Evaluation of the Oregon State Library's

2008-2012 LSTA Five-Year Plan

Evaluated by: Nancy Bolt & Associates
Principal Consultants
Nancy Bolt, SMP
Karen Strege, PhD

Evaluator Contact: Nancy Bolt
9018 Ute Drive
Golden, CO 80403
303 642 0338 (o)
303 905 9347 (m)
303 642 0932 (fax)
nancybolt@earthlink.net

Date submitted: March 12, 2012

Submitted by: Oregon State Library
250 Winter St. NE
Salem, OR 97301

Contact Person: MaryKay Dahlgreen
State Librarian

Contents

Evaluation Summary

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the federal agency responsible for implementing the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA), requires state recipients to conduct an independent evaluation of programs funded with grant funds. The Oregon State Library (OSL) is the state agency that manages Oregon's LSTA Program. They engaged Nancy Bolt & Associates to conduct the evaluation.

OSL is an independent state agency governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor. As stated in its Mission Statement, OSL:
- Provides quality information services to Oregon state government
- Provides reading materials to blind and print-disabled Oregonians, and
- Provides leadership, grants, and other assistance to improve library service for all Oregonians

A major resource assisting OSL in carrying out its responsibilities for library development is LSTA funding provided by IMLS.

 This evaluation will address the following:
- To what extent did OSL activities in the last five years reach outcomes that meet the IMLS priorities?
- To what extent did OSL activities in the last five years meet the goals of the OSL LSTA Five-Year Plan and achieve its identified targets?
- Answers to Retrospective, Process, and Prospective questions posed by IMLS in its evaluation guidelines.
- Answers to the Competitive, Retrospective, and Outcome questions posed by OSL in their Request for Proposal (RFP) for this evaluation study.

Goals and Questions to be Answered
The six IMLS Priorities, the three IMLS Purposes, the Oregon LSTA Goals, the IMLS Evaluation Questions from the *Guidelines for Evaluation of LSTA Five-Year Plans*, and the Output and Impact questions asked by OSL in the Request for Proposals seeking an evaluator are in Annex A. The following table shows the relationship between the six IMLS Priorities and the six OSL LSTA Goals.

Relation between IMLS priorities and LSTA goals

OSL LSTA Goal	IMLS - 1 Expand Services	IMLS - 2 Electronic Networks	IMLS - 3 Electronic Linkages	IMLS - 4 Public and Private Partner-ships	IMLS - 5 Diverse Needs	IMLS - 6 Under-served and Children
1. Access to Info Resources	X	X			X	X
2. Develop Info Literacy Skills	X	X	X			X

3. Foster Joy of Reading	X				X	X
4. Increase Capacity	X	X			X	X
5. Using Techno-logy	X	X	X			X
6. Building Strong Commu-nities	X	X	X	X	X	X

As part of the evaluation, OSL asked evaluators to focus on the following programs:
- Plinkit, websites for public libraries
- Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS) Portal
- Statewide Database Licensing Program
- Continuing education projects including the Northwest Central Continuing Education Network
- L-net, statewide e-reference service
- Youth Services program
- Competitive Grants Program

The following table shows the conclusion of the evaluators on the relation between the Oregon Plan's LSTA goals and the programs the evaluators were asked to evaluate.

OSL LSTA Goal	Programs included in this goal
1. Access to Information Resources	Plinkit; OSLIS; Databases: L-net; Competitive grants
2. Develop Information Literacy Skills	OSLIS; Youth Services; Competitive grants
3. Foster Joy of Reading	Youth Services; Competitive grants
4. Increase Capacity for Service	Plinkit; Continuing education; L-net; Databases; OSLIS Youth Services; Competitive grants
5. Using Technology	Plinkit; Databases; L-net; Competitive grants
6. Build Strong Communities	Competitive grants

Methodology
We used four methodologies for gathering data to determine the outcomes and impact of OSL's activities in the last five years and to answer the evaluative questions posed by IMLS and OSL.
- Review of documentation related to all projects. (See Annex B for a list of documents reviewed.)
- Interviews with OSL staff and others involved with LSTA-funded programs. (See Annex C for a list of people interviewed.)
- A survey of the library community with 333 responses. (See Annex J for the survey instrument and Annex K for the Constituent Survey Report.)

- Nine focus groups: seven with the library community one with the LSTA Council, and one with the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee. (See Annex I for the Focus Group Report.)

Based on the information gathered, this report first presents tables showing the number of grants awarded by IMLS priority and the amount of funding in relation to the IMLS priorities and OSL LSTA goals. We then respond to the IMLS Retrospective, Process, and Prospective questions with general findings about the Oregon LSTA program.

Following responses to the overarching IMLS questions, we present findings for the seven programs indicated above. The findings cover the background of program, whether it met the Plan's targets, and responses to OSL's outcome and impact questions. These findings integrate the results of the four data collection methodologies listed above. These reports conclude with recommendations for program improvement if it is included in the next Five-Year Plan.

Key Findings
1. All IMLS priorities and purposes and Oregon LSTA goals were addressed by some activity during the span of the Five-Year Plan.

2. OSL statewide programs have a significant impact on libraries and their users, with the degree of impact dependent on the type, size, and location of the library.

3. Rural libraries have fewer resources then urban libraries and are more likely to consider the LSTA-funded programs essential.

4. OSL collects a great deal of output or usage data but spends few resources on collecting outcome-based evaluation (OBE) and has no evident criteria for deciding the future of LSTA-funded programs.

Key Recommendations
1. Set realistic and meaningful targets. Many of the outcomes and targets in the Plan required that OSL establish benchmarks before setting program targets. After five years, OSL has sufficient information to set realistic and more meaningful targets.

2. Set impact targets. OSL should consider setting targets for the program's impact on libraries and their users. OSL or libraries can measure these targets through surveys, focus groups, or interviews on a regular basis. OSL should routinely and consistently evaluate the impact of training. Does the training make a difference in the way librarians perform when they return to their work?

3. Increase OBE efforts. Because of the uncertainly of continued LSTA funding, state budget problems, and OSL's policy of spending LSTA funds on direct services or programs, OSL should find low-cost ways to plan OBE in selected programs. We also suggest that OSL choose one or two statewide programs from which to measure the impact on program users. L-net, through its user exit survey, or OSLIS, with the target audience of teachers, might be good candidates for this outcome-based evaluation. Plinkit has a small number of participants; the project manager could easily develop and implement a short satisfaction survey. Another suggestion is for the L-net Coordinator to assist OSL staff in coordinating evaluation activities for OSL.

OSL could also build OBE requirements into competitive grant applications and fund evaluation activities. We suggest that the LSTA Council require each applicant to identify one OBE activity. To

help applicants, Council should provide a list of such activities, examples of each, and an estimate of their costs. Council might also consider compiling a list of OBE evaluators from which grant recipients can choose. After a project is complete and submits OBE information, OSL can highlight achievements and best practices to inform other Oregon libraries.

OSL should revise the evaluation template for competitive grants to focus on outcomes and impact on the library or on the community instead on focusing only on activities and output measures. Reports should not only ask for a report of grant activities and the numbers of users who participate in these activities, but also for responses to and outcomes of the activities.

4. Share information about the grants. OSL should promote successful grant-funded projects to encourage libraries to replicate these projects. In addition to that, OSL could share the outcome methods and tools of projects, such as Kaboom, through workshops and toolkits to replicate the projects. To increase awareness of LSTA projects to both librarians and communities, we recommend that OSL make publicity a grant requirement. To help recipients do so, OSL can continue to provide customizable press releases.

5. Develop criteria for evaluating statewide programs. OSL should develop criteria or use the criteria suggested under IMLS Prospective Questions to evaluate the current use of LSTA funds when making decisions about the future. The focus groups and surveys provided information about the opinions of the library community. OSL can use this information to guide decisions about future programs.

6. Eliminate peer evaluation and replace with focus on OBE. Only survey respondents from school libraries thought the peer evaluations were very helpful; respondents from other types of libraries rated these evaluations as 3.5 or below. A few focus group participants thought these evaluations served the purpose of educating evaluators about other libraries and helped OSL understand the value of LSTA-funded projects. We also found mixed reviews about these evaluations from project libraries; some citing their worth and some calling them not useful. We found no evidence that OSL or the LSTA Council used the results of the evaluation to change procedures or policies for subsequent projects.

7. Work with other states on OBE efforts. OSL staff suggested that states could work together to identify benchmarks, measurements, and OBE strategies to use with similar LSTA-funded projects. For example, many states use LSTA funds to support database licenses and could identify similar benchmarks and methodologies to collect OBE information. In addition, after identifying their common needs, states could work with vendors to develop uniform ways to collect and report output measurements. States could also require vendors to provide easy-to-implement user satisfaction surveys. The initial investment in time in this joint project will pay off in future years and in understanding the impact of LSTA-funded projects in Oregon. The State Librarian could propose this strategy to COSLA or the Western Council of State Librarians. The LSTA coordinators in interested states could then work together to identify a common project and OBE measures.

Body of the Evaluation Study

Study Background

<u>Users and use of the evaluation process:</u> Users of this report include the Oregon State Library Board of Trustees, Oregon's LSTA Council, the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC), staff of Library Development Services, and members of Oregon's library community.

OSL intends to use the information in this report for two purposes:
1. To develop the final evaluation report guided by the IMLS document, *Guidelines for Evaluation of LSTA Five-Year Plans.*
2. To inform the development of the new Five-Year LSTA Plan.

The IMLS Evaluation Questions are included in Annex A, along with Output and Input questions from the OSL Request for Proposal for the competitive grant program and the following statewide programs:
- Plinkit, Websites for Public Libraries
- Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS) Portal
- Statewide Licensing Database Program
- Continuing education projects and the Northwest Central Continuing Education Network
- L-net, statewide e-reference service
- Youth Services

A brief analysis of the seven OSL outcome questions is given in Annex G.

<u>Values of the evaluation process</u>: The evaluators adhered to the principles of neutrality, thoroughness, and confidentiality throughout the study. We remained neutral during every stage of data collection, analysis, interpretation, and writing. We reminded focus group participants and interviewees that we are not affiliated with the State Library, IMLS, or any other interested party. We attempted to eliminate any personal bias by reviewing each other's conclusions. We sought and reviewed major documents regarding the last five years of LSTA projects. We conducted interviews and focus groups in confidence and reminded study participants that their responses would not be individually identified, but only aggregated with other responses.

Description of the Methodology Employed

The following section is organized according to IMLS' requirements for the evaluation report's format. Also, this section contains the answers to Retrospective, Process, and Prospective questions.

<u>Identify how the SLAA implemented the selection of an independent evaluator using IMLS' criteria:</u> OSL developed a Request for Proposal containing details of the project and requirements for the evaluators. After the solicitation ended on July 15, OSL reviewed each submission to judge the evaluators' ability to carry out the requirements of the evaluation as stipulated by IMLS. OSL selected Bolt and Strege after judging them to have the professional competency to conduct the evaluation.

<u>Analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the research design, tools, and methods used</u>: This project used multiple data collection methods, including document review, interviews, a survey, and focus groups. We selected these particular methods because they were most likely to answer the research questions and because we have expertise in their planning, implementation, and

analysis. The ability to triangulate data from the multiple methods is a primary strength of this multi-method design.

