u>, in order to identify opportunities for improvement:
   i.   Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.  LSTA investment for service to 9,200 individuals was $1,373,682 over two years, plus $687,042 in matching funds.
   ii.   Library Service Centers and associated collection development.  LSTA investment totaled $826,357 over two years, plus $939,772 in matching funds.
   iii.   iCONN.  LSTA investment totaled $553,774, with $1,744,621 in matching funds.
   iv.   Connecticar.  LSTA investment totaled $542,930, with $596,565 in matching funds.
B.  <u>Design evaluation protocols</u>, perhaps with assistance from trained evaluators, and make sure evaluation instruments are put in place during the next round of planning, so that goals are measurable and achievable and comparable data can be collected for every LSTA-funded program, at each site and event every year.
C.  <u>Strengthen analysis and reporting of capacity-building data</u>.  Rather than reporting detailed data for every indicator for each session with the same content, find a way to summarize the data across sessions, so that program planners and funders can quickly assess which content, educational processes, and learning contexts are working and which need improvement.
D.  <u>Extend outcome measures</u> for capacity building sessions from end-of-session measures of awareness and knowledge to longer-term measures of skill, behavior, and condition outcomes.  The capacity-building team might want to read *Evaluating Professional Development* (Thomas Guskey), *Taking Charge of Change* (Shirley Hord), or similar titles on

---

authentic assessment of adult learning, for possible frameworks and tools for documenting longer-term outcomes, including changes in skill, behavior, and condition after participants return to their libraries.  Thinking about these deeper outcomes may suggest changes in design of and contextual support for professional learning.

E. Develop a "dashboard" for reporting data on a regular basis (daily/weekly/monthly), so that data is consistent and complete for each year and is immediately available to policy makers, program planners, and participants in Connecticut.  The goal is to make data readily available and use it for state and local decision making, rather than merely reporting it at year end.

F. Review the format for collecting annual reports at IMLS to allow for quantitative data to be shared – charts, graphs, etc. – to encourage comparative and trend analysis.

G. Share all of these – protocols, instruments, dashboard, and annual reports – nationally, so that individual states can take advantage of practical solutions to data gathering for evaluating outcomes, for studying and comparing processes, and for improving results.

## 2. Based on the findings from the evaluation, include recommendations for justifying the continuation, expansion, and/or adoption of promising programs in the next five-year plan.

Outputs, outcomes, and support from librarians in Connecticut confirm that the State Library should continue:

- Access services, including iCONN databases, Connecticar, Connecticard, with the caveat that librarians wish to see improved integration of local catalogs
- Capacity building efforts, including focused continuing education, training, and professional development, and deeper follow-up support and coaching to insure implementation, with attendant longer-term outcomes assessment
- Sub-grants that support innovation, including deeper understanding of target audiences, emerging community needs, and partnerships
- Services for children and young adults, especially when local libraries are full funding partners as in the summer reading program and sub-grant projects in 2008 and 2009

## 3. Based on the findings from the evaluation, include recommendations for justifying potential cuts and/or elimination of programs in the next five-year plan.

The Library Service Centers obviously serve multiple functions, as offices for iCONN and consulting staff, meeting space for workshops and training, centralized professional collections, and specialized collections, primarily for children.  It may be that these functions are complementary and support each other.  However, the evaluators question the need for the specialized collections, especially supplemental non-fiction titles, in the age of Internet access. If such titles are needed at all, perhaps small funding supplements could be provided to libraries or deposit collections could be housed in libraries with five-day courier service providing access to the materials.

The Library for the Bind and Physically Handicapped is another service that is in the midst of a transformation due to the advent of the digital talking book and the BARD download program.

Rash decisions to make major changes to one or both of these programs is *not* a sensible course; however, the evaluators believe that the next LSTA five-year Plan should include a careful examination of what new service delivery models mean for legacy services represented by the service centers and LBPH.

**COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS EVALUATION**

- Cost of contract with evaluator      $ 19,200
- Internal (SLAA) cost estimate      <u>$   1,560</u>
  - Estimated Total      $ 20,760

**Appendix A:  Focus Group Summary**

Only two focus groups were held.  Two others that were scheduled were cancelled due to the massive snow storm/power outages that shut down the state on November 1, 2011.  Attendance on November 2 was about half of what was originally anticipated because tens of thousands of households and libraries in Connecticut were still without power.  Of the two sessions that were held, one was of "subgrantees" and the other was with members of the Connecticut Digital Library Advisory Board.  In order to compensate for the low number of people having input into the evaluation through focus groups, the consultants conducted a larger number of personal interviews that included some of the people who had originally planned to attend the focus group sessions.

**Subgrantees          11/2/11**

*Which LSTA-funded or jointly supported programs has had the greatest impact on your library?*

Ccar has a huge impact in a small library;  we can get things from any library in the state.
When the iConn system went down, we realized how many people were using it from home.
I second that assessment.  For us it's the Ccar/ILL/union catalog.  A lot of the smaller libraries wouldn't be able to support their customers without those services.

I'm not directly involved with it, but the Project Book Fund is important even in the big city.
Some small libraries use the reQuest catalog as their library catalog.
I love the Library for the Blind; it saved my father's life.  People can do it themselves; librarians sign people up to use the service.
iCONN has the only databases that we have.
Even in Hartford, the databases are essential.  We have some other databases but the LSTA funded databases are the core.

LBPH—I'd like for it to have more visibility; in Hartford we don't know as much as we should about it.
Visibility isn't there…I didn't know about LBPH.
We're in a poorer part of the state; we depend on the service centers; we don't have MLS librarians.  Service centers support book discussions.
I've also used the service centers—borrowed the board book kits, professional materials, large print materials…helps us cater to our users' tastes.
Professional Development—Doug and Mary Engels do a lot to network people together.  That levels the playing field for the smaller libraries.

*What about the impact of individual grants?*

Young Adult grant helped us move in that direction (service to teens).  It wasn't as successful as our children's grants.  We were trying to bring the teens into the library.  It was successful in that the kids are still coming in today.

Looking at the Leadership grants (not LSTA GRnts to States funding) — they have to be replicable—National/International, Immigrant Civic Engagement.  The new arrivals grants were replicable.

Arts and Archives grant is different; it's an IMLS Leadership Grant.  It's about getting people to value special collections; it's targeted to older adults and offers free programs.  It allowed us to

do a more sophisticated program for older adults.  Impacted almost 600 people with a creative living program.
We did the program in the public open space; it engaged children, folks of all ages.
Not sure about being innovative, but we took best practices and bundled them... It has continued.  We started a storytime for birth to 18 months.  The staff training changed all of our story times… public awareness, social pieces of the story times are important to building community.

*Collaboration?*

We created the Family Resource System/Schools.  We started working with the Prudence Crandall Museum; it was very new for the Museum to have children and young adults involved.
The Advisory Committee for Library Planning and Development subcommittee on e-books is looking for recommendations in that area.
Collaborations have been huge with the Hartford grants; sometimes we don't talk to our own neighbors; now we have some close collaboration.

I was invited to join the Connecticut Humanities Board because of one of our grants

Traditionally people see the Library as a building; we're going out to change that perception.
Our visibility has been raised because of the service to new arrivals.  It changes the perception of the library.

*Priorities for the next 5 year plan?*

Don't change—you can use the money to pay for staff; get the expertise you need.
I think it's critical that libraries promote themselves; promote that they continue to be relevant.
Innovative programs help build support with people who control the purse strings

I don't know where this fits…e-government: lots of things are mandated.  Filling in forms online disenfranchises a population that is already disenfranchised.
Access to e-government needs to be a priority.
Marketing isn't a dirty word—it needs to be done.
E-commerce—wouldn't it be good if we were able to have e-tablets.
Some of the 55 and older folks that we got in with the grant programs had never used the library before.
LSTA funds in the future—we were able to capture the imagination of one of the TV stations.
Some grants should be more than one year.  You have to come up with a new idea every year.
Two year funding would give me more time to find alternative funding.  Building a prototype takes 2 to 3 years.

*Final say?  Anything else you want to add or to emphasize?*

LSTA is a very valuable support system that strengthens partnerships.
Very friendly environment, very open to ideas, more than many other grant sources, LSTA is grant friendly environment.  They WANT you to get the grant.
Workshops (training for the grants) often happen in the dead of winter and they're not available online.  Could you meet one-on-one for the training?

LSTA is absolutely necessary.  iCONN, service centers, LBPH, subgrants give small libraries the opportunity to initiate something new.

The collaboration part is important; it gets us out in the community.  The library isn't just a building.

I echo her comments about sustainability.  Some programs need to be funded over an extended period of time, be ongoing.
That probably gives more room for innovation.
It's easy to get an idea, but then, how long should it last?  There's a learning curve with a new program.  It takes people a long time to engage with a new program.  It may need to be an extra amount of time.

Reinforce collaboration with the grants.
LSTA enables me to do things I couldn't otherwise do; things would not have been possible without LSTA.
I use the service center several times a year.


**CT Digital Library Advisory Board          11/2/11**

*Which LSTA-funded or jointly supported programs has had the greatest impact on your library?*

Ccar and ILL
Service Centers
Ccar important even for UCONN
I am surprised by the amount of money for Library for the Blind, but I don't know enough about it to know if it's worth the expense.
I use the service centers both as an instructor and a learner—foreign film swap; rotating collection
I use statistics—loading catalog records
Attend workshops

Having input into the digital resources is good— I was interested in the databases; wanted to have a role.  My specialty is business service and others contribute expertise in other areas in selecting the databases.  The selection process is top-notch.
Have a UCONN committee to select databases as well but it's well coordinated with iCONN
I also do licensing at UCONN… but everything that happens at iCONN directly impacts UCONN.
Also Ccar
Ken Wiggin comes to the CDL meetings.  That's good.

*What changes have happened in recent years?*

We're trying to be nimble; we lost access to CINAHL full text; a group got together to keep the databases for those that needed it.  That isn't LSTA funded, but LSTA provides the structure for the discussion.
I didn't appreciate iCONN and Ccar and the statewide catalog until the funds were threatened.
There have been lots of contingency plans in the past couple of years.
We've become very good at contingency planning.
Prior to being on the Committee, I had a more selfish point of view.  But I have had some ah-ha moments.    Schools talk about the impact; it's made me better (to hear the other points of view).
You realize when you've worked in multiple types of libraries as I had.

The databases are near and dear to me; but the general public doesn't appreciate them.
The staff here does more than just putting the databases out there. They create the front page; it's hard to balance all of the needs.

User friendliness/portal is important.
There are some issues with Gale's Power Search. iCONN struggled for a couple of years to decide how to get at it. They kept working at it and they've come to a really good place.
They don't control it; the vendors do. Given that, the digital library folks do a great job with it.
Being from UCONN, working with people from other types of libraries, the advisory board serves a very important role. It's very much a cooperative effort; LSTA is one of the underpinnings.

*Other than more databases, what do you need?*

More integration of content
Video streaming is getting to be big for UCONN.
The technology
I think the staff is really on top of it (knowing what's coming); they take a very collaborative approach.

*Innovation?*

I'm always thinking about ways of providing better access.
It would help us in making decisions if there was a formal database audit.
The team from here should look at how we're linking, etc. Where are you leveraging dollars to make them work the hardest?
You're making users click three times; it needs to be easier than that.
You also need more bandwidth.
Steve or Eric or Ken could look at it and make suggestions; it may not even have to be the staff from here.
Use a SWOT team approach?
People have lots of expertise.
I don't know how to start that, but it would be very useful.
We could use a more subjective approach to selecting databases.

*How do you figure out what should be converted to digital formats?*

We're working with the Boston Library Consortia to see what we should do.
Should we be buying print directories as a consortium? I take a marketing approach.
Our usage reflects how much we've marketed the resources.
In 2010 page usage went down, but it may have been a change in reporting; we need to be paying more attention.
I always wondered what happens when the state library gets e-books.
You can't get an e-book with ConnectiCard; we need a new model to cover digital loans.
It's really incumbent on libraries to push vendors to a new model.
In some ways we're back in the dark ages.

Facilitating the discussion with vendors on e-books about digital rights: we have to sort this out in a way that involves libraries. How do you find that balance? We're in the same place with e-books we were with journals ten years ago.

Connecticut Library Consortium (CLC) offers discounts to academic and public libraries; they negotiate best prices on statewide contracts.
We have a small consortium that licenses some e-content.
There are some small ones for OverDrive too.
We don't want to compete with CDL, but they can't do it all.
The CLC/CINAHL arrangement could be a model
E-books belong under the CDL umbrella. LSTA can't buy all of the content but the discussion and the coordination needs to happen centrally.

*Future?*

The LSTA grants we've seen have looked at specific populations; maybe they need to be more across the board.
Job Seeker is across ages.
The seed money has traditionally gone into age targeted grants, things that can be replicated statewide.
How do the repositories tie into digitization?
There's got to be more technology: how do you do…better, easier, authentication, for example?
Our IT departments, vendors, etc. and the public are all concerned with privacy issues.
Not sure how the move to support open access ties in with CDL.

*Final say?*

My concern is what does ILL mean in the digital age. It's free and easy now, but what does it mean in a digital environment?
My take away is that I value the staff and their expertise. I'd also like to get back to the digital audit idea. It's needed to ensure that we spend the money wisely. Also want to praise the State Library for their ability to do contingency planning… it's been a tough stretch and they often have to make decisions on the fly.
LSTA is crucial to the survival and health of CDL. Helps us get access; helps us collaborate and communicate.

**Appendix B – Personal Interview Summary**

Twenty individuals identified by Connecticut State Library staff were interviewed via telephone. The purpose of the interviews was to provide background information for the consultants and to gain the perspectives of Connecticut librarians and supporters regarding the impact of LSTA funding in Connecticut. A list of those interviewed follows the compilation of comments made in those interviews.

***Have any of the major LSTA-funded or jointly-supported (State and Federal dollars) programs had a significant impact on your library?***

iCONN digital library has. Our library is very small and poorly funded. Because the number of students is small, the library looks well funded on paper; the per student cost and use are distorted. We couldn't survive without iCONN. We have 7 majors; the specialized databases aren't used as much because there are so few students. On paper we had an incredible $/student ratio.
Ccar and reQuest are important, the state funded databases are important—it's good basic stuff.
On a personal level, I wouldn't go to my public library at all if it weren't for ILL. Again, it's too small. So, Ccar is essential.

All of the statewide programs are wonderful. It's a heavy statewide effort—iCONN, Ccar and continuing education. All my people attend the workshops.

Ccar and iCONN are hugely important. We couldn't afford the iCONN databases on our own. I'm not sure what we'd do without it. Our budget shrinks every year!
We serve as an area library; we receive Ccar dollars because we lend (net lender). We are also in a consortium with two other libraries in the area and share lots of materials daily. The impact—because of the statewide card people move things around a lot.
The service centers are crucial for smaller libraries; we don't borrow large collections from them like the smaller libraries do. I take advantage of continuing education too.