Standardization in two of the data collection methods is the primary weakness of this research design. Because of time and budget constraints, the two evaluators conducted separate interviews and focus groups. Although we used a structured interview guide (see Annex K) and a focus group agenda, we did not ask the same questions in precisely the same way or follow-up in the same manner. We attempted to minimize this problem by frequent discussion about the focus groups and interviews.

Process followed: To address all the evaluation research questions posed by IMLS and OSL, we used four different study methods: document review of project files and other pertinent materials; interviews with OSL staff and other statewide project managers; a survey of Oregon's library community; and nine focus groups.

We engaged in data collection, interviews, focus groups with the LSTA Council and the SDLAC at the beginning of the project. After this step, we created and implemented the survey. Following the survey, we conducted seven additional focus groups with the library community. After collecting all the data, we analyzed the documents, transcripts from interviews and focus groups, and the survey results, using as a guide the IMLS and OSL's requirement.

Tools and methods used:
Document review: We identified documents (see Annex B) by reviewing what OSL provided on its webpage and determining the gaps in online availability. During our preliminary review of major documents and interviews with staff, we identified more documents to seek, and OSL staff quickly provided them. Although we identified the document review stage as part one of this study, we found that document review was ongoing, as we identified the need for additional information. We coded these documents to ascertain if the projects' activities resulted in desired outcomes and target results and if each project related to federal Act priorities and to OSL's goals.

Interviews: We interviewed the people identified in Annex C. We determined the questions beforehand and provided these questions to the interviewees to allow them ample time to prepare answers. After each interview was completed, we transcribed our notes and shared the transcripts with each other.

Survey: Members of the Oregon library community, including public library trustees, were invited to access the LSTA Evaluation Survey between September 19 and October 8, 2011. OSL employees had vetted the survey questions, and we used this feedback to finalize the questions and the sequence of the survey. Project evaluator Dr. Rachel Applegate also reviewed the questions and provided the analysis. (See Annex J for the survey instrument. See Annex K for the Constituent Survey Report.)

The survey contained many questions in which respondents were to rate a particular service or identify their level of agreement with a statement. We translated these ratings into a five-point scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 is the extreme negative, 3 is neutral, and 5 is the extreme positive. Therefore, a score above 4 is very positive, a score of less than 4 is average, and a score of 3 and below is negative. For more information about the rating scale, see Annex K. Completion rate for the survey was 76.6%; 333 people started the survey and 255 of those completed it. We analyzed the survey's overall results considering all respondents as one group. In addition, we identified

statistical differences among responder groups. We analyzed survey results according to generally accepted and standardized statistical tests as outlined in Annex D.

Focus groups: We conducted focus groups with members of the LSTA Council and with the SDLAC. In addition to these two groups, we held seven other focus groups in various locations in Oregon with a total of 43 participants. We based our questions on conversations with OSL employees and this evaluation's goals. Focus group questions, locations and the number of participants are included in Annex I. We coded the transcripts independently and then discussed similar and dissimilar findings.

Data sources: We consulted multiple sets of data sources for this evaluation. Our document review relied on documents provided by OSL, including LSTA reports, IMLS annual reports, and OSL Board of Trustees and other groups' minutes. The interviews relied on library development staff members and project managers as the source of data. OSL invited focus group participants who provided information, and OSL provided information on the survey's availability to Oregon's library community.

People interviewed: The list of individuals interviewed and their title and affiliation is in Annex C.

Participation of project/program stakeholders in the evaluation process: Evaluation stakeholders and those involved in creating the new Five-Year Plan participated in the survey and focus group data collection activities. OSL staff members provided documents and advertised the survey's availability. OSL invited focus group participants who represented all types and sizes of libraries. The LSTA Council and the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee members participated in focus groups.

Participation of intended users of the evaluation in the evaluation process: The users of the evaluation report participated in the evaluation in many ways. OSL provided documents for review, made employees available for interviews, arranged focus groups of the LSTA Council and the SDLAC, invited focus group participants, and made local arrangements for the seven focus groups held across Oregon. OSL also advertised the survey's availability. The LSTA Council and OSL staff provided feedback on the summary report of survey, focus group reports, and the preliminary evaluation report.

Validity and reliability of the evidence: The evidence is valid or measures what it proposes to measure in the following ways. Multiple OSL staff members, LSTA-funded project managers, and others created and reviewed the documents we examined. For example, OSL employees vetted LSTA annual reports numerous times before sending the reports to IMLS staff members who also reviewed these reports for errors or omissions. Therefore, we assume that the documents we reviewed are accurate. We assume that those people we interviewed did not provide false information and that their information is both valid and reliable.

Survey validity and reliability: The survey results are reliable. All respondents answered the same questions and each response received the same analysis. We assume that other researchers could use our survey in Oregon and would receive the same general results and the same statistical significance findings. Surveys have inherent limitations on validity. Respondents must fit their responses into pre-determined categories, such as "agree or disagree" or "often or never," and may have different understandings of these choices. To combat this deficiency, representatives from the survey audience pre-tested the survey to provide feedback on any confusing survey parts. We used this pre-testing to

modify the original survey language. To provide greater depth of information and to triangulate the findings, we also conducted focus groups.

Focus group validity and reliability: Focus group results are inherently weak on reliability because small sample sizes and the interaction among participants diminish the ability to replicate results. However, we consider our focus group results to be valid. We are reasonably certain that focus group participants understood our questions and provided responses that were "true" to their own experiences, values, and beliefs. Because focus group participants, in a face-to-face setting, may be reluctant to provide negative comments, the survey provided anonymity. Using both methods provides greater overall validity for the report as a whole. OSL staff members did not attend focus groups, to avoid influencing the discussions.

Ethical considerations**:** We maintained confidentiality of the identities of survey respondents. OSL knows the names of focus group and interview participants, but we did not match their comments with individual names in our transcripts or in this report. We do not present any piece of evidence outside of its contexts in order to promote our conclusions or recommendations. Working together, evaluators questioned each other for any bias or subjectivity in this research and analysis.

Strategies used for disseminating and communicating the key findings and recommendations. OSL will make the evaluation report widely available to Oregon's library community by announcing its availability in posts to listservs and by posting on the OSL website. These postings are a very effective method of reaching most of Oregon's libraries. The report will also be shared by OSL staff as they work with libraries in Oregon and will be used by the LSTA Council to develop the 2013-2017 LSTA Five-Year Plan.

Evaluation Findings

Retrospective questions

1. *Activities undertaken under the current Plan addressed all six IMLS priorities and three IMLS purposes.* The following table shows the number of LSTA projects in relation to the three IMLS purposes and the total amount spent in each year on these purposes. These priorities cover all six of the IMLS priorities. OSL awarded sub-grants for all three purposes every year with the emphasis first on technology, then on lifelong learning, and finally services to persons having difficulty using libraries. Of some concern is the decline in projects in the third category.

Table 1: Number of projects and amount of LSTA funds expended on each of the three IMLS purposes.

Award Purposes	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Totals
Technology Awards	13 Awards $1,058,376	17 Awards $1,092,190	12 Awards $2,542,382	12 Awards $1,039,195	14 Awards $1,276,606	68 Awards $7,008,749
Lifelong Learning Awards	8 Awards $724, 620	13 Awards $986,563	12 Awards $701,359	12 Awards $791,659	10 Awards $753,750	55 Awards $3,947,951
Difficulty Using Libraries Awards	4 Awards $280,216	5 Awards $255,520	6 Awards $190,851	2 Awards $115,788	2 Awards $55,065	19 Awards $897,440

OSL established 31 targets in the Plan. Of these, 12 were met, six partially met, 11 not met, and two for which accomplishment could not be determined. A table in Annex E, prepared by OSL staff,

shows the status of all targets in the Plan. Two major concerns arise. First, the targets that were addressed or accomplished were activities or output targets. Second, we found no consistent methodology to determine if an activity made a difference in the lives of users and in the work of librarians

Determining the ultimate impact of a library service on a library user is difficult for a variety of well-known reasons. A multitude of factors influence changes in a person's life; using a library service is only one of those factors. Organizations such as libraries find contacting service recipients difficult because of lack of contact information or privacy issues. Furthermore, the user may not know if the library service resulted in a positive change until long after they received the service. Discovering the impact of school library services on children is even more problematic because schools place an even higher protection on student privacy. L-net has attempted to ascertain satisfaction measures through online exit surveys. The Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) and OSLIS received unsolicited anecdotal information from teachers.

Survey and focus group results show that OSL activities had a positive impact on Oregon libraries, a main target audience for many of OSL's programs. See below for more information on this positive outcome. However, as mentioned throughout this evaluation, OSL has collected little impact data beyond anecdotes on the results of their programs during the implementation of the Plan. Instead, OSL focused on collecting usage or output data as a substitute for impact data. We collected some impact information and report this in discussions about each statewide program targeted for in-depth analysis.

2. To what extent were these results due to choices made in the selection of strategies and to what extent did these results relate to subsequent implementation? The answers vary from program to program. OSLIS is extremely sensitive to its users and responds quickly to expressed problems and needs. For example, OSLIS was one of the first services in the US to respond to the changes in MLA and APA citation standards and has become a model across the country. While there is substantial information about Continuing Education (CE) needs from the Metz study, discussed below, OSL plans to take action based on the recommendations in this evaluation. Participants in the CSLP program provided feedback, which led to OSL's continued participation in the national collaborative. L-net's usage information causes some Oregon librarians to question the continued need for it; however, rural librarians were vocal in their appreciation.

3. To what extent did programs and services benefit targeted individuals and groups? We found that Oregon librarians value the OSL's use and administration of LSTA funds. Survey respondents were asked about their priorities for the next Five-Year Plan. On a scale where 4 is above average, public librarians gave highest ratings to the summer reading program (4.53), the database program (4.44), and early literacy programs (4.39). Academic librarians rated databases 4.16. School library respondents rated OSLIS (4.69), summer reading programs (4.14), and early literacy programs (4.10) highest. We assume that participants rated highest what they valued most. Survey respondents ranked the expansion of OSL consulting services (such as those provided by the school library and Youth Services consultants) into new areas last (public librarians 3.24; academic librarians 2.98; and school librarians 3.41).

Process Questions
OSL's Request for Proposal for evaluation services contained a set of Process Questions for investigation; this set is similar but not identical to those from IMLS. The following integrates these two sets. To answer these questions, we used data collected from document review, OSL staff interviews, and a focus group with the LSTA Council.

1. Were any modifications made to the 5-year state plan? If so, please specify the changes and if they were informed by outcome-based data? Were performance metrics used in guiding those decisions? OSL staff members report that they made no changes to the Plan, and we found only minor changes in the Plan's outcome targets based on the availability or lack of statistical information. These changes were not informed by outcome-based data.

2. How have performance metrics been used to guide policy and managerial decisions affecting SLAA's LSTA supported programs and services? Competitive grant applicants must link their proposals to the LSTA goals in Oregon's Plan, and provide measurable objectives, reasonable and adequate measurement methodologies, and a plan for publishing their results. The OSL Board used the results of projects funded under the "Extending Service to the Unserved" program to change its focus from creating library districts to supporting projects that explore other ways to serve those in unserved areas. However, OSL does not use performance metrics to guide decisions about LSTA programs and services.