We have a city manager who's supportive, but we've been cut each of the last 8 years. Without the grants we couldn't have done what we have. In 2006—older adults grant provided 1-1 tutoring. We used the grant money to pay teens to tutor older adults, who decided on the content of the tutoring. People were waiting!! They liked having teen teachers. Wonderful relationships were formed! Several teens wrote about it on their college applications. A more recent grant paid for focus groups to engage the community on using assistive devices and equipment. People came in to preview the devices; now we can schedule people to use things.

Our children's librarian wrote an innovative grant; began Read Rock and Rhyme; had 35-50 kids/week, ages 0-2 years. It's a pre literacy program based on Mother Goose. We've been able to continue the program; it draws people from other towns to this library.
We have used training, the service centers; iCONN is a good thing. I would like a statewide circulation system.

Children's Department submitted grants—bought picture books, science and math materials. Has a complex curricula; staff was trained and took the program "on the road' in the city. Ended with a field trip. Was very successful. Was picked up by the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving to sustain the program; it may be continued. Another grant was for teens—we created a

teen advisory board that met regularly. They recently presented their report—will create a teen center at the library.

Last year we had an arts and archives program for older adults—programs were offered by artists and seniors were encouraged to try to create that art. It culminated in a display at the library. Classes were oversubscribed; we had to limit the classes to 75; it was very well done.

iCONN would be first—we use the databases daily; it would have a severe impact on our budget if it weren't available. Ccar—we borrow/lend daily. We had antiquated assistive equipment. We wanted to update the equipment and get training so staff could use the equipment (both campus and library staff). IT department also attended. The project is completed but the training is ongoing; we do three sessions each semester with faculty.

Ccar delivery, catalog, databases—without those we couldn't do what we do.

The statewide card is great; databases are very important, especially to smaller libraries. I used to work in a smaller public library in the eastern part of the state.

The disabilities grant was wonderful! Staff was very careful and did it right. They tailored the project to what was needed (equipment and training). We have a good transportation system here, but few people with disabilities were using the library. Staff brought people into the library for focus groups. Also did a focus group at the school for the deaf. Each group gave input; staff went back to them after the equipment was purchased to tell them what we had. There were also people who had come to the library with sight problems and used the new equipment. On staff development day we trained our staff on the new equipment.

Yes—the Hartford history project. This was my first project: Cooking it up Hartford for people 55+ is my first LSTA project. It was about health related cooking. City restaurants showed how they'd adapted their meals. A family here had underwritten the kitchen in the branch when it was renovated. So the chefs prepared their meals in the kitchen at the branch. Did lots of ethnic cooking: Polish, Italian, holiday cooking. Target audience is 55+; we contacted a senior home. The art program was also targeted to this group.

Ccar and iCONN databases; reQuest…are all very important to all libraries in Connecticut. We're one big happy family; sharing is critical. Our area is wealthy, but we still depend on not having to buy everything; we're willing to share, as are other libraries. It's a good deal for Connecticut.

The databases are critical; we've cut some of the extras we used to buy on our own; we would be in sorry shape without LSTA support. We're also dependent on the training…use the Middletown Service Center. We use Web Junction too.

Ccar and iCONN—we use those all the time; have referred a few patrons to LBPH; do use the Service Center at Willimantic, especially for professional materials. Our first grant fed into the second one; the first was smaller. A family resource center in town is located in our old branch. The center had a very small collection so the director there and I got together on a grant for materials—parenting, literacy kits, etc. We got all of the clients (20+) to come to the library and to get library cards. With the second grant we did a community book bag; placed them in key areas, i.e., parochial and public schools, pediatric center, subsidized housing, day cares (8 locations/partners). We filled them with books, literacy materials, etc. The locations circulated the backpacks. Overall it had a positive impact. Parents like and use the book bags; they're always checked out. The day cares also use them in-house.

Absolutely.  Ccar—delivery wouldn't exist without that.  We would have to mail all the ILL things and that's very expensive.  iCONN has given us $10,000 in savings; we couldn't negotiate that on our own.
We send staff to professional development opportunities; use the Service Centers too.  We're doing a renovation here and used the building consultant service.

The budget's in the toilet…all the programs you listed are core in Connecticut.  I live in a small town, but I borrow widely.  LBPH is important because the population is aging.  iCONN—state universities had budget cuts too that would cut iCONN.  The librarian at our state university about had a heart attack; the university couldn't afford those databases on its own.  All the universities depend on Ccar.
These are core programs.  The Friends went to war; we deluged the state house.  Those cuts would have been like cutting off your nose to spite your face!!

iCONN and Ccar, yes; we haven't used LBPH.  We do use Service Centers because they do the union catalog.  We rely on iCONN for the databases; lets us structure our acquisitions around that.  Ccar is valuable for getting materials we don't have.  ILL, union catalog, statistics piece are all important.
They also provide information for the ARL surveys we complete.

Yes, for my library iCONN reQuest and Ccar are critical.  We don't use LBPH, that has to go through the state library.  We haven't applied for any grants.  The state library hasn't made an effort to do things statewide in other areas.    State library wants libraries connected, at least virtually.  Regionalization might be a better direction.

It's Ccar and iCONN for me!  People place holds—so Ccar is very important.  We get about 250 items coming in daily and about the same number going out.  Some items are just things being returned to their home library.  We use reQuest to do ILL; it is wonderful, includes public libraries, colleges, etc.
We also use the continuing education at the Service Centers.  Those are wonderful because they're inexpensive; I learn about new technologies that way.  I know LBPH exists—I'm on the reference desk most of the time.  We also take part in the Nutmeg Awards too.

We couldn't function without Ccar and statewide card; iCONN databases are hugely important.  ReQuest is important, but we could manage without it.  On a personal note, my mom would be lost without LBPH.  I'm an advocate for that!  We have several blind people using the library and I get good feedback from them.  We don't qualify for most of the grants and I have a small staff.  Four or 5 years ago we did a grant; got magnifying reader, used a match from the Lions Club.  It wasn't used, so we gave it to the Lion's Club.   It's not used there either.

All of them are significant!  (Ccar, iCONN, and the service centers)  They impact every library in the state.  They've all had a significant impact.  Ccar is important to my library because we have an ILS in a consortium and people can place holds and borrow from other libraries.  iCONN—we couldn't afford the databases on our own.  Service Centers—staff and I take classes there.  The rates are reduced.  I've taken classes there for years.  The cost is affordable.
LBPH—that's important too.  I don't have much experience with it, but people who use it really think it's a great service.
Grants to individual libraries are good for supplementing their local funds.  So many Connecticut libraries have private boards and town boards and not lots of money.  My experience was with

supplementary, not substantive grants.  The libraries were all small ones and the grants were helpful, but a lower priority than the big ticket items (Ccar, iCONN, service centers).

The world would be extremely different if we didn't have iCONN—we don't have other databases.  Use genealogy and business in particular.  We're a full service library because of LSTA; get a lot of the benefits of a consortium without the cost.
Ccar—only way we do ILL; mailing wouldn't be possible, it's too costly.  Ccar is used a lot in this part of the state; we live near two universities.  People drop materials off at the two libraries that are close.  It works well for us.
The Service centers—Willimantic service center is a big help to us, especially for children's materials.  We do outreach to HUD Housing using materials from the service center; also use service center for classes and bulk loans once a month.
Continuing education—we do as often as we can; are doing more webinars that we take advantage of.  Database continuing education is better in person.
We've been successful writing grants…gaming as learning tools—recently older adults and Kindle.


***Many of the activities of Connecticut State Library such as consulting services, collection and analysis of library statistics and continuing education would not be possible without LSTA support.  In what ways do these activities of the Connecticut State Library make a difference to your library?***

I'm not sure the bang for the buck is there with continuing education…now that I'm retired I can say that.  I found most of the continuing education I went to, unless I was contributing a paper, just confirmed that I was already doing the right things.  If there's less money available, the money for continuing education should come instead from the dues of the professional associations.
iCONN, Ccar, and services to the poor and disabled are what are important.

We use the consultants a lot; they're very encouraging.  They help us analyze data; there's good statistics there.  Continuing education classes at the Middletown Service Center are very convenient.

We used the services of the building consultant in the last years before her retirement.  She helped us repurpose space for a teen area; we had the money to do the work, but needed her expertise.
We have occasional questions..about board issues, etc.  Sharon B. helps with those.
We use the statistics all the time for our budget presentations.
We have very little professional development money; the state library offers things that are inexpensive, good programs for staff.
We have 3 groups that meet regularly to coordinate our activities: the Connecticut Library Consortium does roundtables, the library association does a fall and annual program—on broader topics and in shorter sessions; and the state library does nitty-gritty things.  We've carved out areas for continuing education.

We use the continuing education classes/workshops whenever we can.  There's great variety and terrific instructors.  Courses are usually offered at the Service Centers.  We borrow materials from the Service Center---large print, children's books and puppets, Mother Goose materials.

There'd be a real problem without the statistics!!  We use those for general edification, convincing funding sources, doing comparisons.  Consulting services—I call them for answers; it's always excellent guidance.  Continuing Education—we go to the Service Center; we were able to do a web page because of a workshop there.

We send staff to continuing education workshops.  Ccar—people work in the city and return materials at their home library, so it's important for us to get our books back.  We don't use the service centers.

We do take advantage of the continuing education.  It's affordable for us.  Having the statistics available speaks volumes; the statistics help the Advisory Council defend the program.

We use continuing education—it's wonderful and inexpensive!! I've used the consulting service in the past.  State Library just lost the building consultant; she was great; she could just walk in and tell you what was possible!

Consulting—we did use the building consultant.  Part of my issue is that consultants wouldn't be necessary if the process of LSTA grants weren't so prescribed.  I.e., when we got a grant (services to people with disabilities…ours was on challenged children), we had to go to class to learn how to do a grant, then another on training on how to do the statistics, output measures.  The administrative cost must be huge!  Maybe the money would be better spent in other ways.  It's too complex and cumbersome.  I do a lot of grant writing, but the LSTA grants are too much work with baggage and reporting.  So we barely look at LSTA grants anymore; they're not worth the effort.  If the grants were for bigger amounts, maybe we would consider applying.

Continuing education is useful because it's aimed specifically at librarians.  WordPress for example—the teacher will be familiar with that application in the library world.  The sessions are also good because they make interaction with others possible.  The Summer Reading Collaboration is big for us too; saves us time and money.

We use the continuing education for training on some of the products.  Also it's a connection for some other educational things they provide..sharing ideas across types of libraries.  LSTA lets us capitalize on that.

We have used the consultants in the past; we were going for a construction grant and used the services of the building consultant.  We do use the statistics to help with the budget preparation and presentation and the staff here uses the continuing education.

Several staff have gone to continuing education at the Service Center.  It makes training affordable.  We wouldn't be able to go if it were more expensive.  The Service center staff and the state library staff are wonderful.  We've used children's consultant and Sharon B.

Not having the building consultant at the State Library is an enormous loss.  Sharon B's leaving will be a huge loss too.  Directors at a recent meeting were wondering, "Who will do that?"  We all depend on them.  Tom N. and Mary E. are helpful too.  Tell them to fill the positions!! That's important.

***One of the ways that LSTA has had an impact on libraries over the years has been in
fostering innovation. Where does innovation "live" in Connecticut libraries? How do new
efforts or initiatives get started?***

Innovation comes through the best librarians; I'm not sure LSTA can play much a role. In a
tanked economy, I'm not sure we shouldn't just stick to the basics. I don't think LSTA dollars
should go into innovative things in a poor economy. Good librarians will be innovative and
make it happen.

LSTA has a role in innovation; I hear about great ideas that LSTA funds….write ups in the
Connecticut Library Association publication. I don't know how else things would get started.
Most libraries do things on a shoestring; they often need the extra push of additional money to
get started.

We follow the LSTA grants to find out what others are doing. Hartford offers older adults art
classes, for example. Knowing there's money (LSTA) is the incentive to think outside. We're
proud when we do new things; it's a feather in your cap! Enfield has a new home bound
service. Web Junction advertisements as well. We all become more innovative. I've been
through the grant process with private foundations; LSTA is so much more logical and easy to
do. Doug Lord leads workshops that help in grant applications too.

With our pre-literacy grant, we heard from other children's librarians about it. Tom Newman, the
data coordinator put the statistics we wanted online. Web Junction is also a great place to go
for ideas.
Ideas also come from the Connecticut Library Consortia.

From our own staff!! Public libraries in Connecticut have organizations: CLA and Connecticut
Library Consortia; it's not the state library that's the innovator. Ideas come from within
libraries—public, academic, and school libraries. On advocacy issues we're left to our own
devices.
A good public library has staff that's aware of the community they serve and they think of ideas
on how to better serve those communities. We ask ourselves, what's the purpose of an urban
public library? What can we do? Innovative ideas come from that—going beyond the traditional
library. We talk not about the collection and services, but about what people do here (when
we're advocating/talking about the library).

We get to know other agencies in the city; we begin to partner with them. The LSTA categories
for grants in Connecticut have been generous to urban resident issues—they lend themselves
well to addressing our needs.

LSTA is key to the opportunity to be innovative. We wouldn't have had the money for such a
quality package for people with disabilities without the grants. Probably we would have updated
some old equipment… The grant allowed us to explore possibilities and to delve into patrons'
experiences. And there was marketing that was supported by the grant. Another library that
received a similar grant created a video.

There's not a lot of innovation being done in Connecticut right now—we're getting "behinder".
We're still struggling to get RFID here. We just finished our second 5 year plan; it seems as
though things are changing so fast. Without funding and the development office at the state

library, I'm feeling not supported.  It feels like we're on our own.  Perhaps too much LSTA goes into supporting LBPH.

The state library has tried to answer the service center question—it needs to get new things done.

There's lots going on.  Because times are hard, we have to innovate to do more with less.  The idea of having money available to reward innovators is good.  Recognition is good…especially when you can share that with town funders (PR effect).  It's important to have the money available.

It comes in collaboration.  We have listserv where we share ideas, books, programs, etc.  Some of the workshops and state meetings are good for collaboration too.  There are programs at low cost.

The Advisory Council on Planning and Development is looking at downloadables in libraries.  It's hard for libraries to stay on top of everything.  We're thinking of ways to have economies of scale and how to implement new things.

iCONN initiatives, educational opportunities—people get together and talk: "how do I do X, Y, or Z?"

For example, audiobooks across types of libraries.  I'm struggling with streaming right now; we try things we might not do within our own institutions.

Not that I've noticed, at least not formally.  We need to do a better job of that.  States in the Midwest are far ahead of Connecticut.  Connecticut/New England is very insular.  Librarians need to be more sophisticated about things.  Our users are sophisticated.  The Northeast hasn't put a lot of money into libraries; the libraries can't afford technology and are becoming obsolete.

The Darien Library is always on the cutting edge; it's in a wealthy area.  There are two listservs we're part of—people put up questions and seek ideas.  Both listservs are supported by the State library.

That's not us!!  Right now we're looking at our ILS; have gone to open source, that's where innovation comes in.  Web Junction is also helpful.  Lower Fairfield is doing a lot, but far from what we can do…Darien, for example, is well funded.  But the little guys can't do all those things.  We look to the state library for realistic ideas.

We hold an annual trend spotting symposium; last year it was on e books; speakers were from all over, including Library Journal.  Next year we'll continue with the e-book stuff; mobile apps; library space planning (learning commons, for example) virtual branch.  We have roundtables that are topic based although they may also be by type of library.  Some of the roundtables are regional.  The children's roundtable took a trip to Queens to see the new children's area, for example.  We set up these things to showcase new things.

It comes from librarians who have vision for the future and technology savvy…you need staff who have the ability to recognize patrons needs and then see how new technologies can address those needs.  It's constant adapting.

***Have specific improvements or advances in library services taken place in the last five years that you believe are largely attributable to the availability of LSTA funding? What would NOT have been accomplished if LSTA funding had not been provided?***

Without LSTA funds iCONN, Ccar, and digitization wouldn't have happened.

The Job & Career Services workshops have been strong.

That's hard to know. Every year there's a category for people with disabilities, also one that targets children and young adults. I believe these programs have an impact on the people served.

The children's literacy program; our web page; large print surfing, training…all are dependent on LSTA.

I'd like a statewide ILS. That would make shared costs easier. A statewide catalog is helpful, but with the consortia, I get shared costs. There are lots of bad records in the statewide catalog. Ccar is crucial; saves money…it's a wonderful thing!

The down side of grants is that there's no opportunity to extend them. Even if a project is successful, we can't renew the grant. This is the largest library in the state; we can usually absorb the successful programs, but most libraries can't. Challenge for us is to be very selective on what we select to do; we have to choose the audiences that we want to cultivate. We're also doing Healthy Cooking project for the post 55 age group. In the long run we must focus on doing the right one. Programming funds in our operating budget are nonexistent.

iCONN databases would be prohibitive if they weren't available.

The databases are paramount to our success and our accreditation. We wouldn't have been as effective without the LSTA funds for the databases and for Ccar. Those programs let our students in poorer communities have access to the resources as well.

Don't know…there's lots of innovation going on, coping with new formats, using social media. There should be more focus on program ideas rather than focusing on collections. Connecticut is very collaborative. Innovation comes from others' examples and sharing and copying each other.

"You can tell I'm nearing retirement…I'm being honest!" It bothers me that focusing on the 5 categories of projects with underserved makes us miss some exciting things, i.e., learning how to fundraise, infrastructure kinds of things like publicity, marketing, etc. We never used to have to pay attention to those things.

We're able to offer the Job Now database; that's huge in this economy. LSTA has provided access to computers in libraries. Some communities have received LSTA grants for computers (not hers but..)

Ccar is huge for us (net lender); I can't imagine what we would have done without Ccar. The consortia was trying to figure out a Plan B if that fell apart. The statewide Summer Reading— having the marketing and branding for that is important and it's a uniform program. It puts a professional stamp on the state library programs. It's a quality program.

It's collaborative effort between types of libraries; sharing knowledge and databases, information. It has impacted what libraries can offer in Connecticut. LSTA lets us do that. The audiobook program, is not as beneficial as iCONN, but we can see and learn from public and school libraries with that.

The development of Ccar…that has been here since 2004; I don't know what came before that. Creating the databases is important; makes the state one big library; need to be more aggressive in evaluating and incorporating technology in Connecticut libraries. We have to figure out how to make access equitable; Using LSTA funds to do that would be important. Since information became a commodity, libraries have been sidelined.

***To what extent do you believe Connecticut's implementation of the LSTA plan has furthered the purposes of the Grants to States program? (specifically, improving access to library services, increasing resource sharing activity, reaching out to individuals with special needs, and building strategic partnerships?)***

Access—libraries are at a crossroads. Marketing will reach only a part of the population. It's very hard to get people to use libraries; they think they can just Google it. You need a population with a certain level of intelligence, but people are too busy working these days.
Resource sharing—wonderful!! Smaller libraries can't afford much. This is very important, but the problem is, it is well received by those who are already using the library…not those who don't use the library.
Special needs—is a higher priority. They might need the library and have difficulty getting it. But be careful of costs, it's too much for too few.
Strategic partnerships—always works as long as you aren't building in more levels of management.

Access—request, databases, iCONN, Ccar; all very important. I personally borrow materials from all over the place.
Resource sharing—that's also true.
Special needs—state library staff came to speak to us. They had a booklet from Tennessee about reaching out. We'll do an in service workshop on it. The state library does a lot of awareness. I'm a fan.

Improved access—Ccar and iCONN level the playing field. There's great disparity geographically and iCONN gives everybody access.
Resource sharing—Ccar is the prime example; that's how we share.
Special needs—I know it's a category, but it's also LBPH. We direct our patrons to LBPH when there's a need.
Partnerships—I'm not aware…State library does collaborate with CLA and other library associations; we did snapshot day twice (take pictures, and patron comments, along with statistics, then use that as PR).

Access—Succeeded! iCONN. Every child and adult can get to those databases; they're a great equalizer.
Resource sharing—the Service Centers and the subgrants encourage us to share.
Special needs—we've done that for a long time with LBPH. We refer to them; the subgrants have also helped us establish some connections we had missed before with special populations.
Strategic partnerships—some grants allow us to establish programs and to keep these going we have to find partners. For example Web Junction—we chat; the roundtables are also a place with wonderful sharing; they're an opportunity to come together to talk.

Access—definitely to the highest extent.
Resource sharing—absolutely
Special needs—absolutely
Strategic partnerships—I'm not as familiar with that; it's probably for schools and public libraries.

Access—to special groups especially—has improved over recent years with special needs and age group grants. Grants have been more focused and the framework lets others replicate what's been done.
Strategic partnerships—hasn't happened as much as needed. We do have the Connecticut Educational Network that brings fiber and T-1 lines to the library. There are more out there, but there's no one at the state library to make them happen. We used to have planners come in to help us with plans, Leslie Burger, for example. There's just not enough push happening from the state library right now to have a single automation system statewide.
Resource sharing—we do that well; need to be sure there's ongoing money for delivery and the databases.

Improve access—tremendous! Fiber optic cables; things are possible with LSTA funds
Resource sharing—greatly appreciated. Helps to supplement what University of Connecticut offers.
Special needs—don't know…there's large print at the Service Centers, they do some Braille too, but I don't know much about this.
Strategic partnerships—LSTA has allowed, most beneficial to Connecticut..partnerships between levels, vendors, publishers. The e-book committee is looking at options, etc. We've impacted the publishing world because of our collaboration.

Improving access—yes. iCONN databases and Ccard provides access to other libraries.
Resource sharing—The money going to the Connecticut Library Consortium is less, but it's stable.
Special needs—LBPH, otherwise, I don't know.
Strategic partnerships—don't know. Web Junction is useful.


### Is there anything else you'd like to add?

The grants are good; the state has done well. My answers would be different if the economy were better. Apple pie is good, but in a bad economy, you have to focus on core things. The economy requires you to be focused on building the core.

Discounts on materials; resource sharing and collaboration are big in Connecticut.

We're going to apply for a grant this year. It'll be a collaboration on literacy for young adults and children, something like the Limitless Libraries in Nashville where they partnered with the local schools.

I'm a great fan of LSTA! It makes a difference. Our patrons wrote letters when it appeared the state library might lose Ccar.

Of course we could all use more money. The good news is that these grants are available. We've applied for two national leadership grants in the last 6 years from IMLS. It's helpful to do those at the same time—help to support the larger issues; want to enhance the experience;

applications taught us who we are.  We need to have a forum for sharing---state conference for example to share experiences.

Connecticut is a small state, but it has 229 library buildings; they're all competing.  We need to do better; communicate what can be replicated; what's not well done.

We couldn't do what we do without the support of LSTA funds.  As a state funded public institution, the funds would have to come from the state.  Doing things through the consortia, with the state library facilitating, gives us cost savings.

The reduction in the Connecticut LSTA funds wasn't huge, but we feel it more because the state dollars also decreased.

I'm a big believer in leveraging, especially in regard to some of the training, programs on how to make your library function like a business.  As director I think we need to use leverage with LSTA funds to make us become better business people.  That would lead to partnerships with the towns, organizations, and officials.

I appreciate the grants.  Next time include something for young adults!

Web Junction—LSTA funds that too.  I checked to see what LSTA was spent for in preparation for our conversation and I was impressed at all the important things it does.

When we did the last LSTA Plan, Sharon B. gathered lots of information for us.  The subgrants came out of that information.  Local libraries can't afford to do their own research.  There are three major organization that promote libraries in Connecticut: CLA (library association), ACLB (library boards), and Friends.  We have come to work together.  We're present at each others' conferences.  I know my library staff wouldn't have any training if it weren't for LSTA.

I'm a big proponent for what Connecticut has done with LSTA.  I've lived in RI and worked in Massachusetts.  Connecticut is amazing, partly in how it's used LSTA.

RFID, etc…people expect streaming…and we're lucky to have e-books.  We don't have money to do all those things.  My community is well-heeled; they just don't like to part with their money.

I wish there was more grant money and not so limited to helping just poor libraries.

Connecticut Library Consortium is valuable beyond the discounts because it has major purchasing power.  We can move quickly…(as opposed to a big bureaucracy).  We want to get the movers and shakers of the next generation in Connecticut libraries together.  There's a need for seeing the big picture. We'll do a Library Futures Summit.  Also want to be a force behind creating a digital Connecticut.  We would love to get LSTA dollars!!

The State Library provides the Connecticut Library website and Web Junction Connecticut; they're like a librarian's online reference collection, very helpful.  As a new director I'm trying to write policies, etc. and these two online resources are extremely helpful.  The State discounts are wonderful too (those you can learn about on the website).

**Interviewees**

**Marian Amodeo, Chief Public Services Officer and Matthew Poland, Executive Director, Hartford Public Library**
**Anita Barney, Director of the Brookfield Public Library**
**Ramona Burkey, Director, Cheshire Public Library**
**Julie Culp, Director, Jonathan Trumball Library in Lebanon**
**Pat Daragan, retired director of the US Coast Guard Academy Library and past chair of the Council of Connecticut Academic Library Directors**
**Kim Flynn, Children's Librarian at the Thompson Public Library**
**Judy Haggarty, ILL at the Guilford Free Public Library**
**Barbara Hall, ILL at the Booth and Dimock Memorial Library in Coventry**
**Jaimie Hammond, Academic Librarian at Naugatuck Valley Community College**
**Susan Hansen, Director of the Bishops Corner branch of the West Hartford**
**Pat Holloway, Director of the West Hartford Public Library**
**Jill Dugas Huges, Executive Director of the Connecticut Library Consortium**
**Kathy Leeds, Director, Wilton Library Association and past president of Connecticut Library Association**
**Jim McShane, Director of the Kent Memorial Library in Suffield and past chair of the Advisory Council for Library Planning and Development**
**Arthur Meyers, Director of the Russell Library in Middletown**
**Donna Miller, Director, Lucy Robbins Welles Library in Newington**
**Carl Nawrocki, President of Friends of Connecticut Libraries**
**Betty Anne Reiter, Director, Groton PL and President of Connecticut Library Association**
**Deborah Sanford, Acquisitions, Finance Services Team Leader, University of Connecticut Libraries, and chair of the Connecticut Digital Library Board**
**Celestia Simmons, Albany Branch Community Librarian and North Cluster Coordinator at the Hartford Public Library**

**Appendix C - Web-Based Survey Summary**

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "No/Very Low Impact" and 5 representing "Very High Impact," please rate the degree to which each of the following programs has a positive impact on library services in YOUR library. (Please select "0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate" if you are unaware of the program or lack the information needed to rate the service.)

| | 0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate | 1 - No/Very Low Impact | 2 | 3 - Moderate Impact | 4 | 5 - Very High Impact | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Continuing education opportunities** | 11.7% 12 | 10.7% 11 | 8.7% 9 | 27.2% 28 | 24.3% 25 | 17.5% 18 | 100% 103 |
| **ICONN (statewide catalog, interlibrary loan system and online databases)** | 1.0% 1 | 1.9% 2 | 1.0% 1 | 4.9% 5 | 15.5% 16 | 75.7% 78 | 100% 103 |
| **Middletown Library Service Center** | 13.5% 14 | 11.5% 12 | 9.6% 10 | 26.0% 27 | 16.3% 17 | 23.1% 24 | 100% 104 |
| **Connecticar (delivery system)** | 8.7% 9 | 2.9% 3 | 1.9% 2 | 1.9% 2 | 10.6% 11 | 74.0% 77 | 100% 104 |
| **Consulting services for libraries** | 30.8% 32 | 15.4% 16 | 7.7% 8 | 22.1% 23 | 13.5% 14 | 10.6% 11 | 100% 104 |
| **Audio and large print collections for the service centers** | 22.1% 23 | 19.2% 20 | 12.5% 13 | 14.4% 15 | 8.7% 9 | 23.1% 24 | 100% 104 |
| **Willimantic Library Service Center** | 19.2% 20 | 21.2% 22 | 10.6% 11 | 12.5% 13 | 12.5% 13 | 24.0% 25 | 100% 104 |
| **Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped** | 31.1% 32 | 25.2% 26 | 15.5% 16 | 11.7% 12 | 7.8% 8 | 8.7% 9 | 100% 103 |
| **Statewide Summer Reading Program** | 14.4% 15 | 14.4% 15 | 9.6% 10 | 10.6% 11 | 19.2% 20 | 31.7% 33 | 100% 104 |
| **Grants to Libraries** | 20.4% 21 | 11.7% 12 | 4.9% 5 | 6.8% 7 | 19.4% 20 | 36.9% 38 | 100% 103 |