3. What have been the important challenges to obtaining and using outcome-based data in relation to the operation of the LSTA program and to guide policy and managerial decisions over the past five years? One of OSL's challenges in collecting and using outcome-based measures for its LSTA-funded statewide and competitive grant programs is the lack of staff to plan and implement OBE for statewide projects and to instruct grant recipients on using OBE. Compared to similar states, Oregon's Library Development Services has six employees. Staff members understand that OBE is important, but with multiple responsibilities cannot take the lead in this endeavor.

OSL's past practice has been to use LSTA to fund state programs and competitive grants rather than funding more staff members. OSL and the Council have been reluctant to approve costly OBE activities in competitive grant projects, as the Council prefers to spend LSTA funds on services and programs.

Another challenge is the difficulty, expense, and lack of expertise to measure the outcome of projects where the target audience is the public. However, managers of projects which deliver online services could use surveys at the point of service to collect performance measures. In addition, OSL can collect impact measures regarding its CE activities for librarians, as their contact information is readily available.

4. What key lessons has the SLAA learned about using outcome-based evaluation? Include what worked and what should be changed. OSL believes that OBE is expensive and time-consuming to implement. However, as stated elsewhere in this section, even though OSL faces challenges to use OBE, the agency is eager to explore ways to plan and implement OBE in the next Plan.

5. How can the information and analysis derived from this evaluation best be used to identify benchmarks for the next five-year plan? OSL has a committed and active LSTA Council that will draft the 2013-2017 Five-Year LSTA Plan. OSL's goal for the new Plan is that it be "organic," that is, derived directly from the needs of the Oregon library community as expressed in this report. OSL also will use this report's recommendations to help identify outcomes-based measures to include in the new Plan. Both OSL staff members and the LSTA Council are very interested in finding ways to use OBE to measure whether projects make a difference for their intended audiences.

IMLS Prospective Questions
1- 3. *How will lessons learned about improving the use of outcome-based inform the state's next five-year plan? How does the SLAA plan to share performance metrics and other evaluation-related information within and outside of the SLAA to inform policy and administrative decisions during the*

next five years? How can the performance data collected and analyzed to date be used to identify benchmarks in the upcoming five-year plan? This evaluation of the Plan has produced substantial new data from the survey and focus groups and a synthesis of existing data and reports. The collection of data can inform decisions that OSL will make in the preparation of the 2013-2017 Five-Year Plan. We offer some criteria that OSL might use to determine which current programs to retain, improve, maintain at a limited level, or eliminate, and what new programs to initiate. Potential budget cuts at the national level make the determination of criteria a critical decision-making task.

Suggested Criteria
- What is the relationship of the program to OSL **mission and values**? Does the program support the mission and values?
- What OSL programs are **unique** and accomplish outcomes that no other program can? What demonstrates the value of libraries in a community?
- **Usage** history of a program
    - Has use increased, decreased, or remained the same over time? A decrease might indicate a decline in the need for the program or a need for more publicity.
    - Is usage declining or increasing in specific types of libraries or geographic areas? A program may be worth continuing if it strongly benefits a type of library.
- What is the **cost** per use of elements of the program? A low cost per use might indicate that it is worth continuing even if not heavily used. A high cost per use might be cause for closer examination.
    - What is the current and potential impact of the program compared to the cost? Do libraries report the program is of value, despite a high cost?
    - What is the return on investment in the program? Is there a "big bang" for low cost even if the program may not be as important as another program?
    - Can the program be maintained to produce an acceptable benefit at the current cost, even if enhancements would improve the service?
- What is the perceived **need** for the program as reflected in surveys, focus groups, or studies such as the CE study?
    - Is the program designed to benefit all libraries? All of one type of library? A specific geographic region? Is this determined to be equitable in terms of other needs?
    - Is the program needed enough to warrant investment of LSTA funds to improve it?
- Do **future trends** in Oregon call for a different response from libraries; for example, closing of state offices forcing people to go to the public library to receive information about government programs?
- Are there **political reasons** to continue a program or enhance it, for example, OSLIS and the decline of school libraries?
- Does the program produce **public recognition**, enthusiasm, and positive attitudes? Is this recognition worth the cost? The CSLP and Battle of the Books may be examples of this.

4. What key lessons has the SLAA learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other States could benefit from knowing? Include what worked and what should be changed. In 2010, OSL staff member Ann Reed and volunteer Jane Scheppke analyzed OSL recent competitive grants to determine best practices. Their paper, "Oregon's LSTA State Grant Program: Excavating Best Practice, Reaching towards Transparency" (http://data.memberclicks.com/site/ola/olaq_16no3.pdf), was published in the fall 2010 issue of *OLS Quarterly*. In the article, they state, "The OSL's LSTA Web site allows potential grant applicants to look over most of the grant applications, progress reports, and peer evaluations submitted in the past ten years." They continue, "To date, the State Library staff has not had time to mine the

records for developing best practices." While this information is available for review and replication by other libraries, focus group participants asked OSL to take the initiative to provide "replication packets" to help libraries implement the projects that have been most successful.

OSL provides a voluminous amount of information about LSTA competitive grants, including studies, competitive grant applications and reports, and grant peer evaluations. Some states do not provide grant reports directly and might benefit from OSL's example. Reed and Scheppke commented:

> While some best practices only apply to specific types of projects, there are patterns of success and failure that become apparent as one reads past LSTA grants. Libraries may use LSTA money to fund a variety of projects, but the basic formula for success stays remarkably constant. With thorough outreach, smart staffing, and strong community support, libraries across the state have achieved great things with the help of Oregon's LSTA grant program.

Statewide Program Analysis

The Request for Proposal identified seven programs for more in-depth evaluation of their impact and benefit to libraries. These programs are: the Plinkit Websites for Public Libraries Project; Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS) Portal; Statewide electronic database licensing program; continuing education projects, including the Northwest Central CE Network; L-net, statewide e-reference service; Youth Services; and Competitive grants. The evaluation of each program is below. Recommendations for possible changes in each program are in Annex F.

Plinkit
Background**:** Plinkit (Public Library Interface Kit) is a web-authoring environment libraries can use to create library websites. Oregon's Plinkit project is the offshoot of a 2003 -04 LSTA-funded grant to the Multnomah County Library. In 2005, OSL began to administer the project. In 2006, representatives from five state libraries and regional organizations formed the Plinkit Collaborative. Its goal is to provide Plinkit to libraries beyond Oregon and to pool funds for software development, training, documentation, and marketing. As of November 2011, 58 of Oregon's 128 public libraries use Plinkit as their website.

Relation to IMLS priorities and OSL goals**:**
IMLS Priority: Plinkit provides improved access to information resources and therefore meets LSTA's first priority: "Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages."

Oregon Goals: Plinkit is tied to Goal 1 in Oregon's Plan: "Providing Access to Information Resources: All Oregonians have access to high-quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives."

Plinkit achieved results identified in the LSTA Act and the Plan*:* Plinkit benefited its targeted group, Oregon public libraries. Study participants identified a number of positive impacts from this project. Neither this study nor OSL evaluated Plinkit's impact on Oregon's residents or library users to find if they benefited from improved library websites.

 Plinkit's targets **:** OSL identified two specific targets for Plinkit in its Plan.

Target 1: Increase the number of visits to Plinkit sites. Evaluation: OSL developed a baseline for this measure in 2008 and in 2010 began reporting the number of average daily visits to all Plinkit sites, www.plinkit.org and oregon.plinkit.org. Between 2010 and 2011, visits decreased from 6,541 to 6,028, a drop of 8%, therefore, not meeting its target.

Target 2: Increase the number of features and/or information resources available on Plinkit sites (Introduce one to two new features and/or information resources/services per year). Evaluation: OSL has met this target by increasing the features available to project participants each year and implementing a major update of system software. In 2009, Plinkit received an award from the Center for Digital Government to recognize progressive and innovate web sites.

OSL spent the following LSTA funds on Plinkit.

Plinkit	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012 Estimate
Oregon	$73,823	$49,000	$51,027	$63,000	$52,000
National Collaborative	$10,000	$ 6,000	$ 8,000	$ 8,000	$ 8,000

Questions Posed by OSL in the RFP
1. How is the identified project working for library consumers and library staff in general? Study participants identified positive impacts from Plinkit. Users who responded to the survey agreed that their library saved money, that library users were better served, and that Plinkit was an essential library service. Focus group results confirmed these findings; many participants agreed that "we would not have a website without Plinkit." We have no information about how library users view Plinkit, but librarians strongly agree with the statement that their users are better served because of it.

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts? Plinkit is very successful at reaching libraries without the resources either to hire a staff web specialist or to contract for Plinkit-like services. Larger public libraries with their own IT staff find Plinkit less useful because of their in-house expertise. In addition, some libraries are required to use the services of and conform to standards set by city or county government IT departments.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? When asked how they heard about Plinkit, 33% of the responders answered "through a colleague." About 20% cited "contact from the state library" and another 20% said "a conference or a meeting." These responses confirm the importance of personal contact in Plinkit marketing efforts.

4. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate? Many libraries cannot participate in the Plinkit project due to local restrictions. However, some that could participate are reluctant because they perceive that Plinkit offers limited functionality and is "dated." A refreshed Plinkit design may provide motivation for non-participating libraries, without municipal restrictions, to join Plinkit.

5. How satisfied are library clients and library staff with the identified project? Although most participants appreciate the availability of Plinkit, many are frustrated with some aspects. Both survey respondents and focus group members identified the same problems, including Plinkit's slow response time and limited functionality. One respondent called Plinkit "kind of old fashion." Other study participants called for Plinkit to integrate social networking applications.

6. How has the identified project benefited libraries and their users through cost savings? Survey respondents strongly agree with the statement "my library has saved money on web services because of Plinkit." Although this study does not include a cost-benefit analysis, over the last five years, OSL spent $67,780 annually on Plinkit. Using an average of 50 participants, the annual expenditure per participating library was $1,356. Libraries would likely pay much more for website services, including maintenance, hosting, and training, without Plinkit.

Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)

Background*:* OSLIS is twelve years old, and was created by a cooperative effort of the Oregon Association of School Libraries (OASL) and OSL. It began as a tool to help school librarians teach information literacy skills. It has evolved into an online educational tool for both students and educators that includes Gale databases and Learning Express arranged for elementary and secondary students; a citation maker following the updated MLA and APA format; suggested lesson plans and resources for elementary and secondary teachers; and the ability for registered users to establish a "my stuff" file for their personalized work. This latter feature allows students to create work at school to continue at home or at the public library. An OSL staff member and a committee of OASL members manage OSLIS. New school library standards, based on the American Association of School Librarians' standards, will be built into OSLIS when these standards are completed. OSLIS staff continuously updates its resources and website with new functionality. Content teams regularly add content such as information literacy lesson plans. OSLIS staff completely overhauled the portal in 2008 to include Web 2.0 functionality.

Relation to IMLS purposes and OSL goals**:**
IMLS Purpose: OSLIS provides improved access to information resources and therefore addresses the first IMLS priority: "Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages." Due to reduction of school library services, particularly in rural areas, OSLIS also addresses the sixth IMLS priority: "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 level."

Oregon Goals: OSLIS meets Oregon LSTA Goal 1: "All Oregonians have access to high quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives." It also meets OSL Goal 2: "All Oregonians possess the information literacy skills necessary to find, evaluate, and use the information resources that they need to succeed."