**2. Briefly tell us about the impact that your highest ranked service or services has had in YOUR library.**

| Count | Response |
|:-----:|:---------|
| 1 | Availability of audio books for our struggling readers, and reference materials. |
| 1 | Better able to serve our patrons |
| 1 | Connecticar Delivery is critical to the operation of the State's automation consortia. |
| 1 | Connecticar assists with ILL - although we lend more than we borrow. |
| 1 | Connecticar transports hundreds of items daily for us. |
| 1 | I depend on it for services in our school. |
| 1 | I use ICONN databases daily and direct students to use them as frequently as possible. |
| 1 | ICONN provides high quality databases essential to teaching and learning in our school. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar are very valuable to a smaller library such as ours. |
| 1 | ICONN is used a great deal for student instruction. |
| 1 | ILLs and Connecticard/Connecticar |
| 1 | ICONN provides us with access to so many more databases than we can afford on our own. |
| 1 | Service center provides training that we could not get elsewhere. |
| 1 | Shared e-resources |
| 1 | The electronic sources help with student research, reading, and information. |
| 1 | We are a medium size association library. We could not operate without ICONN and Connecticar. |
| 1 | We process a large number of loan items for patrons through Connecticar every day. |
| 1 | We use ICONN all the time to search for books that we do not own. |
| 1 | We would be sunk without Connecticar, which our patrons heavily rely on. |
| 1 | ICONN-very useful for databases and collection enhancement |
| 1 | ICONN enlarges our collection beyond anything we could afford to do alone. |
| 1 | ICONN is used daily by our Reference staff.  As an individual library we could never afford to duplicate the range of services available through ICONN. We refer library users to this site regularly. Connecticar supplements our materials budget. Used regularly. Wonderful service. |
| 1 | We send and receive a large volume of items daily through Connecticar. Our library users demand and rely on this quick and efficient delivery service for ILL and LION loans as we are a small town filled with voracious readers. |
| 1 | With our space and budget limitations, we rely heavily on the availability of interlibrary |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | loans through reQuest and supplementary materials through WLSC. |
| 1 | I am the Children's Librarian. The Statewide Summer Reading Program and the Willimantic Library Service Center have a high to very high impact on the services that our library can provide our patrons. Susan and Linda are so helpful, creative and hard working, they make my job easier. |
| 1 | The LSTA grants have allowed us to present programs that are both incredibly valuable and newsworthy. They help us aid our customers in literacy and quality of life issues. Also, the kind of attention they draw to the library helps us attract both more patrons and continued funding from other sources. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar are critical on a daily basis; we can't give proper service without them. Summer Reading Program materials are a great help in planning an educational and enriching summer for young people. |
| 1 | Our staff attends training sessions at the service centers. We are a small library and are not able to do our own staff training. ICONN and Connecticar are invaluable to us. It is how we locate materials for our patrons from other libraries and get them delivered to our library. It would be wonderful if all libraries in the whole state could be on the same ILS so that we could more efficiently and inexpensively order and receive ILL materials. Our Statewide Summer reading program is very popular. The materials and advice make it easier to provide the program. We would not have been able to build an addition to our library or complete a recent renovation project if grant money was not available. Our small town does not have the funds for this. |
| 1 | We received a grant in 2004 and another in 2010 that allowed us to continue providing outreach with materials and programs to our community |
| 1 | We really rely on the databases that are provided through ICONN. Our library would not be able to afford them on our own, and they get a lot of use. |
| 1 | ICONN is essential. If we did not have it, we would have to divert funds to buy some of the resources ICONN provides. |
| 1 | Interlibrary loans, the statewide computer catalog support, and learning opportunities are excellent. |
| 1 | ICONN allows our patrons access to needed materials from collections around the state that our library does not own or is unable to acquire due to budgetary constraints. The annual grants that our library receives are critical, and allow us to purchase more expensive capital items such as computers, that the Town does not provide. |
| 1 | Encouraging summer reading is always a benefit to young students. I like that the parents are also involved, which reinforces good reading practice all summer long. |
| 1 | Our municipal budget for collection development was cut by 50% for the last three years, and on top of that the budget was frozen during the spring. If it were not for Connecticar (and the willingness of our public libraries in the state to lend), our members would have felt this hardship to a much greater degree. |
| 1 | We were able to create "Leading to Reading Bags" with money from an LSTA Grant. They have enriched the lives of countless families and continue to draw new patrons to |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | our library to enjoy all our other services once they find out about them. |
| 1 | Continuing education and consulting help keep staff up to date for better public support. ICONN provides online resources that we cannot afford. Connecticar is indispensable. The service centers help us extend our collections including professional, large print, summer reading and other programs. Bottom line...we could not afford to do it without the help. |
| 1 | As a small, stand-alone public library, all of the services listed have a great, positive impact on the level and quality of services that I can provide my constituents. |
| 1 | ICONN provides critical databases for our K-12 students. We could not afford to provide these resources on our own. ICONN levels the playing field by providing equity of access to resources for all students. |
| 1 | ICONN databases are used by our patrons extensively. We would be lost without it. The service centers help us round out a collection area or add materials that are needed for specific areas of study. |
| 1 | The availability of the Connecticar delivery service is absolutely critical to our library and community. With just 1,200 sq. ft. of library space, it is impossible to have a collection in-house that meets the varied needs of our patron base. Our ability to borrow items and have them delivered regularly and cost-effectively is a lifeline we can't imagine having to do without. |
| 1 | On our own, we couldn't afford to provide even a tenth of the ICONN databases that our patrons depend on. Connecticar is vital to all small libraries. None of us can afford to buy all the books our patrons want/need, and Connecticar allows every library in the state to provide better service. |
| 1 | Connecticar delivery system: having the ability to provide access to resources of libraries throughout the state is core to the function of the library. |
| 1 | As a children's librarian, I find the statewide summer reading program a huge help to us, and it is always popular with our young patrons. |
| 1 | The provision of online databases through ICONN has saved our library thousands of dollars. Although we are not a net lender, I am 100% in support of the philosophy of Connecticard. |
| 1 | I spend a good portion of my time each day processing interlibrary loans. It is a wonderful service that the state library provides. We receive positive feedback from our patrons. I believe strongly that it is important for larger libraries to share their resources with smaller ones, and that it helps even out the service that can be provided for libraries with smaller budgets. |
| 1 | Having very low cost materials for summer reading helps us use our Friends' money for other big ticket items. Connecticar is the best service! Our patrons really take advantage of it. |
| 1 | ReQuest and ICONN are used every day as is Connecticar and Connecticard. Our service would be severely diminished without these. |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| 1 | The Governor's Reading Challenge and supporting materials encourage many of our students to read over the summer. We heavily promote summer reading through this and encourage all students to participate through newsletters, our website, and flyers to children. Our town library does not participate in the statewide theme, but instead creates its own themed program each year, which also has a tremendous impact on our students' summer reading. School librarians collaborate with town public librarians to promote this, create book lists, and encourage students to participate. |
| 1 | We borrow audio books from Middletown. Our faculty and staff (we are a small college) love this, since our library otherwise would not be able to make audio books available. This is a greatly appreciated service. |
| 1 | We direct users to the ICONN reQuest when they search for items not found in our library. Also ICONN assists us when CONSULS is down, something occurring too often lately. Actually ICONN is a tremendous asset, worth consideration of expansion in my opinion. |
| 1 | My students use ICONN every day to complete their research assignments. I use it weekly when preparing lessons. |
| 1 | Connecticar saves us a tremendous amount of money. Without it, we might not be able to do interlibrary loan. The several LSTA grants that we have received have helped us provide services to children and senior citizens. |
| 1 | We are a strong user of Connecticar and the ICONN databases and interlibrary loan. Although in the same town we do not make great use of the library service center; its collection, with the exception of some professional material, is not used. We have received LSTA grants and they are appreciated. |
| 1 | The Connecticar delivery system is a great service. Our library has many out-of-town borrowers who appreciate the ability to return books to any library. With the van service, the turnaround time for interlibrary loan requests is fast, which is great and especially appreciated for book and school reports and summer reading lists of "required reading." The cost of providing these services without the Connecticar system would be prohibitively high. |
| 1 | We receive and give approximately 250 items every weekday through Connecticar. This is a vital part of our library service and is integrated with our consortium so we can find and deliver items to our patrons seamlessly. |
| 1 | While many of these services positively impact the day-to-day functioning of the library, it is the Library Service Centers that, in my opinion, most greatly affect the quality of the services we offer. From the professional collection for librarians, to book props and other story time materials, to the multiple copies of books for group discussion, WLSC and the MLSC improve our libraries. |
| 1 | Access to free resources, such as audiobooks and children's books, has enabled our library to stay within a very tight budget. The ongoing education and training workshops help our staff to stay abreast of trends and learn new skills -- again, little or no funds in our operating budget for these types of services. |
| 1 | As a major stand alone library, we find the Connecticar system and ICONN to be |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | invaluable must-haves. Providing patrons with access to materials in all the libraries in the state and allowing them to return materials at a different library are vital parts of our library services. |
| **1** | As the smallest town's rural library, the state programs help us to maintain at least a small competitive edge for our patrons. Our annual budget is just over $30,000 which includes salaries and all expenses and utilities. |
| **1** | I try to use ICONN as much possible. There are several research projects I collaboratively plan with classroom teachers in which the students are required to use ICONN for one of their sources. We tell them we are requiring them to do so not only because ICONN is a reliable source, but also because they need to learn how to search in a subscription database, which is quite different from doing a Google search. |
| **1** | Both ICONN and Connecticar are at the top of the list. These two services help libraries with tight budgets -that's all libraries - to offer first-class service; patrons have grown to depend on both and consider each as a service necessity. |
| **1** | We constantly rely upon the statewide catalog and interlibrary loan to fulfill requests for patrons for materials of all types. Additionally the ICONN databases allow us to offer in depth reliable information to our patrons without using local taxpayer dollars. The grant funds we have received have enabled us to develop programs and services to the homebound residents of our community. We often participate in the Statewide Summer Reading Program especially because so many of our border towns are also participating and it is nice for the families to share the same themes across the state. It means that there are more programs available and often at lower rates. |
| **1** | Through the ICONN databases, my high school students have access to rich assortment of timely, reputable sources. Our budget could not begin to provide such an array of great resources. |
| **1** | Connecticar has become an integral part of our library services. Patrons expect to be able to access resources from any library in the state. |
| **1** | Cooperative services, programs, materials and databases are essential in northeastern CT. I cannot stress enough their importance to the materials, services and programs we offer our patrons. |
| **1** | I am in an elementary school library and we use ICONN databases such as Kids InfoBits for many research projects. |
| **1** | The databases provided via ICONN are an integral element of school library offerings at the secondary level. When marketed appropriately, these resources are absolutely essential for curriculum support and research-driven projects. These databases would be nearly impossible for most school libraries to afford on their own and are greatly appreciated by students and staff. |
| **1** | The continuing education programs have allowed us to keep library staff up to date on many of the current library services or issues. ICONN is so important to the everyday services that we can offer our patrons. Connecticar helps to expand the materials we can offer our patrons and patrons throughout the state. The summer reading programs that we offer children, teens and adults are very popular and very important to our |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
|  | community. Having the statewide program helps to make the planning and implementation easier for all involved. Grants to Libraries help us offer new and innovative programs or services that we might not be able to offer. |
| 1 | We cannot afford to independently buy some of the services/resources that the State Library provides. Electronic databases are extremely expensive; ICONN provides access we would not otherwise have to teach our students to meet the Common Core standards through research and other academic activities. The Willimantic Service Center (particularly) provides vast resources we cannot afford and is used for library purposes as well as whole academic teams and individual teachers. When we have children with severe visual impairments, we would be unable to even buy, let alone afford, enough materials and textbooks as are available with the Library for the Blind. Our ability to appropriately serve our student population would be decimated if the State Library were not there. |
| 1 | I use the continuing education services to improve my skills. I have always found them very valuable. |
| 1 | Connecticar for interlibrary cooperation is probably the most crucial service for us. We use the ICONN/reQuest database frequently at the reference desk and recommend ICONN databases to patrons. MLSC's bulk loan is very helpful. Grants are "lifesavers" when we receive them. |
| 1 | The audio circuit allows us to "stretch our budget" in this area while providing the best "bang for the buck." |
| 1 | Continuing education opportunities are absolutely essential for our staff to meet the needs of services to the public. We could not afford the training without this type of funding. Connecticar delivery system is also essential and critical to providing over 15,000 items annually to our patrons who rely on us solely for this type of information sharing and delivery. ICONN continues to be one of the most important sources we rely on for current, reliable and accessible database content. We could not afford the many resources it delivers with our own collection development budget. The summer reading program has come to be a much sought after program by the community and our summer residents as well for their children and grandchildren. |
| 1 | The LSTA grants have allowed us to implement programs in our library that we would not have been able to if not for the start-up funds. The continuing education opportunities have allowed our staff to stay abreast of newer technologies and services; we use Connecticar very heavily to borrow from other libraries, and the ICONN databases are all we can afford. |
| 1 | The public is able to access an immense array of resources, far more than we could provide on our own. This is especially crucial during a time of severe budgetary restrictions. |
| 1 | Audio and large print collections from the WLSC mean we can swap out 30 items in each category every three months. We are a small library with little space and the patrons come back to see what's new. Without this service the LP and audio books would be very limited. We do not invest money in these two collections; what we have are mostly donations. Connecticar offers our patrons more services they want. Although |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | we are small, we loan out about 50 books a month and borrow about 80 each month. We can't imagine our library functioning without these services. |
| 1 | As a tiny public library that is not part of a consortium, ICONN/reQuest, Connecticar, and public library grants are critical to our ability to provide the services our patrons need. |
| 1 | I demonstrate ICONN to all of the students in our high school and try to encourage them to use this as a resource over Google or any other search engine. |
| 1 | The Connecticar delivery system makes it possible for us to offer our patrons more than our brick and mortar building can hold. We would be sunk without it! |
| 1 | ICONN provides library patrons and staff with essential information about the holdings in other CT libraries and the ability to borrow materials from these libraries. It is imperative to our patrons. It also provides access to informational databases that each individual library would need to buy if the state program was not funded. Finally, transporting the materials between libraries helps serve those patrons who are not able to easily get to other parts of the state. |
| 1 | Ability to find and borrow books from other libraries and have them delivered in a timely fashion is extremely important to our patrons. Both ICONN databases and reQuest catalog are used by staff and patrons constantly. |
| 1 | ICONN, Connecticar and the Willimantic Library Service Center are essential to our ability to provide the most information to the public. These are all services that we use and rely on heavily. |
| 1 | North West Conn. never got the service center that the state promised to build; even though Middletown is an hour plus ride; we make the trek for educational opportunities. We also call or email to receive bulk loan items of large print, AV, and children's story hour props. Of course this wouldn't be possible without Connecticar support. |
| 1 | I use ICONN pretty much on a daily basis to find out where students can get books and other materials we do not own ourselves and to help students do research for topics that are not covered by our subscription databases. I also use ICONN when I have to catalog a book and am debating where to shelve it; I compare the call number I am considering to what other libraries have assigned. |
| 1 | Connecticar is Connecticut's library workhorse, delivering upwards of 4,000 ILL requests to us, not to mention general Connecticard returns. Being able to supplement our collection with large print and audio books from the service centers is invaluable to us, especially when we address the needs of local nursing homes or teachers. And having the ability to apply for grants to pilot new services is fantastic. |
| 1 | Connecticar is essential to how we currently provide service. Our patrons frequently request items from other libraries and have come to expect that the Connecticar service will run smoothly. The Statewide Summer Reading Program is a big time-saver for us. The audio and large print collections help augment our collection and the Stafford Library building would not be here without the State Library Construction Grant that we received about 12 years ago. |
| 1 | Our library is small and specialized, so if we do not have an item, we very often refer our |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | patrons to the ICONN catalog and sometimes they are able to locate and request ILL services through their local library to obtain a specific item. It is very useful to us. |
| 1 | Both service centers have loaned us books for a summer program, America's Reading Corps, a volunteer reading tutoring program. Connecticar is used a lot; we interlibrary loan books at a high rate. |
| 1 | Without a doubt, ICONN in conjunction with Connecticar is the most valuable service for our library. Given the economy, these programs are essential to satisfied customers. |
| 1 | We are a very small library in the Northwest corridor of the state. Our materials budget is approximately $16,000 per year. We provide an increasingly popular ILL service. We could NOT survive without ICONN, ReQuest and most specifically, Connecticar. Thank you for requesting our input on this survey. |
| 1 | ICONN and interlibrary loan are lifelines to information for my students. Students heavily rely on ICONN for magazine, newspaper, and journal articles. Thanks to Connecticar students can research any topic they choose and we can get the resources we need in a timely manner. We couldn't purchase and receive every book students need, even if we could afford to, in the short time it takes to borrow them interlibrary loan. Other libraries also often provide us with good information on obscure topics in books that may be out of print. |
| 1 | We could not do what we do without ICONN or Connecticar. They have been invaluable in helping all the collections in CT be utilized to their maximum effectiveness. |