OSLIS achieved outcomes identified in the LSTA Plan and Act*:* OSLIS has been continuously enhanced to meet the expressed needs of its users with increased functionality and resources. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest, school librarians rated OSLIS their second highest priority (4.67) after databases (4.73), which are delivered through OSLIS. Librarians and teachers who use OSLIS praise it highly. However, all data on achievement of outcomes is usage data and anecdotal. As with other programs, there is no impact-based data.

OSLIS Target*:* There is one target for OSLIS in Oregon's Plan: Increase the use of OSLIS website resources other than databases (Target 20% increase in each year covered by the 2008-2012 Plan.) In 2009, this was changed to an increase in daily visits. Use increased every year, 16% between 2008 and 2009, 11% between 2009 and 2010, and 11% between 2010 and 2011, but not at the 20% level.

OSL spent the following LSTA funds on OSLIS:

Grant	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
OASL contract	$30,000	$30,000	$24,337	$30,000	$30,000
School Library consultant	$63,786	$42,000	$52,095	$53,000	$53,000
Technical support	$34,755	$114,450	$23,857	$34,000	$23,000
E-books		$40,000	$16,782		
Total	$128,541	$226,450	$117,071	$117,000	$106,000

Questions posed by OSL in the RFP

1. How is the identified project working for library consumers and library staff in general? Schools are the most frequent but not the only users of the OSLIS portal. Except for the databases, which require Oregon residency, all information on OSLIS is freely available and is used by school librarians and teachers across the country. OSL staff provide approximately 14-18 training sessions a year about OSLIS, mainly at state conferences and, when requested, for education service districts (ESD) or school districts. The change from EBSCO to Gale databases required additional training sessions and support, as users had to learn new protocols. The update of the APA and MLA citation format has been extremely well received and is easy to use.

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts? Predictably, survey respondents had different responses depending on the type of library in which they worked. School librarians were the heaviest users and most supportive. Public librarians reported they did not know enough about OSLIS, and academic librarians found the resources on OSLIS to be less relevant to their needs. There were few school librarians in the focus groups, and few of the participating public and academic librarians had used OSLIS; most were not aware of OSLIS.

OSLIS seems most effective at reaching larger schools, which may employ a school librarian despite recent layoffs, particularly if the school librarian attends conferences where a program on OSLIS is presented. Additional outreach efforts are required to reach smaller and rural schools and schools without a school librarian.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? School librarians who responded to the survey reported learning about OSLIS at conferences such as OASL and those for school boards and educators. In 2012, OSLIS will send a letter describing OSLIS services to all school principals¸ school library staff, curriculum, and technology heads in school districts, ESDs, and home school groups. OSLIS coordinators are attempting to identify one person in each school district who can be a primary contact for OSLIS, promote OSLIS to students and educators, and encourage students and educators to use OSLIS to support their instructional needs. OSLIS staff think that OSLIS use will increase if a school district places a link to OSLIS on its website. Without this link, students and teachers must search to find OSLIS. OLSIS staff do not know if this mailing will increase use and have no systematic plan in place to train the school district contacts about OSLIS. The limited time of OLSIS staff have made it difficult for them to offer more training. Staff send regular information about OSLIS to a listserv with approximately 1,200 subscribers and post OSLIS news to the OASL listserv, which has approximately 400 subscribers. Data about OSLIS use are available, and OSLIS staff have discussed analyzing these reports to determine which areas of the state to target for additional publicity or training, but to date have not done so.

*4. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate***?** Educators, students, and library staff need to know about OSLIS and how to use it, in order to participate. Users praise the access to the databases and particularly the citation maker. OSLIS offers in-person training at conferences and selected training when requested to do so and has created self-paced tutorials. These are currently unavailable because of technical problems with the OSLIS website. OSLIS plans to develop additional online tutorials. Public librarians can be a source for informing students about OSLIS if these librarians know about its benefits.

5. How satisfied are library clients and library staff with identified project? Users of OSLIS rated it highly, with children's librarians saying that users are better served (4.58), that it is essential (4.25), and that the training is useful (4.56). However, the rating for ease of use was only 2.32. This low rating may have occurred because the full OSLIS website was unavailable due to revisions during both the survey and focus group period. One participant in the focus groups said, "OSLIS has been going down a lot. It's hard to get to the databases. If they want people to use it, it has to be stable." Others have found OSLIS difficult and complicated to use. One potential user said, "We have participated in a training session but there was so much to it that it was overwhelming. Our teachers think it's too complicated for the kids to even use. There's great info on it but there needs to be a simpler way to get everyone on board with it." These users could have been referring to the use of databases in general; focus groups discussed the overall difficulty of searching databases.

We found no outcome information about OSLIS' impact on student achievement; however, there is anecdotal information about OSLIS usefulness from users. Some positive comments volunteered by several different OSLIS users include:

> I just wanted to take a moment to say THANK YOU! I did a review lesson on citation maker with sixth graders this past week and it went so well.… I was thrilled to have it go so smoothly and get maximum learning time out of the class session.

> We were all amazed at the plethora of great resources you've made available for teacher, librarians, and students in Oregon. It is truly incredible the amount of great information and tools you've brought together in such an easy to use interface. Kudos to you and the others who have worked on OSLIS over the year.

> To be blunt, the majority of [college name omitted] students struggle in life. We are a business, medical, tech school and many of our students were not successful in high school. So, this MLA tool helps these students take a difficult task of writing a works cited by scratch into a fun activity by using the generator… The generator is simple and easy to follow.

> OSLIS is virtually a school library with lesson plans and information literacy information. But databases are the most important.

6. How has the OSLIS benefited librarians and their users through cost savings? The most important benefit for schools is that they do not have to pay for databases. Most schools have no subscriptions to databases and would have no access without the databases provided by OSL. One person commented, "I am concerned about the continuation of databases offered through OSLIS. Our ESD has cancelled all the databases they provide to schools for the next year. The Gale databases and virtual library are such a valuable part of our library program."

Statewide Database Licensing Program
Background: From 2005 until 2009, OSL used LSTA funds to subsidize the purchase of database licenses for Oregon libraries. Those for K-12 libraries were funded at 100% by LSTA funds. Starting in October 2009, using LSTA funds, OSL fully supported the database licenses for 22 products from Gale/CENGAGE Learning for a cost of just under $400,000 per year. In November 2010, LearningExpress Library was also fully subsidized. The Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC) provides advice to the OSL staff and the LSTA Council, which advises the OSL Board of Trustees. Ninety-seven percent of Oregonians served by a public library had access to the statewide databases. This program is open to non-profit school, legally established public, tribal, and non-profit academic libraries.

Relation to IMLS priorities and OSL goals:
IMLS Priority: The Database Program provides access to information resources and therefore meets LSTA's first priority: "Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages."

Oregon Goals: The Database Program is tied to Goal 1 in Oregon's Plan: "Providing Access to Information Resources: All Oregonians have access to high-quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives."

Program targets: OSL identified one target for the Database Program as follows: "Increase number of searches by public library patrons 10% each year." In 2008, OSL changed this target from reporting searches from public library patrons to reporting average daily visits from all types of libraries. OSL made this change because the previous database provider could not provide the necessary information by type of library. Evaluation: OSL did not meet its target to increase average daily visits by 10% a year.

Database Program Target	2008	2009	2010	2011
Increase the use of the statewide databases by public library patrons by 10% annually (changed to average daily visits)	13,081	14,665 +12.11%	12,491 -14.82%	15,793 +27.88%

OSL spent the following LSTA funds on the Database Program.

Database Program	Actual 2008	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Estimate 2011	Estimate 2012
Subsidy	$210,072*	$299,981*	$527,898	$547,898	$547,898
SDLAC	0	0	$2,500	$5,000	$5,000

*In 2008 and 2009, OSL had pre-paid using previous allotments, so expenditures for those two years were reduced.

Questions Posed by OSL in the RFP
1. How are databases working for library consumers and library staff in general? Oregon librarians value the overarching goal of the Database Program, which is to enable all Oregonians, wherever they live, to have access to high-quality information resources. Study participants strongly endorsed the project's value in equalizing access to information resources.

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts? Oregon libraries know about the Database Program. Two hundred of the 296 survey

respondents knew about this program and all the focus group participants were familiar with this project. Almost half of the 200 survey respondents use the databases at least once a week. The current statistics collected by OSL show that school libraries are the heaviest users of the databases.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? As mentioned above, the study found that most Oregon librarians know about the Database Program. This familiarity is due to the project's longevity and its success. In addition, OSL and the database vendors provide training across Oregon, which increases library staff members' awareness of the program. Study participants suggested that one-to-one training by a librarian is the most effective way of demonstrating the value of the databases to library users.

4. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate? Most eligible libraries do participate in the program. However, the amount of their use depends on the training that they have received and on the value that they see in the products.

5. How satisfied are library clients and library staff with the identified project? Public and school libraries support and value training about databases. Survey respondents from these groups strongly agreed that training improved their understanding of the databases and their ability to help library users benefit from the databases. Academic librarian respondents were less likely to attend training saying that they already know how to use the databases.

School and public libraries survey respondents strongly agreed with these statements: that they "couldn't provide the equivalent resources," and "the databases are an essential part of my library's services." The following quote summarizes the impact of the Database Program:

> Databases are an essential part of our service and collection offerings to patrons. They help fill holes in our collection, save money on print-based purchases, and allow greater functionality in helping patrons access information.

Participants from academic libraries believed that the current database products do not meet the needs of their students and faculty. Survey results show that academic respondents were likely to rate training and the impacts of the databases lower than respondents from other library types. Because many academic librarians are displeased with the current general database, respondents from these libraries might have answered more negatively about the impacts of the Database Program than if the product satisfied them. Of the 34 survey comments received from academic librarians, 32 of those and all Focus Group participants from academic libraries complained about the change from EBSCO to Gale. The following comment is typical of those received:

> We were one of the academic libraries that opted to purchase the general periodicals database from the previous statewide vendor because our analysis showed it provided more value, content, etc. for our users. As a result, I don't think we can say we depend on the statewide [databases] in the way we have previously.

Oregon librarians believe that their users underutilize the databases because users do not understand their value and the products are too difficult to use. Focus group participants indicated that the Database Program would have more impact if OSL implemented a "discovery layer" on top of the databases, and one suggested the Encore or Bibliocommons products as examples. Study participants believe that OSL should promote the databases directly to Oregon residents. Focus group respondents tied a lack of awareness and use by library patrons to their lack of awareness of what the library offered in general. The following statement expresses this sentiment.

> We collectively have not succeeded in making enough patrons aware of the resources in the databases – perhaps there should be some public interest announcement developed for TV?

6. How has the identified project benefited libraries and their users through cost savings? Study participants from school and smaller public libraries clearly stated that their libraries could not afford similar information resources. Overall, survey respondents agreed with the statement that their library saved money on print and online resources by participating in this program.

Continuing Education Projects and the Northwest Central CE Network

Background: OSL used LSTA funding for several CE projects during this Plan's period. Funds have supported MLS scholarships each year; for BCR membership before BCR closed; for a library science collection at OSL; for webinars offered by the College of DuPage; for a grant to the Portland Community College to update the Northwest Central Continuing Education Network; and for a statewide study of CE needs. The Northwest Central Continuing Education Network grew out of the PORTALS project that provided CE to Washington and Oregon. When PORTALS ceased operation, it left a budget of $160,000 that was used to create and fund Northwest Central. Portland Community College (PCC) assumed the management of and received a small grant from OSL to redesign the website and increase its content. PCC allows providers to add content about CE opportunities to the database directly without mediation of PCC staff. This is arranged by topic, date, and region. It also allows the posting of resources from workshops for download and future use.