**3. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "No/Very Low Impact" and 5 representing "Very High Impact," please rate the degree to which each of the following programs has a positive impact on library services on a STATEWIDE basis. (Please select "0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate" if you are unaware of the program or lack the information needed to rate the service.)**

| | 0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate | 1 - No/Very Low Impact | 2 | 3 - Moderate Impact | 4 | 5 - Very High Impact | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Continuing education opportunities** | 12.6% 13 | 1.9% 2 | 1.9% 2 | 23.3% 24 | 30.1% 31 | 30.1% 31 | 100% 103 |
| **ICONN (statewide catalog, interlibrary loan system and online databases)** | 3.9% 4 | 0.0% 0 | 1.9% 2 | 2.9% 3 | 3.9% 4 | 87.4% 90 | 100% 103 |
| **Middletown Library Service Center** | 23.5% 24 | 2.0% 2 | 4.9% 5 | 20.6% 21 | 18.6% 19 | 30.4% 31 | 100% 102 |
| **Connecticar (delivery** | 5.9% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.0% | 89.1% | 100% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **system)** | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 90 | **101** |
| **Consulting services for libraries** | **39.2%** 40 | **5.9%** 6 | **2.9%** 3 | **21.6%** 22 | **13.7%** 14 | **16.7%** 17 | **100%** **102** |
| **Audio and large print collections for the service centers** | **34.0%** 35 | **2.9%** 3 | **8.7%** 9 | **17.5%** 18 | **17.5%** 18 | **19.4%** 20 | **100%** **103** |
| **Willimantic Library Service Center** | **28.7%** 29 | **4.0%** 4 | **9.9%** 10 | **14.9%** 15 | **11.9%** 12 | **30.7%** 31 | **100%** **101** |
| **Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped** | **31.4%** 32 | **4.9%** 5 | **6.9%** 7 | **12.7%** 13 | **16.7%** 17 | **27.5%** 28 | **100%** **102** |
| **Statewide Summer Reading Program** | **19.6%** 20 | **2.0%** 2 | **4.9%** 5 | **12.7%** 13 | **20.6%** 21 | **40.2%** 41 | **100%** **102** |
| **Grants to Libraries** | **18.2%** 18 | **2.0%** 2 | **4.0%** 4 | **7.1%** 7 | **13.1%** 13 | **55.6%** 55 | **100%** **99** |

**4. Briefly tell us about the impact that you think your highest ranked service or services has had on a STATEWIDE basis.**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Better access to materials and services for patrons |
| 1 | Connecticar allows Connecticut interlibrary loan services to function efficiently and inexpensively. |
| 1 | Connecticar and ICONN facilitate sharing across the state, stretching the impact of all libraries. |
| 1 | Connecticar allows us to borrow from each other as well as the state service centers. |
| 1 | Economics; patrons and library assistants/professionals need the interaction. |
| 1 | Grants to Libraries allow needed resources to move forward with library services. |
| 1 | Helps search collections of the entire state |
| 1 | I can't imagine ILL without Connecticar; it is a benefit to all state residents. |
| 1 | ICONN has been a tremendous asset to our library. |
| 1 | ICONN has saved money for every library that uses it. |
| 1 | ICONN provides a research resource for school and town library users, which is invaluable. |
| 1 | ILL |
| 1 | Most small libraries cannot do the things they do without this support...all of it! |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | My comments on the last question hold true here also. |
| 1 | See my previous answer re. The library service centers |
| 1 | Statewide Connecticar has been a lifesaver for most libraries. |
| 1 | Statewide library card would not function without materials handling. |
| 1 | The statewide summer reading program is beneficial as it provides a wide variety of resources. |
| 1 | ICONN databases level the playing field for many residents with no other access to database info. |
| 1 | ICONN--So helpful for all types of libraries |
| 1 | ICONN is the only source of databases for many smaller libraries. Critical. |
| 1 | No comment |
| 1 | Our school budgets are very low, so we depend on state for ICONN.org |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar help the smallest to the largest libraries. We all have budget constraints. It's wonderful to have shared resources available. Many times the cost of an item or limited use may keep us from buying, but we know where to go to get it to the user. |
| 1 | ICONN, Connecticar and continuing education would be the most essential from my perspective, but I cannot assess the impact as well as others might. |
| 1 | I would think that these services are extremely important to all libraries, but I have no direct knowledge. |
| 1 | ICONN is used by many people. Connecticar allows us to share books statewide, and grants are instrumental in a wide variety of improvements to library service statewide. |
| 1 | I believe that the statewide programs allow access for smaller libraries that would not be able to function without the statewide resources available to them. The ICONN catalog and online databases open up a world of additional information to our patrons every day 24/7. |
| 1 | Service Centers and Connecticar are indispensible services. ICONN provides wonderful resources for libraries that can't afford to buy database subscriptions on their own. Grants make or break the possibility of providing various services and programs. |
| 1 | I have used the Connecticar delivery system to get books and audiobooks from out-of-town libraries on a regular basis. This helps me both professionally and personally, and it was a huge help when I served on the selection committee for the Nutmeg Children's Book Award. |
| 1 | Again, the cooperative services, materials and programming offered by the service centers and the ILL services are crucial to providing library services for all but the richest communities. |
| 1 | I ranked Connecticar very highly because ILL is one of the capabilities I use most often |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | and value most highly. It is not possible for every library to own every resource, but CT residents still have access to every library's resources through this program. I also rated continuing education and grants very highly because my budget, like that of many libraries, has shrunk recently, and any way we can improve our service (by attending workshops or obtaining grants) without increased spending is a huge asset. |
| 1 | The four services I marked are all necessary for library improvement and to avoid stagnation. Most libraries cannot afford to send personnel to college or credit courses, hire consultants who may/may not know the subject as it pertains to library services, or afford to purchase all the books anyone may request. "Old" libraries from the 1950's and 1960's limped along gamely alone with very limited services. The modern support services- such as the statewide summer reading program- allows for creativity and sharing without duplicated work. Grants for libraries in this tight economy help everyone improve, try something different, stir up some enthusiasm for something new. |
| 1 | Connecticar is very important for interlibrary loan services, which most people in CT take for granted. CT librarians realize that we are very fortunate to have this service that is rare in other states and offers equal access to library materials for our patrons throughout the state. |
| 1 | ICONN is undoubtedly the best service offered. It allows all libraries to share resources. We could not operate without the help of our wonderful State librarians. Many small public libraries cannot afford to have an MLS on staff. I have referred many people to Library for the Blind; they helped my father-in-law remain a "reader". |
| 1 | All of the ones that I ranked highest not only help a library locally but also allow the librarians throughout the state to learn and keep current and to share resources and ideas that help keep libraries relevant throughout the state. |
| 1 | Every library is able to provide access to a much wider array of resources and information than they can provide through their own budget. |
| 1 | The ILL and the Connecticar services are most important. It is a great way to share resources and is one of the true Connecticut services that is regional and works well. |
| 1 | ICONN is a valuable resource especially for smaller school libraries that don't have sufficient funding to purchase databases for student use. |
| 1 | These services allow librarians across the state to stay abreast of trends, knowledge and skills, thus making Connecticut a strong library environment for its residents. |
| 1 | The databases are invaluable - couldn't live without them, and I'm guessing most libraries feel the same. |
| 1 | Both ICONN and Connecticar are wonderful services for the people in Connecticut. I think they reach people across the state every day in a very real and useful way. |
| 1 | The service center serves as the libraries' library; without it and the knowledgeable staff, we would be worse off. |
| 1 | I can't say enough about Connecticar -- see previous statement. We absolutely rely on it in providing for the needs of readers all over the state. |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Connecticar provides the link that helps ICONN succeed. Without the delivery service no library system could afford to provide the resource sharing that has made this state a model for other states. |
| 1 | I must also rate ICONN at the top of my list of statewide impact, since it is a resource that my students can and do continue to use even after they graduate. |
| 1 | Given the small amount of money, comparatively, used on these services, CT is getting a very good deal and a great return on their tax dollars. There needs to be more investment in information and technology in order to bring CT into the 21st century. |
| 1 | Again, it would have to be the Connecticar delivery service, which I feel has the greatest impact on libraries across the state. It is a fundamental service we cannot do without. |
| 1 | I can't imagine what library programs would be like without Connecticar. I also cannot imagine doing without ICONN. |
| 1 | Because of Connecticar our collections are extended. Workshops are educational and grants help with budgets. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar even out the accessibility to information for patrons in poorer/more rural locales. They are vital programs. |
| 1 | I am going to have to say that ICONN has made the strongest impact on libraries statewide, because individually we could not afford the subscriptions to so many of the wonderful databases we still have access to. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar save money through sharing resources and meeting customer demand, while equalizing library services for poorer towns throughout the state. |
| 1 | I am not aware of the effects of services on a statewide basis. I would have to look at statistics. |
| 1 | We would lose so much without ICONN and Connecticar. Our patrons use them every day, and I'm sure that applies in most libraries. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar are the great equalizers in library service in the state. No matter how wealthy or poor a person's community is, every library card holder has access to great information, books, and audio visual materials. |
| 1 | Connecticar - a great way for libraries to stretch their budgets by loaning materials in an efficient manner to each other. Patrons leave satisfied knowing the materials they need and want are available to them without having to drive all over the state. |
| 1 | Connecticar performs a huge function to get resources to the patrons between libraries. Do not underrate this service. |
| 1 | See my previous answers. A note, and I could be wrong, but it is my impression that the name ICONN is not memorable to patrons and does not make people think of the state-wide library catalog and the State Library provided databases. I have no suggestions for a better name. I know that we public libraries need to do a better job marketing ICONN to our patrons. |
| 1 | The Connecticar delivery system benefits patrons by expanding their access to titles |

| Count | Response |
|-------|----------|
|  | beyond the walls of their home library and library budgets by allowing libraries to share resources, saving money. Connecticut was a leader in establishing this type of service. |
| 1 | All of these services are critical to libraries across Connecticut, and should continue to be funded and supported. |
| 1 | The sharing of information and services between all libraries creates an equal standard of library service for all state residents, no matter the size of the library in their town. |
| 1 | I work in a mid-sized suburban community, but I live in a small rural community. The services for libraries provided by the Connecticut State Library and the LSTA grants are a life line for many smaller, poorer communities and their libraries. These services are also very appreciated by all libraries. Whenever I meet with other librarians, I hear how much these services help and how awful it would be to lose any of them. |
| 1 | ICONN is a tremendous service provided to CT residents, schools and libraries. I think it is a crucial resource, especially as school systems are losing money to subscribe to databases. Our older students in the system rely heavily on the outstanding quality databases for students provided by ICONN. |
| 1 | Delivery system and ICONN help libraries large and small so I think that those have the highest impact |
| 1 | ICONN is a very important service that I hope will be expanded with more databases for schools, such as, Culture Grams from ProQuest and TeachingBooks.net. This is one of the few places where schools without funding can get quality information for their students. Poorer readers have access to information because several of the databases will read the information to them. |
| 1 | As town funding decreases due to the current economic climate, grants and statewide services and funding are crucial to the survival of our library system and the important services we provide to our patrons. |
| 1 | Grants to libraries seem to be a great service. I have heard of plenty of great ideas funded through grants. |
| 1 | The ICONN database is so important to the state and our individual libraries who cannot afford the high price of electronic materials. We are then able to offer these materials to our patrons. |
| 1 | Connecticar helps patrons statewide get information that is not easily accessible to them. It saves gas since they are not driving everywhere themselves. The ICONN databases save money for every library in the state. |
| 1 | Statewide in CT all towns/municipalities are cutting libraries in order to put funds towards town expenses and projects. Libraries are looked at as unimportant. |
| 1 | Again, Connecticar delivery service is critical to the operation of the shared ILS consortia in the state. |
| 1 | ICONN truly allows equal access to populations with fewer local dollars for high quality information. Connecticar is an amazing service that moves needed resources between communities. |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | ICONN helps small libraries obtain obscure items for their patrons, so we all seem to have a great collection. Each library could not afford access to so many journals, but together through ICONN we can. |
| 1 | By negotiating for the ICONN databases, the State Library helps provide equity of access for everyone, whether their own library can afford to subscribe or not. The Service Centers provide resources (both materials and staff) to enhance collections of libraries without adequate funding. The Library for the Blind provides direct service to library patrons who are unable to read a physical book, allowing them to continue their lifelong love of reading. The delivery service moves materials so everyone has access to the library material they need. |
| 1 | Services ranking a 5 support excellent service for patrons and staff.  In-service educational opportunity and direct service enhancements for patrons are crucial for patron satisfaction with CT Library services; patrons from other states who move to CT remark on the quality of CT library services. |
| 1 | Statewide interlibrary loan system and Connecticar(d) provide access for all residents to materials in any public library in the state and make it possible for everyone to use all public libraries. This kind of open access to information and materials is not found in many other states and represents the ideal to which all library systems should aspire. |
| 1 | I know that other schools, community libraries, and teachers depend heavily on these services as school budgets and town budgets have been so severely restricted. Without them we could not adequately serve our constituencies, let alone serve them well. |