Relation to IMLS purpose and OSL goals:

IMLS purposes: The CE projects collectively meet the IMLS first priority: "Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages."

Oregon LSTA Goal: CE projects collectively meet LSTA Goal 4: "Increasing capacity to provide library service."

Continuing Education Projects results identified in the LSTA Act and the Plan: Data on the results of the CE activities is mixed. All MLS candidates except one received their MLS or are still in school. Eighteen of the 29 graduates are employed in professional positions; however, none is employed in rural Oregon, a goal of the program. The library science collection is available to librarians in the state; however, there is no data on its use. An evaluation of the College of DuPage webinars was essentially positive. The Northwest Central CE Network was redesigned and the content doubled but no data was available on its use. The Continuing Education study was conducted and its results discussed below.

CE Targets: Target 1: Create baseline of data regarding number of library staff (at all levels) who have participated in some form of library education. (Target: set baseline in 2008 and set increased targets for each year 2009-2012.) The data were collected so the target was met, however, there is no information that shows the impact or use made of the continuing education. The following table shows the number of participants and annual percentage change.

2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
1032	1356 (+31%)	1497 (+10%)	1380 (-8%)	Data not available

Target 2: Determine the number of librarians holding MLS degree in rural Oregon. The number was reported, so the target was met.

2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
60.82	59.90 (-2%)	64.75 (+8%)	65.20 (+1%)	Data not available

A goal is to increase the number of professional librarians in rural Oregon. This has proven difficult because, in general, the unemployment rate in rural Oregon is higher than in urban Oregon; libraries have fewer positions open for professional librarians; and most of the MLS scholarship recipients were already library support staff in urban libraries and remained in their urban area after graduation.

Target 3: Increase the number of continuing education opportunities that are site-neutral (participants can take part from any location. There is incomplete data on the full number of CE events sponsored by OSL and no data on the number of CE events taken because of finding them on the Northwest Central Network. It is unclear if this target was met.

Target 4: Measure the effectiveness of staff development offerings. Routinely conduct pre- and post-participation surveys to assess outcomes/effectiveness of training efforts and what happens as a result of the training (e.g., implemented a new technology, added a service targeting a population identified in the LSTA purposes, etc.). Target not met.

OSL evaluated the College of DuPage webinars at the conclusion of the webinars, and participants gave positive responses to the training, but OSL did not ask how participants would use the training, nor did OSL follow up with participants to find if training continued to provide benefits.

OSL spent the following LSTA funds on Continuing Education.

Program	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
OLA MLS Scholarships	$20,000	$ 800*	$ 19,796	$25,000	$25,000
BCR	$ 2,497	$ 2,675			
Library Science Collection	$ 8,000	$10,000	$ 11,986	$13,000	$13,000
College of DuPage			$ 2,500	$ 2,500	$ 2,500
PCC Northwest Central Network	$12,160				
CE Study			$ 66,297		
Total	$42,657	$13,475	$100,579	$40,500	$40,500

*FFY08 covered most of the 2009 scholarship, hence the low number reported on the FFY09 annual report

Questions Posed by OSL in the RFP
1. How are continuing education projects working for library consumers and library staff in general?
All of the major programs (OSLIS, databases, Youth Services, L-net) conduct training about their programs. Measuring the impact of the program is primarily anecdotal. There is little evaluation of the Northwest Central Network. Only one survey respondent, a CE provider, mentioned that Northwest Central had increased her program's visibility. Several survey respondents volunteered that the greatest value of the CE was the ability to download handouts from conferences, particularly those from the OLA conference. MLS scholarship support has resulted in MLS graduates, but some interviewed questioned the need for more support for MLS students considering the declining market for professional librarians and the inability of rural areas to offer employment.

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts? CE provided by the major state programs is effective at reaching those programs' users. People have an interest and a need to learn how to use databases, L-net, children's services, etc, so they are ready to be trained, particularly when there are webinars or other online CE activities available. The survey and focus groups participants rated training in all these areas relatively high. In fact, many program users call for additional training. However, the CE Database is a passive CE effort; the initiative to add CE events rests with the providers and the initiative to find and take CE with the user.

In 2010, OSL awarded a grant to Portland Community College for Ruth Metz Associates to conduct a CE assessment in Oregon. Metz conducted 29 regional focus groups to ascertain the CE needs of Oregon librarians. Based on the results of the focus groups, Metz created a Taxonomy of Training Needs, indicating the top CE needs identified in the focus groups. The Metz report essentially had three major recommendations: 1) convene a council to coordinate CE within Oregon; 2) contract with a CE coordinator and part-time regional staff to facilitate CE activities within the region; and 3) support a CE Web Portal, an enhancement of the Northwest Central CE Network. The Metz study reported significant support for CE from Oregon librarians.

The survey respondents ranked CE as the fourth priority with a rating on a 5-point scale of 3.95 from public librarians, 3.35 by academic librarians, and 3.97 by school librarians. About 24% of the survey respondents had heard of the Northwest Central CE Network, mostly public librarians; 13% had used it to find an event; and 5% had taken a CE event they found on the site. Survey comments reported the major use of the Northwest Central Network was to download resources from past workshops.

The three focus groups that discussed CE were divided on the emphasis that CE should receive from OSL. Some think that there was sufficient CE available from multiple sources that OSL need to do nothing. Some think that future CE should focus on the training about the OSL's current statewide programs. Others thought that OSL should implement the Metz study's recommendations with an emphasis on the highest expressed needs in the taxonomy.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? As mentioned above, CE is most effective at reaching librarians interested in currently funded statewide programs.

4. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate? To increase participation in CE, two suggestions surfaced. The first is awareness of what is offered. The Northwest Central CE Network is primarily passive. OSL does announce and encourage participation in the CE that it offers, however, this could be increased. The second need is for more online offerings. The Metz Report indicated that librarians wanted more face-to-face training. Focus group participants, however, indicated that they now have less time or resources to travel and attend in-person workshops. Until recently, librarians were reluctant to take online webinars; now more librarians are comfortable with them and find them an attractive and affordable alternative to travel.

5 How satisfied are library clients and library staff with the CE offered by OSL and the CE Database? The results of the survey, the focus groups, the Metz study, and other background documents suggest that library staff appreciate the CE offerings and give them high marks. However, none of the CE examined evaluated if the CE participants actually used the CE in their subsequent library work.

6. How has CE projects benefited libraries and their users through cost savings? The CE offered by the OSL is free. A cursory review of the Northwest Central CE Network shows that most of these CE

events also seem to be free, although in-person workshops may require travel at the participants' expense. MLS scholarships benefit the recipients. OSL pays for Oregon librarians to participate in College of DuPage webinars.

L-net
Background: In 2003, OSL and the OLA launched a pilot virtual reference project. Currently this project, now called L-net, is managed by LSTA grant-supported staff at the Multnomah County Library. The project has an Advisory Board with the responsibility of advising the L-net Program Coordinator and the Fiscal Agent about L-net's development, implementation, promotion, and evaluation. L-net's premise is that Oregon's libraries can serve communities well by connecting Oregon citizens directly to reference librarians online and that collaboration ensures effectiveness and efficiency.

Relation to IMLS priorities and OSL goals:
IMLS Priorities: The L-net project provides access to reference services and therefore meets the IMLS second priority: "Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national and international electronic networks."

Oregon Goals: L-net is tied to Goal 1 in Oregon's Plan: "All Oregonians have access to library resources: All Oregonians have access to high-quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives."

L-net achieved results identified in the LSTA Act and the Plan: Study participants identified a number of positive impacts from the L-net project. L-net's exit survey of its users showed that the majority of those who answered the survey were very satisfied with the service.

L-net targets: In the Plan, OSL identified two specific targets for L-net. L-net met the first target and almost met its second target.

L-net Targets	2008	2009	2010	2011
1. Increase daily questions by 10% per year	59	80	94	94
2. Improve 80% satisfaction rate to 90% during 2008 – 2012	85%	88%	83%	86%

OSL spent the following LSTA funds on L-net.

Year	Actual 2008	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Estimate 2011	Estimate 2012
L-net	$294,000	$294,000	$305,000	$358,000	$334,000

Questions Posed by OSL in the RFP
1. How is the identified project working for library consumers and library staff in general? Survey respondents from public and academic libraries gave high scores to these impacts: "users are better served," and "L-net is an essential part of my library's services." School librarians rated these impacts lower. In addition, respondents rated L-net technical support and training very high. Many survey participants agreed with this statement, "With our small staff, L-net has a huge positive impact. It allows us to better serve our patrons." Focus group participants, particularly from rural areas, used and appreciated the service, saying that, "L-net saves staff time and assists particularly where staff are untrained or few."

However, survey respondents gave low ratings to these impact statements, "my library users depend on L-net to find the information resources that they need," and that, "my library increased its visibility because we use L-net."

Libraries that provide staff to answer L-net questions are considered L-net partners. Survey respondents from partner libraries selected "giving back for what the library received from L-net" as the primary reason for their participation. Partner respondents from public libraries were more likely to say this networking makes their job more interesting than respondents from other libraries. Respondents added, "Sharing information should be a core ethos for reference librarians, and therefore an expected part of the job," and, "I like keeping my chops up with student patrons and those who are far away."

The L-net program provides a good model for collecting and using a variety of output data. Project staff members collect user evaluations online though exit surveys. They also evaluate partner training and the annual Summit meeting. The online exit survey is particularly well thought out, asking brief questions about the user and their experiences. L-net project staff also use sampling techniques, which can reduce the time spent on data collection and analysis. L-net staff provide a summary of the data collected in a quarterly document, comparing current and past statistics. The L-net Advisory Board discusses this information and uses it to suggest procedural or policy changes.

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts? According to the usage report, dated July 1, 2010 to June 30 2011, 42% of respondents who answered an exit survey said they were using the chat service for a school assignment. During the last two years, 2010-1012, academic library use of L-net has increased by three percent; however, most L-net users identify themselves as affiliated with their public library. As stated below in recommendations, L-net can target multiple audiences to improve usage.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? The survey showed that only 15%, 42 of 288 total respondents, had not heard about L-Net. Respondents identified conferences or meetings and colleagues as the ways in which they first heard about L-net. Even though most librarians know about L-net, some said when they have an opportunity to use it, they forget to do so.

4. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate? We found that some library staff believe that they need to answer questions for L-net before using the service, which is a misconception. Potential partner libraries need to know the time commitment and the extent of training required. We also found that some librarians, particularly from academic libraries, believe that they can answer all their users' reference questions

5. How has the identified project benefited libraries and their users through cost savings? The costs and benefits of L-net received many comments during the focus groups and some comments in the survey. Some participants were concerned that the cost of L-net exceeds its overall benefits. These evaluation participants urged OSL to study this issue and make decisions about the future of L-net based on its results. One focus group participant suggested using Tutor.com instead of L-net to control costs.

Youth Services Program
Background: The OSL Youth Services program, funded by LSTA, consists of a Youth Services consultant who coordinates state-level summer reading offerings, plans and executes a biennial training institute, and provides consulting services to public libraries. Oregon is a member of the

national Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) which provides a common theme and professionally-designed support materials for all member libraries. Oregon's membership to CSLP is offered to public, volunteer, and tribal libraries in partnership with the Oregon Library Association (OLA). The Youth Services consultant serves as Oregon's voting representative for CSLP and coordinates communications between CSLP and OLA. Member libraries use CSLP materials to provide local summer reading programs. The Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute (Institute) is a biennial training for public library staff without an MLS who work in Youth Services. The Institute has a maximum attendance of 30 to facilitate learning. Priority is given to staff at small, rural libraries. Youth Services consulting is usually provided electronically, and the most frequent requests are for resources and advice. When invited, the Youth Services consultant will visit a library and, when traveling, visits additional libraries when possible.

Relation to IMLS priorities and OSL goals:
IMLS Priorities: The Youth Services program provides services that address IMLS' sixth priority: "Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth to age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line." It also addresses IMLS's fourth priority: "Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations."

Oregon goals: The Youth Services program addresses two Oregon LSTA goals: Goal 3: "Fostering the Joy of Reading: All Oregonians experience the joy of reading and develop and maintains a high level of reading ability," and Goal 1: "Providing Access to Information Resources: All Oregonians have access to high quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives." Goal 1 has as an outcome of "supporting the development of basic library services though consulting services provide by the OSL's Library Development Services."

The Youth Services program achieved results identified in the LSTA Act and the Plan: OSL's Youth Services program clearly benefits Oregon's public libraries directly and children indirectly. Focus group and survey respondents all reported satisfaction and positive impacts from both the consulting services and the Institute; however, neither of these was heavily used. Institute participants complete an evaluation immediately after the Institute. The evaluation asks the participants to identify the Institute's utility and suggest improvements for the next Institutes; impact data from the participants is not collected at some later date.

Library reading programs in the summer are a result of a combination of state support through the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) and local summer reading program efforts. Focus groups participants and survey respondents gave credit to OSL for their efforts in funding CSLP and representing Oregon on the national CSLP committee. Focus group participants felt the quality of the CSLP materials and the consistency of the program across Oregon (and even the nation) made their local program better. Some anecdotal stories emphasized both the quality of the CSLP materials and the value of having the same program nationally. On the constituent survey, respondents rated OSL support of summer reading programs as one of the highest rated programs and 57% felt they could not have the same quality program without CSLP. They gave the state library's support of CSLP and local programs a 4.31 overall rating (on a 5-point scale); 4.3 for the quality of the CSLP materials; 4.56 that the children enjoyed the program; 4.36 that the children maintained their reading skills over the summer; 4.44 that more children used the library as a result of the program; 4.59 that parents appreciate the program; and 4.36 that teachers appreciate the program.

<u>Youth Services targets</u>: OSL identified one specific target for Youth Services in its Plan and one desired outcome: Award statewide grant or statewide project to create an OBE research design that assesses the impact of library-based reading programs on development and/or maintenance of reading skills. If possible, create expectation for replication of the study on a periodic basis for a longitudinal study.

<u>Evaluation</u>: OSL issued a RFP for a consultant to conduct the study. No consultant responded, and OSL did not have the in-house resources to conduct the study. Thus, this target was not met. However, the Youth Services consultant reports that she is still hopeful to conduct the study. This study was also recommended by focus group participants.

OSL spends the following LSTA funds on the Youth Services program. This support remained even; funding for competitive grants for Youth services program varied during this period.

Program	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Estimate	2012 Estimate
CSLP membership dues and manuals	$ 3,249	$ 3,249	$ 3,028	$ 3,400	$ 3,400
Consulting services	$86,733	$65,000	$60,560	$60,000	$60,000
Focus Institute		$10,000		$10,000	
Every Child Ready to Read			$13,409		
Competitive grants	$87,57 (1)	$28,130 (1)	$45,901 (1)	$49,560 (2)	
Total	$177,552	$106,379	$122,898	$122,060	$63,400

<u>Questions Posed by OSL in the RFP</u>
1. How is the identified project working for library consumers and library staff in general? All 130 public libraries in Oregon participate in the CSLP. Participants in focus groups praised CSLP highly with comments such as, "With collaboration we now have quality materials with less work;" and, "We can plug into the theme and use the same resources." Participants in each focus group mentioned national studies that show that reading in the summer helps children maintain or grow their reading skills. Some participants shared anecdotes of conversations with teachers who felt their students' reading scores had not deteriorated over the summer. A school librarian commented in the survey, "I am a librarian in a public school and my students tell me about their experiences at the public library and how much they enjoy the SRP (summer reading program)." One benefit mentioned in three focus groups was that children visiting their grandparents or parent after a divorce could easily participate in the library's program because of the uniformity of the national program. One focus group participant said that circulation and library use increases in the summer, "In 2000, we had 11 children in our summer reading program; in 2011 we had over 400. We could not have done this without CSLP."

Survey respondents from school and public libraries gave CSLP and summer reading programs high marks, with public librarians rating it their highest priority at 4.53 and school librarians their third highest priority at 4.14, after OSLIS and databases. Participation in summer reading programs has grown from 131,342 children in 2006 to 165,487 in 2010.

Survey respondents reported little use of the Institute; only 11 respondents said they attended the Institute and 33 said they had employees who attended the Institute. This small group rated the impacts positively, with over half of both attendees and supervisors saying the Institute changed the way they served their users and that they learned valuable information. One attendee

commented, "I wanted to tell you how much my notebook from the conference has already helped me. I will be using the great information provided in the library presentation from the conference."

The Youth Services consultant estimates that from October 2010 to June 2011, she provided approximately 50-60 hours of consulting each month, mainly providing resources or advice. One librarian responded to her help by saying, "You send out such good information! I've been stealing some of your suggestions and sharing them on our Twitter and Facebook, so our users can connect with the content."

2. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which required additional outreach efforts? In the summer reading programs, students who participate in the program are those who have transportation to the library and are willing to engage in library programs during the summer. More difficult to attract are children from low-income families. Several focus group participants said they take materials to free lunch sites, day-care centers, pre-schools, and other sites serving low-income families. "Even if these children cannot participate in the full CSLP, they can be exposed to it." The Youth Services consultant thought that the most difficult children to reach are those from low-income families or from high-risk families, with drug or abuse issues, and from ethnic and cultural minorities.

The Youth Services consultant said that the libraries needing her support the most are those without a dedicated Youth Services librarian. She sympathized with small and rural libraries with limited staff for which it is a struggle to do anything more than a story time and SRP. She would like to reach out to these librarians with low-effort ideas that they can do to improve services.

3. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups? Children with a history of library use are the easiest to attract to summer reading programs. If the local school publicizes the summer program, attendance increases. One survey comment epitomized this concern:

> I wish there were better connections between schools and the public library. Some schools were doing their own summer reading programs, which is great but we can't expect the kids to do two programs. It was also very hard to get into schools to distribute materials and while we were welcome, I don't think some schools bothered to even pass out flyers. The school librarians need to be involved with the summer reading program.

4. What do non-participating libraries need to participate? All 130 public libraries are CSLP members and used CSLP materials to provide local summer reading programs in 2011. Currently the Institute is limited to 30 participants and expansion requires additional resources. Similarly, OSL needs more resources for the Youth Services consultant to expand consulting.

5. How satisfied are library clients and library staff with the identified project? Focus groups and the survey participants reported high satisfaction with all aspects of the Youth Services program. While there is data from other states on the impact of summer reading programs on student reading scores, there is no Oregon data other than anecdotes from teachers and school librarians. The Youth Services consultant commented that "the true outcome [of a library program] is that a child is ready to read when he or she enters kindergarten and [that data is] very hard to get."

The Institute's target audience is those without an MLS who work with youth in libraries. Again, there is no systematic OBE conducted several months after the Institute; however, the focus groups, the survey, and letters sent to the Youth Services consultant show positive impact. Anecdotal letters submitted by librarians who have benefited from the consulting also show the positive impact of consulting.

6. How has the identified project benefited libraries and their users through cost savings? There was consensus in the focus groups that the CSLP saved their library money, but more importantly, saved time and provided a professional image difficult to replicate without the CSLP. When asked if libraries could provide a summer reading program without CSLP, survey results were mixed. Only 2% said they would have to cancel the program entirely, but 57% said they would offer a more limited program and 27% said the library would develop their own. The impact on small libraries would be stronger. Two respondents in the survey commented, "Although Summer Reading is essential, it would likely happen sporadically. It would easily get cancelled because of the staff time involved." A second person said, "The library would develop its own summer reading program but would burden the staff with extra planning." The Youth Services consultant reports that most of her requests for consulting are for information and resources that librarians "don't have time to search for and hunt down themselves." She feels her best contribution is just "being there." The impact of the Focus Institute is reported as learning new information and networking with colleagues.

Competitive Grants

Background: Each year OSL offers approximately $800,000 in LSTA funds for projects from legally established libraries or non-profit organizations that serve libraries. Public, academic, and special libraries can apply for these grants; school libraries are also eligible, but OSL requires that these applicants coordinate with other school libraries and with the Oregon Association of School Libraries.

OSL's grant application process consists of two steps. The first phase is a brief proposal, which the LSTA Council reviews. If the LSTA Council approves the proposal, they then recommend that the OSL Board invite the applicant to submit a full proposal. The Council provides feedback to the applicants at that time. The second phase starts when the Council receives the applicant's full proposal, which they review, and, again, send their recommendations to the Board. OSL requires that grant recipients submit quarterly reports, in addition to final narrative and budget reports.

Relation to IMLS priorities and OSL goals:
IMLS Priority: OSL offers libraries the opportunity to apply for funds for projects that meet at least one of the priorities in the LSTA legislation.

OSL Goal: In addition to meeting one IMLS priority, each funded project must meet one OSL Plan goal.

Competitive Grants Program targets: OSL identified six targets related to competitive grants in its Plan.

1. Award sub-grants to develop statewide information literacy curriculum. Evaluation: Met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	Task force articulates development of skills across the K-18 curriculum
2009	09 13-2a. Cooperative Library Instruction Project
2010	10-16-2a. Cooperative Library Instruction Project 2
2011	11-05-2s. Oregon Association of School Libraries. Standards for School Libraries

2. Award sub-grants for pilot implementation of a unified/coordinated information literacy curriculum incorporating OBE. Effort will be made to develop evaluation of the sub-grants that utilize outcome-based evaluation methodology by 2011. Evaluation: Grant #10-16-2a funded the

development of information literacy tutorials. The applicant proposed to collect usage statistics, not OBE measures. Evaluation: Partially met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	None
2009	None
2010	10-16-2a. Cooperative Library Instruction Project 2
2011	None

3. Report number of competitive grants in readers' advisory/reference, at least one by 2012. Evaluation: Met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	08-10-2m. Oregon Author's site
2009	Oregon 150 Reads – Oregon reading list (noncompetitive)
2010	Downloadable e-book opening day (noncompetitive)
2011	Downloadable e-book opening day (noncompetitive). Added selection of e-reference books to OSLIS

4. Award sub-grants to encourage staff sharing that enables enhanced services to targeted populations, at least two by 2012. Evaluation: Not met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	None
2009	None
2010	None
2011	None

5. Award sub-grants to demonstrate new technologies, at least two by 2012. Evaluation: Met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	None
2009	09-02-5m Sage open-source automation demonstration
2010	10-11-5m Sage open-source automation
2011	None

6. Award sub-grants that enable libraries to participate in open-source projects such as LibraryFind and Plinkit, at least two sub-grants by 2012. Evaluation: Met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	None
2009	09-02-5m Sage open-source automation demonstration
2010	10-11-5m Sage open-source automation. Plinkit update.
2011	Oregon State University - Oregon Digital Library Portal

7. Target programs and services to fit local communities, at least one sub-grant to design or replicate appropriate programs or services. Evaluation: Met.