**5. In your opinion, which of the services or initiatives that have been identified as being supported with LSTA funds offers the greatest VALUE to the customers/end users of libraries? Why did you select this service?**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Connecticar deliveries |
| 1 | Connecticar allows us to work with each other. |
| 1 | Connecticar and ICONN: interlibrary Loan is essential. |
| 1 | Connecticar offers informational "justice for all". |
| 2 | Connecticar |
| 1 | Connecticar allows us to share our resources from all the libraries with all the patrons. |
| 1 | Connecticar, ILL and ICONN databases: provide optimal access regardless of a library's ability to pay. |
| 1 | Connecticar enables patrons to easily use multiple libraries. |
| 1 | Connecticar offers direct savings to patrons. |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| **1** | Connecticard and ICONN could not be successfully funded on the local level. |
| **1** | Connecticard provides open access to information and materials, which is something I consider a top priority. |
| **1** | Definitely the service centers |
| **1** | Grants enhance our programming and the quality of services to our patrons. |
| **1** | I would choose ICONN. Having one place to find resources statewide has been invaluable. |
| **1** | ICONN |
| **1** | ICONN connects all library users throughout the state. |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar |
| **1** | ICONN because many libraries would not have databases if it were not for LSTA funds |
| **1** | ICONN is of greatest value to our school because it is a free resource and easy to use. |
| **1** | ICONN is used daily and there's no way could we afford to provide those resources individually. |
| **1** | ILL, Connecticard, Shared resources for all |
| **1** | ICONN because every library in the state can provide their patrons with valuable databases |
| **1** | Interlibrary loans - see my prior comment. |
| **1** | The continuation and appropriate funding of the Connecticar statewide delivery service. |
| **1** | Connecticar |
| **1** | Databases and catalog |
| **1** | ICONN - because it's probably used by the largest number of people |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar |
| **1** | ICONN-helpful for all libraries; Connecticar-helpful for patrons |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar make resources available statewide. |
| **1** | ICONN- all we have |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar: I think both of these are have the greatest impact on the services and service we can offer our patrons at any library. |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar: Without ICONN we would lack the additional resources that are necessary to service our clientele. We would not be able to process interlibrary loan because it would be cost prohibitive. |
| **1** | ICONN enables all types of libraries and users access to many more materials than can be found in any local library or region. |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| 1 | Services to children and senior citizens as they are some of the most frequent users of public libraries |
| 1 | The Service Centers: I have used them for training, books to augment our collection, advice and help from Linda and Susan. Both women are constantly looking for ways to support the libraries and librarians of this state. |
| 1 | First is ICONN; second is interlibrary loan through Connecticar delivery. This service saves individuals a great deal of money and time. |
| 1 | Both ICONN and Connecticar because they redistribute or give access to information resources within our state, both in print and online |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar: More and more library users appreciate being able to access our services from home (or with a wireless device), and time and gas prices continue to prohibit people from visiting distance libraries in person. So these two services definitely are top on the VALUE list. |
| 1 | Once again, I believe that ICONN is the most important service currently provided. Although I come from a school library environment, I see the impact of a statewide electronic resource repository as an important part of continuing the impact of libraries. |
| 1 | Connecticar - because it provides patron access to library materials from every library in the state. Provides collaboration too. |
| 1 | Connecticar because it allows libraries to share their collections in a cost effective way. The cost to individual libraries to send or transport library materials to another library would prohibit many libraries from participating in this cooperative effort. Thanks to Connecticar, individuals have access to the titles they need or are interested in no matter where they live in the state. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar get tremendous use because they are a good value and satisfy customer requests easily. |
| 1 | The greatest value to the patrons is probably Connecticar because of the convenience of returning materials to any library in the state, and because it allows for interlibrary lending. |
| 1 | ICONN: most libraries in CT could not afford to provide anywhere near what is made available to all citizens of the state. |
| 1 | Connecticar because it serves users directly by delivering their ILL requests, and returning their CONNECTICARD materials. Its value is high not only because of the low cost to library users but also because it saves them the direct time and gas costs that they would otherwise have to make. ICONN is second, but it's a service library users have to be introduced to in order to use. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar provide information and access to residents across the state and in all types of libraries. |
| 1 | It's a toss-up between Connecticar and ICONN databases and catalog. Patrons really expect to pull materials from anywhere in the state so this is probably most valued. Of course they need reQuest to locate materials and for smaller libraries the databases |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | from ICONN are all that they can offer. |
| 1 | Connecticar and ICONN databases are the greatest value. I see their contribution to the spread of information on a daily basis. |
| 1 | The access to free materials, such as audiobooks and books, probably has the greatest impact on our customers. |
| 1 | ICONN/reQuest and Connecticar offer access to information and materials to all residents. I see their importance to the patrons and recognize how valuable they are to the functioning of the library as the information center of the community. |
| 1 | ICONN: books and media can be purchased in small quantities but access to large expensive databases is impossible for most small towns and their libraries. |
| 1 | ICONN databases, Connecticar, state grants, and the Service Centers impact our library with its budget. |
| 1 | To repeat: even in better economic times, many CT libraries are not well supported by their town budgets. Resource sharing is essential to meet even the basic needs of the customers. |
| 1 | ILL and Connecticar: as mentioned previously, we are a small library with a limited budget.  Our patrons depend on the continuation of these services. |
| 1 | Connecticar is essential as is the statewide catalog reQuest. Without both of these interlocking services it would be impossible to provide residents with high quality library services.  Libraries have always been underfunded; Connecticar goes a long way to even the playing field for residents in all of the 169 towns in CT. |
| 1 | Connecticar and ICONN are things individuals can't buy and many individual libraries can't afford. Sharing books on Connecticar is a priceless service. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar offer the greatest value. Through ICONN patrons have access to materials that their local library does not own or is unable to provide. Patrons do not have to drive from library to library to retrieve needed items. This saves money on gas. Requested items are delivered directly via Connecticar to a patron's library of choice. |
| 1 | ICONN gives the best bang for the buck here. All citizens can use the databases and many enjoy using the reQuest system and Connecticard. |
| 1 | Reviewing ILL statistics: there's an increase in patron requests because of economics people aren't buying books and online services. |
| 1 | ICONN, because its target audience is so very wide, with uses from children through seniors. The resources gathered there are excellent quality and important for all CT residents to be able to access for free. |
| 1 | Connecticar: patrons would be very unhappy if they couldn't return books at any public library and even more unhappy if we/they couldn't borrow books from other libraries because there was no delivery service available. Almost no libraries can afford to send books back and forth by USPS. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar are invaluable to CT residents. ICONN puts libraries on a level |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | playing field with many varied databases and provides virtual accessibility. Connecticar provides physical accessibility to library resources and is a more "green" service. |
| **1** | ICONN has an enormous impact. The resources offered would be far beyond the budget of any one school or community library. They are vital to training students to be functional, participating 21st century citizens. |
| **1** | Connecticar is a great way for libraries to stretch their budgets by loaning materials in an efficient manner to each other. Patrons leave satisfied knowing the materials they need and want are available to them without having to drive all over the state. |
| **1** | The sharing of materials that is possible between ICONN (locating the desired material) and Connecticar (transporting the desired material between libraries) offers the greatest value to our customers. While the other services are of immense help to staff (and through staff to our customers), our customers use and depend on locating and receiving the material they desire with a minimum of effort (calling individual libraries and driving to collect the material they desire). |
| **1** | Connecticar and Connecticard allow our patrons access to all the books in all Connecticut libraries. |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar:  ICONN databases can be used by patrons anywhere, anytime. ICONN reQuest is used for ILL. Connecticar moves the materials back and forth between libraries. Patrons are used to and expect us to be able to get them the materials they need quickly. If we didn't have these services, it wouldn't be possible. Most libraries could not afford to do the volume of ILL we do by mail or pay for our own couriers. |
| **1** | The two service centers and staff have the greatest value to the end users of libraries. Their services and materials help library staff as well as their patrons. |
| **1** | Connecticar because it allows patrons access to books they would otherwise not have. Many of our patrons could/would not drive to another library to get materials we do not have. |
| **1** | MLSC and WLSC because we can always drive there to get up-to-date items for our library and have the option of Connecticar. We get many requests and do not have space for all the items needed. |
| **1** | The Connecticar delivery service because it affects all libraries and users with a direct tangible service that patrons can identify. |
| **1** | The resources in ICONN give patrons access to content originating from magazines, reference books, and academic journals. Before ICONN, a patron would have had to visit a large public or university library to find such good information. |
| **1** | The Connecticar delivery system offers taxpayers a simple but helpful way to make their busy lives less hectic. The number of Connecticar boxes that our library receives can number up to nine per delivery. This includes returns from other libraries and interlibrary loan requests. This is an extraordinary number of items for any library. Taxpayers are getting good value of materials by sharing, not spending their money. |
| **1** | ICONN databases, because if each library had to purchase them individually, very few |

| Count | Response |
|-------|----------|
| | libraries could afford them. |
| 1 | Connecticar: being able to distribute books from all the libraries to share saves each library thousands of dollars and space. |
| 1 | We can obtain the books that we need from other libraries by Connecticar, the adjunct to ICONN. We search, we locate and then we receive the item we want. |
| 1 | All of them have tremendous value; some are direct, such as Connecticar, ICONN, and collection supplement from the service centers. The others are indirect through the staff continuing education. As a small library, we need to have these to provide the best service to our users. Could we do without? We would do something, but it wouldn't be easy. |
| 1 | I would choose ICONN because it opens up a huge catalog to people who are looking for a specific topic or item. |
| 1 | Connecticar enables patrons to get books from any participating library in the state without having to drive all over the state to do so. |
| 1 | I believe Connecticard and Connecticar offer the greatest value to those who use Connecticut libraries. Our library has many patrons who visit many different libraries and greatly appreciate the fact that they may take out books in any town and return them in any town. |
| 1 | ICONN: just because it is the one I use the most, but it would not be effective without Connecticar. |
| 1 | ICONN: I think that having a database for research is important. We cannot depend on Google for everything! |

**6. In your opinion, which of the services or initiatives that have been identified as being supported with LSTA funds has the greatest potential for improving library services in Connecticut?**

| Count | Response |
|-------|----------|
| 1 | Again, ICONN, particularly through ever-changing technology -- it is the future now! |
| 1 | Again, the sharing of information databases and Connecticar |
| 1 | Connecticar permits us to share books and resources among libraries. |
| 1 | Continuing education and Connecticar, Online journals |
| 1 | Connecticar, ICONN, and continuing education for library staff |
| 1 | Connecticar |
| 1 | Connecticar |
| 1 | Connecticar, continuing education, grants |

| Count | Response |
|-------|----------|
| 1 | Continued funding for the service centers, ILL systems, programming, and individual grants |
| 1 | Continuing education: we are out here alone! |
| 1 | Continuing education |
| 1 | Digital information services |
| 1 | Grants |
| 1 | Grants and possibly the use of ICONN by reference departments |
| 1 | Grants for programming, materials, and technological advances |
| 1 | Grants have the greatest potential because they make new initiatives possible. |
| 1 | Grants: libraries are able to test out projects and offer unique services in this way. |
| 1 | Grants: money is always needed to improve services. |
| 1 | I am not sure. |
| 1 | I don't have an opinion on this. |
| 4 | ICONN |
| 1 | ICONN and ILL services |
| 1 | ICONN continues to improve the assistance and resources that we offer to our patrons. |
| 1 | ICONN, Connecticar, continuing education opportunities for librarians and grants to libraries |
| 1 | ICONN and I would like to see more databases added to that service. |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar |
| 1 | ICONN and statewide catalog |
| 1 | ILLs and grants more readily available |
| 1 | If the grant could extend to include World Cat services. it would be helpful to patrons. |
| 1 | In service staff training |
| 1 | Same as above |
| 1 | Shared e-resources |
| 1 | The continuing education workshops |
| 1 | The greatest potential is certainly through the grants money that is offered to libraries. |
| 1 | The summer reading program and grant initiatives |
| 1 | Without a doubt ICONN databases could offer expanded resources. |
| 1 | Expanding programming |

| Count | Response |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | ICONN |
| 1 | ICONN and Connecticar |
| 1 | ICONN |
| 1 | ICONN Connecticar |
| 1 | ICONN, Service Centers |
| 1 | ICONN/reQuest and complementary Connecticar delivery system |
| 1 | ICONN |
| 1 | ICONN serves children in k-12. |
| 1 | ICONN; Connecticar |
| 1 | Unsure of this one...perhaps grant-funding for innovative/creative partnerships |
| 1 | The outreach programs, such as Connecticar, Services for the Blind and continuing education, expand library services to the public and also to library staff development. |
| 1 | They are all important so choosing is difficult. Consulting services definitely provide help for librarians from smaller venues, which could not otherwise afford them to assist them in improving services. |
| 1 | Professional development opportunities offered via WebJunction help keep us anchored in best practices and provide inspiration for innovative services. Best is that they are often free--if not, we wouldn't be able to attend and learn. |
| 1 | I would have to vote for ICONN again because it is just so effective. I think the library service centers are also excellent for resource sharing and training and I wish I knew more about the library consulting service. I would imagine the grants are also invaluable to the libraries that can implement the programs required. The services for the blind and physically impaired are a lifeline for many people and I believe this program should never be discontinued. |
| 1 | The ICONN databases are already improving library services in Connecticut and I believe that they will only become more important. There is so much there; once you introduce it to patrons they are amazed. We need to actively promote these databases more and let people know that libraries provide so much more than books and movies. |
| 1 | Connecticar is very convenient for patrons and ensures that people can get their hands on the resources they need no matter what library they visit. |
| 1 | I think it is important to have the Middletown and Willimantic service centers for those school libraries that are underfunded by town taxes. |
| 1 | ICONN provides equity in library informational services throughout the state by providing an excellent range of online resources for all to access. |
| 1 | I think the continuing education services, the consulting/advisory services, and the resources and knowledgeable personnel at the Service Centers have already made a significant improvement in library services, and I think their roles will continue to be |

| Count | Response |
|-------|----------|
| | significant in the future. |
| 1 | Again - ICONN and Connecticar: we would quickly become an obsolete institution if we could not offer databases to our members, and we are not able to offer them as current a collection as we would like, so sharing our individual collections is critical for continued good service. It all boils down to not enough money. We are grateful to be able to share the cost with others and willing to share our collection with other libraries. And a big thank you to those who fill our members' requests from their shelves. |
| 1 | More databases in ICONN would be great. These have been cut recently. Ability to fund better databases would be good also. I feel that ProQuest and EBSCO are much better products that the Gale databases currently available in ICONN, but are not currently affordable. The grants greatly impact services also. When an addition or renovation takes place, usage increases because the libraries can do much more with additional space. |
| 1 | ICONN: the digital library can be expanded with more funds to provide even more enriching materials for taxpayers and their families. |
| 1 | ICONN, in particular reQuest, allows patrons to get what they need without going all over the state for those items. |
| 1 | I didn't see it as a choice, but I think the next best initiative would be a statewide catalog of downloadable e-books. |
| 1 | I would say consulting services. We need IT advice on a statewide level on how to streamline and improve services. ICONN needs advice, it's cumbersome to use. Every CT library should be linked in one network that's transparent and easy to navigate....and the MLS program at SCSU needs help! |
| 1 | Grants to libraries can have a great impact as grants promote creativity and can launch new and innovative programs. Grants can assist in keeping libraries viable when towns are struggling financially. |
| 1 | ICONN still has the greatest potential for improving services in Connecticut because it allows us to share resources that save libraries money but also give patrons more choices. |
| 1 | Continuing education for library staff is the most important. I would like to see standards set for libraries in our state with required certification for ALL library directors. |
| 1 | ICONN will continue to grow in importance as print reference and serial collections shrink and patrons grow more comfortable with online searching. |
| 1 | Training programs for staff are great; I've attended some and found them very helpful in developing the skills I need to serve library patrons. |
| 1 | Connecticar is very important because it allows all of the libraries in Connecticut to share resources that would otherwise be impossible to manage. |
| 1 | Databases allow all libraries access to some type of informational database. Many libraries cannot afford databases on their own. |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Library service centers provide not only materials, but also the technology that libraries need to continue updating to continue to serve our populations. |
| 1 | Grants to libraries because they allow libraries to do building improvements; implement new programs, services, and collections; participate in professional development, and take advantage of other opportunities |
| 1 | ICONN has the greatest potential to improve service because of its content and potential to reach all age groups with essential information content. |
| 1 | The direct LSTA grants because they provide examples of innovation for the greater library community. However, if those funds could be used to pull together an effort towards a shared ILS, the long term effect would be amazing! |
| 1 | State Grants: if the state and federal governments would look at libraries as being a necessity in our economy and help us to put literacy first, our state and country would be a lot better equipped in the future with generations that read for information as well as recreation. |

**7. Among the LSTA Grants to States program priorities are encouraging resource sharing, fostering strategic partnerships and serving individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services. Please share any examples that you have that indicate that these kinds of activities are resulting from the services/initiatives that the Connecticut State Library has undertaken using LSTA funds.**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Can't give any examples - not familiar enough. |
| 1 | Clearly Ill statistics stand out. |
| 1 | Connecticard |
| 1 | Do not know |
| 1 | For our library, the support for ILL services and shared resources are key. |
| 1 | I don't know of any. |
| 1 | ICONN, Services to the Blind, Connecticar. |
| 1 | My only experience is with ICONN. |
| 1 | N/A |
| 1 | Obviously there would be far less sharing of resources without Connecticar. |
| 1 | One of my LSTA grants was in support of outreach to home-bound individuals. |
| 1 | Our early literacy program!! |
| 1 | Patron expectation that resource sharing is a given |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | Shared resources such as e-books, etc. |
| 1 | Sorry - not knowledgeable to answer this one |
| 1 | Unable to comment |
| 1 | Unfortunately I am unsure of where the LSTA funds have been directed. |
| 1 | ICONN-Assist teachers/students/parents |
| 1 | na |
| 1 | No comment |
| 1 | Large print books are very expensive and take up a lot of shelf room, the two things most libraries don't have enough of, money and space. By using Connecticar and the Service Centers, libraries are able to meet the needs of elderly and vision-impaired patrons. The same can be said for books on cd. |
| 1 | I have no knowledge of an LSTA funded program; however, I know that my public library, Wallingford, has run many outstanding initiatives that were grant funded, such as launching a town wide Raising Readers program, reaching out to home day care providers with a Let's Get Ready to Read program with the creation of a "storytime in a bag" collection, and most recently a Nature Calls program to encourage conservation, stewardship and time spent outdoors. |
| 1 | I don't remember the specifics, but the programs that get the library out in the community. I think it might have been the Ferguson Library. |
| 1 | "Encouraging resource sharing" is very dependent upon the Connecticar delivery system throughout the state. Without this service, a good deal of sharing would stop. |
| 1 | The availability of ICONN, the library service centers, the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped and the Connecticar services all help with resource sharing statewide. |
| 1 | I think that the ICONN databases and now digital media have given people who might not come to the library in a traditional sense the ability to use the library from home or a mobile device. This has allowed us to offer a hard to reach population something useful from the library for free. |
| 1 | We make the electronic sources accessible to the entire school community through the school website. |
| 1 | In Union Free Public Library we utilize the Willimantic Service Center for audiobooks and large print books. This Service Center is used for Book Clubs for grades 3-8 as well. Connecticar is used to provide our patrons with materials that we can't afford. Our state grant is used for materials as well as support for an Elderly/House Bound Program we are implementing with "Meals on Wheels" and our Summer Reading Program, which has gone from 14% participation in 2009 to about 70% participation in 2011. We also implemented a Summer Adult Program, which this supports. |
| 1 | Without Connecticar, resource sharing falls apart. We have several patrons, some with disabilities, who rely on reQuest/Connecticar for items we would never be able to |

| Count | Response |
|:-----:|----------|
| | provide for them. I wish more funds (or whatever is needed) could be directed there to improve the delivery system. |
| **1** | Connecticar is vital to resource sharing and will remain so as long as physical books and other items are used by library patrons. I know several people who use the services of the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. They have told me how much their life has been enriched by being able to continue to "read with their ears" long after their eyes have given out. |
| **1** | Through reQuest even the smallest library can share its valuable collection throughout the state. Through the use of LSTA grants to libraries many of us have taken on partnerships that we may not have made if not for the requirement from the grant. The whole idea of taking our library programs to others rather than making them come into the library was realized through an LSTA grant. |
| **1** | Our community experienced first-hand how LSTA funds can bring about strategic partnerships when our LSTA grant created a scenario that helped us form such partnerships with many organizations to help the elderly. Networking with local nonprofits resulted in long term community relationships that continue to be important to the library's role and visibility in the community. The elderly are better identified and served because of the community network created with our initial LSTA funds for homebound services. |
| **1** | We are able to run our own book discussion groups because we have Connecticar and ILL. We meet each other at educational opportunities, which allow face to face communication. When other libraries receive grants we learn from them - how to handle each of the new technologies as they come along. I have given applications to the Library for the Blind to older individuals who have suffered from strokes or hearing or sight loss. They then see their library as a door to the world. |
| **1** | ICONN and Connecticar encourage resource sharing, as communities have access to databases that have been negotiated statewide. Our statistics support the need for these services. |
| **1** | Both Connecticar and reQuest are crucial to resource sharing. So are the service centers - their bulk loans save money, and they enable libraries to try new types of materials and observe their circulation before buying those materials with a library's limited budget. LBPH is wonderful for low-vision patrons. |
| **1** | We often have students who have severe physical impairments, including profound visual difficulties. The Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped is a lifeline for them. |
| **1** | LSTA Grants funded our initiative to develop home delivery services to the homebound residents of our community. We have a Public Services Librarian who visits the local nursing homes and individuals who are unable to come to the library delivering materials on a regular basis. Without the funds we would not have been able to get the program off the ground. |
| **1** | Regarding resource sharing, I am a school librarian who regularly searches the catalogs of public libraries via ICONN to see where my students and I can locate books we do not |

| Count | Response |
|:---:|:---|
| | own. I also have a number of students who understand material better when it is read to them, so having access to audiobooks has been wonderful. With my own budget, I can afford only a small number of audiobooks. |
| 1 | I think our priorities intrinsically encourage resource sharing, foster strategic partnerships and serve the exceptional patron. |
| 1 | We are able to be much more selective in purchasing materials as we see their availability in other libraries. |
| 1 | The presence of the two state service centers enables the borrowing of temporary collections of materials in formats not otherwise available in our library. Specifically, our ability to borrow collections of large print and YA materials on a quarterly basis enables us to offer fresh reading choices to the readers of that format and genre without having the space to house permanent collections The service centers are also a wonderful source for supplementary holiday and themed books for juvenile readers. |
| 1 | In my school we read the Nutmeg choice books as a group; our public library borrows multiple copies for us from collections in the region and ones all over the state. I couldn't afford to purchase all the books needed to do this program from my school budget. |
| 1 | Because of the library's participation in reQuest ILL, the volume of materials satisfying our patron requests from other libraries has doubled. |
| 1 | As stated above, many of our patrons could not go to another library even if they wanted to due to lack of transportation. Connecticar enables us to meet many needs. |
| 1 | ICONN encourages resource sharing. We ask for and send out lots of materials each day. We can get the esoteric thing that only one patron is interested in from another library. We don't spend money for it and it then doesn't sit on our shelf for five years with no use. It would be good if the state had a program where libraries would either keep the last copy of an item available in the state or there was a repository where items could be sent. It would also be good if the colleges like Yale would provide materials through reQuest. In RI, Brown University didn't really want to fully join in the statewide system, but when they finally did, they found out that they actually received more that they supplied. |
| 1 | Without Connecticar delivery service, it would not be affordable to allow residents in our City to place holds on other libraries' materials. Last year, our patrons received 24, 978 items from other libraries in our consortium, and we lent 16, 267 items to other libraries. |
| 1 | We used LSTA grants to develop collections for English Language Learners and foreign language materials. In doing so, we partnered with several agencies in the community and reached out to people of different nationalities to sponsor programs and new services for people who may not have come to the library before. |
| 1 | Connecticar certainly fosters resource sharing. Grants help us reach out to underserved communities. |
| 1 | Connecticard and interlibrary loan very clearly foster resource sharing. The professional development workshops help participants share ideas for improving their library services as well. Materials for the blind would help serve individuals who find it difficult to use |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | traditional library services. I believe that individual grants may help provide these services even better. For example, a grant may be provided for outreach to underserved populations. |
| 1 | The biggest thing that comes in mind in terms of resource sharing are the Connecticar and Connecticard initiatives. |
| 1 | Our library received an LSTA grant to improve services to individuals with sensory and motor challenges. The equipment we purchased with grant funds has allowed a core group of library patrons to use all the library's resources more independently. |
| 1 | My last LSTA grant was targeted at families who find it difficult to use traditional library services and we fostered strategic partnerships within the community to provide outreach to these families. |

**8. Do you have any ideas or suggestions about how the LSTA program in Connecticut could be improved? What program or programs would you prioritize?**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Connecticar would probably be my top priority. What about Connecticard? Is that LSTA-funded also? |
| 1 | I would like the option to propose grants that do not fit into the current categories. |
| 1 | I would like to see construction grants restored to non-distressed communities. |
| 1 | ICONN databases could offer more. |
| 1 | If at all possible, please keep ICONN and Connecticar. |
| 1 | If the grant could fund all interloan services that would be helpful. |
| 1 | More funding for the centers, ILL, and especially shared databases.! |
| 1 | New technology trends |
| 1 | No ideas |
| 1 | No suggestions; appreciate what is there now. |
| 1 | Since there is one statewide library card, there should be one statewide ILS. |
| 1 | Smaller libraries need the training!!! The others need to be kept up! |
| 1 | The LSTA program should concentrate on helping libraries fund new technologies. |
| 1 | We still need to get more people in the state to use ICONN. |
| 1 | ICONN |
| 1 | More workshops for support staff |
| 1 | na |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | See above |
| 1 | Is there a way to shorten the application? Make it easier to complete? The process is rather daunting. |
| 1 | Could grants be offered to schools in high poverty areas to provide e-readers, such as Kindles, which read to students. E-readers that can read a book while displaying text would help our growing number of bilingual students learn pronunciation and increase their English vocabulary. |
| 1 | I would recommend securing the availability of the four services I mention above. I don't know how this could be done, but I feel that they should not be on the chopping block when money is tight. Maybe there is a way to endow these services. |
| 1 | Keep up the good work; ILLs and Connecticard/Connecticar: people can't afford to run around looking for stuff and appreciate services of ILLs. |
| 1 | Partner with CLC for e-resources and professional development. Eliminate service centers. Eliminate grants to individual libraries and use the money for cooperative e-collections. |
| 1 | With the explosion of e-books and e-readers, it would be nice to have some sort of grants and/or sharing to help small libraries acquire the materials needed to have their own collection. |
| 1 | I think the programs are excellent. Were more funds to become available, I think some funds should be reinstated to local libraries for resource sharing. |
| 1 | I would like to see a state-wide ILS. This would improve library service to all residents. We have already taken the first step with our barcode system. I would like to see standards set for libraries as far as staff training, hours of operation, and funding. |
| 1 | Not a single suggestion! As to prioritizing, I suspect libraries could do local summer reading programs on their own, and individual users could partially pay for borrowing and returning via Connecticar. |
| 1 | See above responses for suggestions. Priorities 1. ICONN and reQuest; 2. Grants; 3. Summer Reading Program; 4 Training at Service Centers |
| 1 | Keep ICONN and keep Connecticar. Never let go of staff during budget crises. We have wonderful resources and programs in this state, but without people to run them we will get nowhere. |
| 1 | I am honestly not even aware of what the "consulting" aspects of LSTA funds support, so I think that there is room here to improve or get the word out about this program. |
| 1 | Prioritizing these programs is so very difficult for us. As stated previously we try to split the monies we receive from the State Library and LSTA and we utilize all programs that we can from the programs available. |
| 1 | There is an important need for support of the latest technologies, i.e., e-books and e-readers as well as smart phones and various tablets that are becoming standard means of accessing or communicating information. Many small and rural libraries can use |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | assistance to implement such technologies in their communities. If not already in place, all grant forms and reporting mechanisms should be accessible from the Internet and shared electronically with all parties involved for ease of filing, reporting and communicating effectively. |
| 1 | Anything that would either strengthen statewide services (a shared ILS for example) or would target the "have-not" population, strengthening their technology skills and access to technology. Many employers accept only online applications, even for low-skill, low-wage positions. Access to government services requires access to computers and for many "have-nots" a lot of handholding at the library. Sometimes the have-nots aren't poor, but somehow they haven't had personal access to technology. |
| 1 | The grants to individual libraries seem to go exclusively to public libraries. I have given up applying as an academic library. |
| 1 | I think it is important to remember sustainability. It does us no good to fund something short term without a process in place to continue. I'm not sure that always happens. My priorities are anything fostering early literacy, resource sharing and continuing education. |
| 1 | Greater communication to school libraries about resources that may be available, such as grant opportunities and continuing education programs, perhaps though the CASL listserv. |
| 1 | Other than the ones I have direct knowledge of as being instrumental, I would hate to deny the value of ones I do not have personal experience with, such as books and equipment for the Blind....... |
| 1 | The LSTA grant process needs to be streamlined. It is incredibly and needlessly complex, when compared to other grant applications. |
| 1 | Upon reflection, it is obvious I would prioritize the continuation and sufficient funding of the Connecticar delivery service as well as the many services provided by the Willimantic and Middletown service center staffs. |
| 1 | I'm not directly involved in this at my library, but I know that we have a very difficult time getting IT support from our city. We have one person who works only 20 hours a week, who must service over 200 computers throughout the city. I'm sure additional funding for more hours and better network equipment would help, but that's a municipal problem. I'd say better training for library staff to fix relatively minor problems, but honestly, we've been running on a skeletal staff for far too long to be able to add to anyone's work load. |
| 1 | My only suggestion would be for the powers that be to recognize the extraordinary value of the services and resources and increase that funding! |
| 1 | I need to look into the programs you have to offer. Unfortunately, a school like mine does not always qualify for grants because we don't have a high free lunch population, but our budget is still affected by the economy. All of our library budgets have been reduced by half. |
| 1 | This may be beyond the scope of what the LSTA grant provides, but my biggest challenge right now is mounting a more effective e-book program to patrons. A state-wide "bid" from an e-book provider for e-book titles that libraries can purchase for their |