Year	Sub-grant Award
2008	08-01-5p and 08-04-5p
2009	09-11-1p inspired by 02-6-2.7
2010	6 grants awarded.
2011	5 grants awarded.

Questions posed by OSL in the RFP

1. How does the competitive sub-grant process help meet the goals of the LSTA State Plan? Each sub-grant project states that it will meet a goal in the Plan; however, success of each project varies. OSL monitors sub-grant progress by requiring quarterly reports. The final reports, which OSL posts on the web, require recipients to provide output summaries, in addition to other information.

		Oregon LSTA Goals 2008-2012 Fiscal Years				
		2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Estimated	2012 Estimated	Totals Estimated
Goal 1 Number of Awards & $	6 Awards $348,330	11 Awards $989,511	10 Awards $1,207,961	8 Awards $1,157,586	6 Awards $1,027,837	41 Awards $4,731,225
Goal 2 Number of Awards & $	9 Awards $1,238,841	4 Awards $404,760	3 Awards $220,061	3 Awards $132,200	2 Awards $119.000	21 Awards $2,114,862
Goal 3 Number of Awards & $	2 Awards $40,405	4 Awards $178,630	1 Awards $10,000	3 Awards $40,675	2 Awards $65,420	12 Awards $335,130
Goal 4 Number of Awards & $	3 Awards $79,920	6 Awards $366,295	5 Awards $267,601	6 Awards $325,354	5 Awards $272,626	25 Awards $1,311,796
Goal 5 Number of Awards & $	3 Awards $249,936	8 Awards $354,577	8 Awards $444,555	5 Awards $234,397	7 Awards $425,259	31 Awards $1,708,724
Goal 6 Number of Awards & $	2 Awards $105,780	1 Awards $40,500	3 Awards $115,666	1 Awards $76,430	3 Awards $113,949	10 Awards $452,325

Note: The table above has 6 data columns (2008 Actual, 2009 Actual, 2010 Actual, 2011 Estimated, 2012 Estimated, Totals Estimated) plus the row-label column and a leading spacer column.

2. *To what extent do competitive sub-grants benefit eligible libraries and library clientele?* Focus group participants identified the following benefits of OSL's competitive grant program:
- Allows experimental and innovative projects
- Encourages cooperation among libraries and other community agencies
- Acts as leverage for additional funding

Some sub-grant reports include anecdotes from grant recipients and project participants about the project's value, and most reports contain accounts of how the project met its identified outputs.

Multnomah County Library hired a third-party evaluator to assess the Kaboom project participants' satisfaction with its activities and used pre- and post-class evaluations in its project "Families Reading Together." The Oregon Digital Library Consortium also employed user satisfaction surveys for projects funded in 2008 and 2009. Most sub-grant recipients do not describe how they measure user satisfaction or report outcome-based project results, making benefit difficult to assess.

3. *What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate in the sub-grant program?* Two hundred twenty-four or 76% of survey respondents know about the competitive grants program. Non-applicants who responded to the survey identified the primary reasons for not applying as "No time to write," and "No ongoing funding" to maintain the program.

4. *Is the competitive sub-grant program most effective at reaching any particular user groups? Are library user groups aware of the sub-grant program?* Many of the sub-grant programs are aimed at youth from birth to 18 and those who are unserved by libraries.

5. *How satisfied is library staff at eligible libraries with the sub-grant process? What changes are desired – as long as state and federal requirements are still met?* Oregon library staff is generally satisfied with the administration of the competitive grant program. In survey results, in which 4 was an average rating and 3 was a negative rating, respondents gave a score of over 4 to the following statements. Focus group participants confirmed the survey's results.
- The two-step application process allows grant applicants to refine their proposals.
- OSL staff members helped me when I asked for help with our grant application.
- OSL's written resources helped me when I wrote and submitted a grant application.
- I understood what I needed to include in the grant application.

Study participants shared the following ideas about how to change the competitive grant program:
1. Share the results of LSTA grants: Participants said that systematic sharing of results, particularly those that were successful, could enhance the value of LSTA grants. They asked that OSL increase efforts to help libraries replicate successful projects. Participants felt that even though grant recipients were responsible for project dissemination, that OSL shared responsibility for this.

2. Streamline the grant process: Study participants generally approved of the two-tier grant process. However, many participants requested a shorter time between beginning the application process and starting the project. Academic and school respondents want grant awards coordinated with the start of school and academic calendars. Grant recipients want fewer paperwork requirements, but understand the need to meet Federal requirements.

3. Some study participants said that small and rural libraries had more difficulty applying for LSTA grants than larger libraries because those who work there have little or no experience in grant writing and less time to write the grants, because of their multiple responsibilities. Some said that, despite these limitations, small and rural libraries could benefit from LSTA grants to larger libraries if OSL could show how to replicate successful projects. One suggestion was that OSL establish a special grant category for small libraries with limited awards and minimal requirements.

ANNEXES

A. The six IMLS Priorities, three IMLS Purposes, the Oregon LSTA Goals, the IMLS Evaluation Questions from the *Guidelines for Evaluation of LSTA Five-Year Plans*, and the Output and Impact Questions asked by OSL in the Request for Proposals.
B. Documents Reviewed
C. People Interviewed
D. Survey Analysis Process
E. Analysis of Plan Results Prepared by OSL Staff
F. Consultant Recommendations for Statewide Programs
G. Additional Questions Asked by OSL to be Addressed
H. List of Acronyms
I. Focus Group Report
J. Constituent Survey Instrument
K. Constituent Survey Report

Annex A
The six IMLS Priorities, the three IMLS Purposes, the Oregon LSTA Goals, the IMLS Evaluation Questions from the *Guidelines for Evaluation LSTA Five-Year Plans*, and the Output and Impact Questions asked by OSL in the Request for Proposals

IMLS Priorities

1. Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages;
2. Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national and international electronic networks;
3. Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries;
4. Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;
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; and,
6. Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line.

IMLS Purposes

IMLS has suggested to the states in the Drop-down Menus Guide that the six purposes be condensed into three for the purposes of reporting LSTA activity relating to the IMLS priorities. Oregon organizes all of their annual reports in this manner. The three priorities are:

1. Library technology, connectivity, and services
2. Services for lifelong learning in a variety of formats for individuals of all ages
3. Services to persons having difficulty using libraries

Oregon Goals in the 2008-2012 LSTA Five-Year Plan

OSL established six LSTA goals as follows:

Goal 1: Providing Access to Information Resources: All Oregonians have access to high-quality library and information resources, anytime, anywhere, that help them achieve success in school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives.
Goal 2: Developing Information Literacy Skills: All Oregonians possess the information literacy skills necessary to find, evaluate, and use the information resources that they need to succeed.
Goal 3: Fostering the Joy of Reading: All Oregonians experience the joy of reading and develop and maintain a high level of reading ability.

Goal 4: Increasing Capacity to Provide Library Services: Libraries in Oregon offer expanded access to information and educational resources, enhanced access to networked information, improved linkages between and among all types of libraries and more effective services to populations targeted in LSTA because library staff have the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need to effectively advance the six LSTA purposes.

Goal 5: Using Technology to Expand Access and to Increase Efficiency: Oregon libraries use cost-effective technologies to expand and enhance the access that all Oregonians have to information resources.

Goal 6: Positioning Libraries to Help Build Strong communities: Oregon libraries are centers of community life where Oregonians connect with information resources and with each other.

IMLS Evaluation Questions

IMLS asks the following questions be answered as part of the evaluation:

Retrospective Questions
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
1. Were modifications made to the SLAA's plan? If so, please specify the modifications and if they were informed by outcome-based data?
2. If modifications were made to the SLAA's 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 SLAA'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
1. How does the SLAA plan to share performance metrics and other evaluation-related information within and outside of the SLAA to inform policy and administrative decisions during 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 SLAA learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other States could benefit from knowing? Include what worked and what should be changed.

OSL Additional Questions on Outcomes and Impact

Competitive Grant Program Questions
1. How does the competitive sub-grant process help meet the goals of the LSTA State Plan?
2. To what extent do competitive sub-grants benefit eligible libraries and library clientele?
3. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate in the sub-grant program?
4. Is the competitive sub-grant program most effective at reaching any particular user groups? Are library user groups aware of the sub-grant program?
5. How satisfied is library staff at eligible libraries with the sub-grant process? What changes are desired – as long as state and federal requirements are still met?

Retrospective Statewide Program Questions
1. How is the identified project working for library consumers and library staff in general?
2. Did the activities undertaken by the project achieve results relate to the LSTA State Plan and the purposes identified in the Act?
3. Which user groups is the program most effective at reaching? Which require additional outreach efforts?
4. What types of outreach appear most effective for which groups?
5. What do non-participating libraries need to be able to participate?
6. How satisfied are library clients and library staff with the identified project?
7. How has the identified project benefited libraries and their users through cost savings?

Outcome Questions
What are the program's impacts on consumers served (for all consumers and the various sub-groups)?
1. What are the impacts of the service or assistance provided (staff and consumer)?
2. What type(s) of information assistance is each program most effective at addressing?
3. What types of inquiries/services/assistance are most difficult for the program to address?
4. What are the program's impacts in relation to effective information assistance alternatives available to consumers?
5. What is the nature and scope of assistance provided to consumers that they would not otherwise have if the program was not available?
6. To what extent is the program helping consumers who would not otherwise have a benefit from the program?
7. To what extent is the program complementary, supplementary or redundant to other programs or services available to consumers?

Annex B Documents
Consulted

2007

Himmel & Wilson. (2007). *Report of the Independent Evaluation of the Oregon State Library's Implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan, 2003-2008.*

2008

Oregon State Library. (2008)*. Annual Library Services and Act Technology Plan*. Submitted to the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Oregon State Library. (2008). *Library Services and Act Technology Plan. Annual Report. FY 2008.* Submitted to the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

2009

Gale-Cengage*. Satisfaction Performance Report (SPR*). September 06, 2009 - August 25, 2010.

Oregon State Library. (2009). *Library Services and Act Technology Plan. Annual Report. FY 2009.* Submitted to the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

2010

Gale-Cengage. *Satisfaction Performance Report (SPR*). September 13, 2010 - July 14, 2011.

Oregon State Library. (2010). *Library Services and Act Technology Plan. Annual Report. FY 2010.*

Oregon State Library. (2011). *Major Activities 7 Usage for OSLIS, October 1, 2007 – July 31, 2010.*

The Plinkit Collaborative. (2010). Plinkit 2.0 User's Manual.

Ruth Metz Associates. (2010). *Continuing Education for Oregon Library Personnel, Needs Assessment Report and Proposed Model.*

Oregon State Library (2010). *Comments of Oregon's LSTA Council on proposals on May 21, 2010.*

2011

Oregon State Library. (2011). Various OSLIS publicity materials.