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| | INDIVIDUAL catalogs, not consortial catalogs, would be great. |
| 1 | We need funds for building improvements and updating our current building. We have outgrown our storytime space and need to modernize the building for better electronic access. |
| 1 | I would like to see smaller, simple grants, such as the funding for downloading audio books (about $1,000), or buying $500 books for summer reading lists made up by the local schools, or money for the entire set of Nutmeg books for the year. And that this money be available ONLY to small rural libraries, not the big libraries in the wealthiest part of the state. Small libraries often have no full-time help. Small libraries often have very low budgets. I would like the process to be much less complicated with long drawn out goals and outcomes and follow-ups other than invoice receipts and a simple paragraph. Smaller rural libraries do not have full-time staff to sit in workshops, to create collaborations, or to do involved follow-ups. Smaller rural libraries do not have staff making a sustainable income. At the same time, they need the basics. Even up-to-date books on the states and countries can be unreachable for a small rural library. School children do reports on states and countries and it is a resource that needs constant up-dating to be useful. Countries change names, borders etc. States also change. |
| 1 | Monthly round tables for high school library-media specialists; online webinars on contemporary issues/applications useful for high-school library media specialists that will improve student learning in the 21st century |
| 1 | I wouldn't prioritize reQuest. I would prioritize continuing education for librarians (professional development), also Connecticard and interlibrary loan. ICONN databases provide a base reference resource that is vital for underfunded libraries and schools, so I'd also prioritize it. |

**9. The category that most closely describes your role/responsibilities in the library community is:**

| Value | Count | Percent % |
|---|---|---|
| Public Library Director | 39 | 37.9% |
| School Librarian/Media Specialist | 22 | 21.4% |
| Academic Library Director | 1 | 1% |
| Children's/Youth Services Librarian | 16 | 15.5% |
| Reference/Information Librarian | 9 | 8.7% |
| Interlibrary Loan or Technical Services Librarian | 2 | 1.9% |
| Library Technology Specialist | 1 | 1% |
| Other Library Staff | 10 | 9.7% |
| Library Friend or Library Trustee | 1 | 1% |

| | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Other (Please specify.) | 2 | 1.9% |
| Librarian in a Special Library | 0 | 0% |

**If you selected "other," please specify here.**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Assistant Director and Adult Collection Manager |
| 1 | Assistant Library Director |
| 1 | Automated Library Consortia |
| 1 | Circulation |
| 1 | Director Branch and Children's Services |
| 1 | Library Assistant |
| 1 | Library Technician |
| 1 | Head of Circulation - circ always gets short shrift; doesn't even appear as a category on your list... |

**10. Please complete the following sentence. I work in or am most closely associated with:**

| Value | Count | Percent % |
|---|---|---|
| a public library | 73 | 70.9% |
| an academic library | 4 | 3.9% |
| a school library/media center | 23 | 22.3% |
| a special library | 1 | 1% |
| Something other than those in the list (Please specify.) | 2 | 1.9% |

**If you selected "other," please specify here.**

| Count | Response |
|---|---|
| 1 | Automated Library Consortia |
| 1 | Our library is an Association, but the only one in town, so functions as the Public Library. |

**11. Please indicate the size of the community or the student body of the library in which you work.**

| Value | Count | Percent % |
|---|---|---|
| Fewer than 250 | 1 | 1% |
| 250 – 499 | 7 | 6.9% |
| 500 - 2,499 | 18 | 17.6% |
| 2,500 - 9,999 | 20 | 19.6% |
| 10,000 - 49,999 | 39 | 38.2% |
| 50,000 - 99,999 | 13 | 12.7% |
| 100,000 - 499,999 | 2 | 2% |
| Does not apply | 2 | 2% |
| 500,000 or more | 0 | 0% |

**12. Please estimate the overall annual operating budget of the library in which you work or with which you are associated.**

| Value | Count | Percent % |
|---|---|---|
| Less than $10,000 | 8 | 7.8% |
| $10,000 - $49,999 | 16 | 15.5% |
| $50,000 - $99,999 | 3 | 2.9% |
| $100,000 - $249,999 | 11 | 10.7% |
| $250,000 - $499,999 | 7 | 6.8% |
| $500,000 - $999,999 | 20 | 19.4% |
| $1 million or more | 21 | 20.4% |
| Don't Know/Not Sure | 17 | 16.5% |

## Appendix D - List of Acronyms and Terms

ACLPD    Advisory Council for Library Planning and Development – Advisory Council for the Connecticut state Library's Division of Library Development

ARL    Association of Research Libraries - ARL is a nonprofit organization of 126 research libraries at comprehensive, research-extensive institutions in the US and Canada that share similar research missions, aspirations, and achievements.   http://www.arl.org/

C-Car    ConnectiCar the statewide delivery system

CDL    Connecticut Digital Library

CLA    Connecticut Library Association -   Connecticut's professional organization of over 1,000 librarians, library staff, friends, and trustees working together: to improve library service to Connecticut, to advance the interests of librarians, library staff, and librarianship, and to increase public awareness of libraries and library services.   www.**ctlibraryassociation**.org/

CLC    Connecticut Library Consortium - The Connecticut Library Consortium is a statewide membership collaborative serving all types of Connecticut libraries by initiating and facilitating cost-effective services, creating and supporting educational and professional development, and helping libraries to strengthen their ability to serve their users.   www.**ctlibrarian**s.org/

Connecticar    C-Car – The statewide delivery system

Connecticard    Statewide library card

iCONN    Statewide suite of databases and other specialized information resources http://www.iCONN.org

ILL    Interlibrary loan

IMLS    Institute of Museum and Library Services   http://www.imls.gov

LBPH    Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped – General name applied to state-level outlets of the National Library Service programs.  Connecticut's LBPH operates as a unit of the Connecticut State Library   http://www.cslib.org/lbph.htm

LSTA        Library Services and Technology Act - LSTA is part of the Museum and Library
            Services Act, which created the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
            and established federal programs to help libraries and museums serve the
            public.  The LSTA sets out three overall purposes:

- Promote improvements in library services in all types of libraries in order
  to better serve the people of the United States.
- Facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of
  cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; and
- Encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose
  of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the
  public.

The LSTA Grants to States program is a federal-state partnership. The Program
provides funds using a population-based formula, described in the LSTA, to each
state and the territories through State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs).

LSTAC       Library Services and Technology Act Coordinator

ReQuest     Connecticut statewide library catalog    http://rqst-agent.auto-
            graphics.com/homepages/customerwide/iconnLandingGuest.asp?cuid=rqst&lid=
            RQST&myses=17860549&cusrvr=minerva

## Appendix E - Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

American Evaluation Association, "Guiding Principles for Evaluators," 2004.

Brettschneider, Sharon. Ccar Trunaround Study, April 2010, accessed December 2, 2011 at:
http://ct.webjunction.org/ct/ccar/-/articles/content/94060764

Connecticut. State Library. Preliminary Results: Survey of Users of Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

Connecticut. State Library. Indicator Measurements for Capacity Building Sessions, accessed December 2, 2011 at: http://ct.webjunction.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=87341672&name=DLFE-22890042.pdf

Connecticut. State Library. *LSTA Five-Year State Plan 2008-2012*.

Gibbs, Graham*. Analyzing Qualitative Data* (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2007).

"iCONN user satisfaction summary, August 2009 – December 2010," Gale Cengage Learning, accessed December 2, 2011 at: http://www.iconn.org/documents/iCONN_User_Satisfaction_Survey-minus_Gale_Comparison.pdf

U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services. *Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation*.

U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services. *Nine to Nineteen: Youth in Museums and Libraries: A Practitioner's Guide*, accessed December 2, 2011 at:
http://www.imls.gov/assets/1/workflow_staging/News/750.PDF

See also Appendix D (List of Acronyms and Terms) for URLs for additional websites explored.

# Appendix F - Summary of Coding Used in Qualitative Analysis

| Descriptive Codes | Focus Groups + | - | Library Leader Interviews + | - | Total + | - |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| iCONN databases/ReQuest ILL | 22 | 1 | 31 | 2 | **53** | **3** |
| Connecticar delivery | 6 | | 13 | | **19** | |
| Continuing education/professional development | 4 | | 14 | 1 | **18** | **1** |
| Library Service Centers | 5 | | 12 | 2 | **17** | **2** |
| Talking Books | 3 | 1 | 12 | 2 | **15** | **3** |
| Services for children/young adults | 4 | | 8 | | **12** | |
| Statistics | 1 | | 8 | | **9** | |
| Consulting | 1 | | 8 | 2 | **9** | **2** |
| New technology/video streaming | 6 | | 2 | | **8** | |
| Cooperative purchasing | 3 | | 4 | | **7** | |
| E-books | 6 | | 2 | | **8** | |
| Connecticard | 2 | 1 | 3 | | **5** | **1** |
| E-government | 4 | | | | **4** | |
| Digitization | 2 | | 1 | | **3** | |
| Services for immigrants/new arrivals | 2 | | | | **2** | |
| Usability | 2 | | | | **2** | |
| WebJunction | | | 2 | 1 | **2** | **1** |
| **Strategies** | | | | | **+** | **-** |
| Capacity building (sub-grants 20/6, professional development 18/1, consulting 9/0, advocacy/public awareness 19/1) | | | | | 47 | 7 |
| Collaboration | | | | | 33 | 3 |
| Access | | | | | 21 | 2 |
| Innovation | | | | | 13 | 4 |
| Budget crisis/contingency planning | | | | | 11 | |
| **Qualities** | | | | | **+** | **-** |
| General support | | | | | 11 | |
| Suggestions | | | | | 3 | |

**Appendix G – Research Instruments**

**Connecticut LSTA Interview Questions**

Himmel & Wilson is working with the Connecticut State Library to conduct an evaluation of the State's implementation of the Federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) "Grants to States" program. LSTA "Grants to States" is a population-based formula driven program intended to fulfill specific purposes outlined in the Museum and Library Services Act.  Under the Act, each state is required to conduct an evaluation of the program every five years.  The current evaluation covers activities conducted under the State's approved LSTA plan for the period between Federal FY 2008 - 2012.

*Major programs and initiatives that have recently (2009 data) received LSTA funds in Connecticut include Connecticar (Delivery - $230,999), iCONN (statewide catalog and database portal - $394,398), Leading libraries (library development and consulting, $319,167), LBPH ($756,627), the Willimantic Library Service Center ($254,042) and the Middletown Library Service Center ($133,427).   (2009 total= $2,232,404).  LSTA funding was also used to support continuing education efforts and to fund a small number of grants to individual libraries for innovative projects.*

LSTA "Grants to States" funding for Connecticut has decreased from more than $2.2 million in Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010 to just under $2.1 million in FY2011 as total Federal funding for the program has been reduced.

1.   Have any of the major LSTA-funded or jointly-supported (State and Federal dollars) programs had a significant impact on your library?

2.  Many of the activities of Connecticut State Library such as consulting services, collection and analysis of library statistics and continuing education would not be possible without LSTA support.  In what ways do these activities of the Connecticut State Library make a difference to your library?
    a.  What is the impact of consulting services offered by CSL on your library?  What about continuing education/staff development efforts?

3.  One of the ways that LSTA has had an impact on libraries over the years has been in fostering innovation?  Where does innovation "live" in Connecticut libraries? How do new efforts or initiatives get started?  Does LSTA play a role in innovation?

4.  Have specific improvements or advances in library services taken place in the last five years that you believe are largely attributable to the availability of LSTA funding?  What are the most important things that would NOT have been accomplished if LSTA funding had not been provided?

5.  The LSTA "Grants to States" program purposes highlight activities that improve access to library services, increase resource sharing activity, reach out to individuals with special needs and build strategic partnerships.  To what extent do you believe Connecticut's implementation of the program has furthered these purposes?

**Connecticut LSTA Focus Group Questions**

Himmel & Wilson is working with the Connecticut State Library to conduct an evaluation of the State's implementation of the Federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) "Grants to States" program. The "Grants to States" program is a population-based formula driven program intended to fulfill specific purposes outlined in the Museum and Library Services Act. Under the Act, each state is required to conduct an evaluation of the program every five years. The current evaluation covers activities conducted under the State's approved LSTA plan for the period between 2008 - 2012.

*Major programs and initiatives that have recently (2009 data) received LSTA funds in Connecticut include Connecticar (Delivery - $230,999), iCONN (statewide catalog and database portal - $394,398), Leading libraries (library development and consulting, $319,167), LBPH ($756,627), the Willimantic Library Service Center ($254,042) and the Middletown Library Service Center ($133,427). (2009 total= $2,232,404). LSTA funding was also used to support continuing education efforts and to fund a small number of grants to individual libraries for innovative projects.*

LSTA "Grants to States" funding for Connecticut has decreased from more than $2.2 million in Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010 to just under $2.1 million in FY2011 as total Federal funding for the program has been reduced.

1.  Which of the LSTA-funded programs or jointly-supported (State and Federal dollars) has had the greatest impact on your library?
    a.  In what ways is your library better able to serve the public because of this program or initiative?
    b.  In what ways are you as a library director/library staff member better able to serve the public?

2.  Many of the activities of the Connecticut State Library would not be possible or would be significantly curtailed without LSTA support. What impact do services provided by CSL have on your library and/or on your library users?

3.  Have specific improvements or advances in library services taken place in the last five years that you believe are largely attributable to the availability of LSTA funding? What are the most important things that would NOT have been accomplished if LSTA funding had not been provided?

4.  The LSTA "Grants to States" program priorities highlight activities that improve access to library services, increase resource sharing activity, reach out to individuals with special needs and build strategic partnerships. To what extent do you believe Connecticut's implementation of the program has furthered these purposes?