College of DuPage (2011). *College of DuPage Library Futures eSurvey*

Oregon Library Association (2011). *Comments from Oregon Library Association Conference Session on Oregon's Five-Year Plan.*

Oregon Library Association (2011). *OLA MLS Scholarship Students Report*

Multi-Year Documents

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). Library Board of Trustees. *Meeting minutes.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). Library Services and Technology Act Advisory Council. *Meeting minutes.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee. *Meeting minutes.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). L-net Advisory Board. *Meeting minutes.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). L-net. *Survey results and usage reports.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). *Evaluation of Focus on Children and Young Adult Institute.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). *Evaluation of Summer Reading Program.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). *Oregon Competitive Grants Funded.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). *Library Services and Technology Act, Grant Activities Report, Oregon School Library Information System.*

Oregon State Library (2009-2011). *Biennium Review of LD 2009-2011 Team Charter.*

Oregon State Library (2008-2011). *Library Development Services Customer Satisfaction Survey.*

Oregon State Library (undated). *Project Proposal Evaluation Procedures.*

Oregon State Library (2009-2010). *Annual Performance Progress Report (APPR) for Fiscal Year (2009-10)*

Annex C People
Interviewed

Jim Scheppke State Librarian

MaryKay Dahlgreen Library Development Program Manager

Ann Reed Federal Programs Coordinator

Katie Anderson Youth Services consultant

Jennifer Maurer School Library consultant

Kate Vance OSLIS Committee Chair

Darci Hanning Technology Development Consultant

Caleb Tucker-Raymond L-net Service Coordinator

Emily Papagni L-net Partner Support Librarian

Donna Reed Director, Portland Community College Library

Roberta Roberts Continuing Education, Portland Community College

Debbie Lomax Contact, Northwest Central Continuing Education
Network

Ruth Metz Ruth Metz Associates

Annex D
Survey Analysis Process

All survey questions, except those in which responses allowed the respondent to choose more than one response, were tested for statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. For scale questions (ratings), this was a one-way ANOVA and for categories (including yes/no) this was a chi-square test.

Roughly speaking this means that we have high confidence (95% certainty) that an observed *difference* is real, that, for example, a difference between 3.3 and 3.9 is meaningful. Statistical significance does not refer to the magnitude of a difference, but to the certainty that it is not just sampling error. Thus, something is not *very* statistically significant. A difference can be *very large,* and statistically significant.

For questions in which respondents could choose more than one response, we reported simple descriptive figures. For some questions, we reviewed the responses to see if they were roughly proportionate. For example, if 60% of respondents overall were from public libraries and from 30% academic libraries, then if 20 public and 10 academic respondents selected something, their responses were proportionate. We noted those questions where the responses were **not** proportionate. This is *not tested statistically*, but roughly estimated.

Annex E
Targets of 2008-2012 Oregon LSTA Five-Year Plan with Results
Prepared by Ann Reed, Federal Programs Coordinator

Target	Target Amount	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Methodology
Goal 1- No net loss of public library service (from Progress Bd. Report)		Un and underseved 19.77%	Un and underseved 17.84% No loss	Un and underseved 16.28% no loss	Avail. Dec. 2011		Progress Bd annual report
Goal 1 - Success rate of district projects in enhancing library communication, cooperation, and community support to improve service to the public		Survey to be developed	Not done	Not done	Not done		
Goal 1 - Increased awareness of the potential of library service as measured through the Oregon Population Survey		State Library seeking alternate survey with defunding of Or. Progress Bd.		State Library seeking alternate survey with defunding of Or. Progress Bd.		State Library seeking alternate survey with defunding of Or. Progress Bd.	State Library seeking alternate survey with defunding of Or. Progress Bd.
Goal 1 - Increase in the use of OSLIS website resources other than databases (ave. daily visits- reset measure in Sept. 09)	20% increase in each year covered by the Plan	3,678	3,966 10.8% increase	4,237	4,698		
Goal 1 - Increase in use of L-net – average daily visits (measure changed to ave. daily questions)	Increase daily visits by 10% per year	59	80	94	94		
Goal 1 - Increase in use of L-net – Satisfaction rate	Improve 80% satisfaction rate to 90% during 2008 – 2012	85%	88%	83%	86%		

				6,541	6,028		
Goal 1 - Increase the number of visits to Plinkit sites	Develop targeted increase for each subsequent year	baseline for total visits per Plinkit site in 2008		6,541	6,028		
Goal 1 -Increase in the number of features and/or information resources available on Plinkit sites (Introduce one to two new features and/or information resources/services per year)		Award winning administrator's manual created	Platform updated for easier implement-tation. Manual for Plinkit users.	Upgrades to community calendar, added more links to quality sites	Added links to Learning Express and Opposing Viewpoints databases		
Goal 1 -Increase the use of the statewide databases by public library patrons	Increase number of searches by public library patrons 10% /yr	Academic + public+ school use is 13,081	Academic + public+ school use is 14,665	Academic + public+ school use is 12,491	Academic + public+ school use is 15,793		
Goal 2 - Completion of survey on current K-18 information literacy education efforts to aid in design of statewide curriculum	Completion and dissemination of useful baseline information by end of 2009	Not done	Some work in conjunction with WOU Clip project	Not done	Not done		
Goal 2 -Planning project to explore creation and implementation of a statewide K-18 information literacy curriculum	Formation of task force to develop needed steps, procedure and timeline		FFY 09-13-2a WOU work on college Curricu-lum.	FFY10 grant project of WOU to dev. curriculum for state academics	FFY2011 grant: OASL Standards for School Libraries		

Goal 2 -Award subgrant to develop statewide information literacy curriculum	Task force to articulate development of skills across the K-18 curriculum		FFY 09-13-2a WOU work on college curriculum statewide	FFY10 grant project of WOU to dev. curriculum for state academics	FFY2011 grant: OASL Standards for School Libraries		
Goal 2 -Awarding of subgrants for pilot implementation of a unified/coordinated information literacy curriculum incorporating OBE	Effort will be made to develop evaluation of the subgrant(s) that utilize(s) outcome-based evaluation methodology by 2011	None	None	FFY10 grant project of WOU to dev. curriculum for state academics	None		
Goal 2 -Report number of competitive grants in readers' advisory/reference	Minimum of one project during 2008-2012	FFY08 grant to OLA for Oregon Author's site 08-10-2m	Noncompetitive Oregon 150 Reads – Oregon reading list	Download-able e-book opening day funded (noncompetitive)	Download-able e-book opening day funded (noncompetitive) / Added selection e-reference books to OSLIS		

Goal 3 - Award statewide grant or statewide project to create an OBE research design that assesses the impact of library-based reading programs on development and/or maintenance of reading skills. If possible create expectation for replication of the study on a periodic basis for longitudinal study	Plan for county level data, school district if possible. Create baseline in first study by 2010 and compare results in follow-up study by 2012	None	None	Funding approved by Board of Trustees for study of impact of Early lit. activities	Funding cancelled at request of OSL given constraints of labor and time	Funding cancelled at request of OSL given constraints of labor and time	Outsource to known researchers now reporting year 1 of a longitudinal study. Oregon to try to sign on for later years.
Goal 3 - Percentage of Hispanic population using libraries within previous year (as measured through the Oregon Population Survey)			Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Target: 58% usage by 2010; Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon Progress Board
Goal 3 - Percentage of Oregonians over the age of 65 using libraries within the previous year as measured through the Oregon Population Survey			Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon population survey defunded, OSL not yet found alternative	Oregon Progress Board
Goal 4 - Create baseline of data regarding number of library staff (at all levels) who have participated in some form of library education	Set increased targets for each subsequent year 2009 – 2012	1,032	1,356	1,497	Available Dec. 2011		Annual statistical survey
Goal 4 - Determine number of librarians holding MLS degree in rural Oregon	Base for 07 = 67 – fscs outlet file status=no	60.82	59.90	64.75	Available Dec. 2011		Annual statistical survey

Goal	Target						
Goal 4 -Increased number of continuing education opportunities that are site-neutral (participants can take part from any location)	Set increased targets for each subsequent year – 2009 – 2012			8/31/09 – online events 50 (8/31-12/31)	5/6/10 – online events 35 (5/1-8/1)	4/26/11 – Online events in NW central 24 (5/1-8/1)		Measure NW central avail. Which includes LSTA-funded BCR
Goal 4 - Effectiveness of staff development offerings	Routinely conduct pre and post participation surveys to assess outcomes /effectiveness of training efforts and what happens as a result of the training,				Done – 79.31% of post-survey respondents thought College of DuPage webinars useful (used ffy10 funds for subscript.)	Avail. April 2012		
Goal 4 - Timely release of statistical data (Target: Oregon Public Libraries data set on OSL website by 12/31 each year	2007 early release	On time	On time	On time				
Goal 4 - Meet IMLS federal public library data submission deadline	2007 early filing	2008 early filing	2009 early filing	2010 regular deadline met	2011 regular deadline met			Team Charter evaluation
Goal 4 - Number of subgrants awarded that encourage staff sharing that enables enhanced services to targeted populations	Target: at least 2 by 2012	None	None	None	None			
Goal 5 - Award subgrants to demonstrate new technologies	Target: at least 2 by 2012			09-02-5m Sage open-source automation demonstra-tion	FFY10 Sage ILS year 2, / e-book open-ing	None		

Goal 5 - Planning and conducting "Digital Summit"				conduct summit in 2010 (shelved)	Not done - lack of staff time		OSL to investigate coop with BCR, and outsource this with adopting of BCR standard statewide
Goal 5 - Adoption of a set of Oregon library community standards for digitization projects				Awarded FFY2010 grant to OSU for portal to bring Oregon digital collections together	Digitization guidelines added to 2013 LSTA grant packet		OSL to investigate coop with BCR, and outsource this with adopting of BCR standard statewide
Goal 5 - Development of priority list of collections resources that are candidates for digitization as a planning tool			FFY09 UO collaborative collection dev. for archives.	Have disseminat-ed report from FFY09 grant on archives	No progress		OSL to investigate coop with BCR, and outsource this with adopting of BCR standard statewide
Goal 5 -Awarding of subgrant(s) that enable libraries to participate in open-source projects such as LibraryFind and Plinkit	At least two subgrants awarded during 2008 – 2012		09-02-5m Sage open-source automation demonstration	FFY10 Sage ILS year 2 – Noncompt. Grant to upgrade Plinkit	Oregon State University - Oregon Digital Library Portal		
Goal 6 - Encourage public libraries to do a community analysis	At least one subgrant awarded during 2008-2012			Grant proposal turned down – not replicable	Proposal from Salem in full proposal		
Goal 6 - Target programs and services to fit local communities	At least one subgrant to design or replicate appropriate programs or services	FFY08 grant to Cornelius, and MCL "This is how I use my library"	09-11-1p Wasco Van – inspired by Jefferson County 02-6-2.7	6 FFY2010 grants awarded fit	5 FFY2011 grants awarded fit		

Annex F
Consultant Recommendations for Statewide Programs

Plinkit

Recommendations: If Plinkit is included in the next five-year plan, OSL might consider the following recommendations:

1. OSL should develop more outcome and output measures regarding the use and the impact of Plinkit. Plinkit has a small, homogeneous user group, which makes outcome evaluation easier than for projects with a large, heterogeneous group. The Plinkit Project Manager maintains a close relationship with participants. Drawing on this personal relationship, she could ask participants to complete an annual questionnaire to measure impacts and compare these responses over time.

2. OSL should address Plinkit's problems. Plinkit's Project Manager is aware of these problems; however, OSL's small staff size requires each Project Manager to have multiple responsibilities, leaving little time for them to plan and implement changes. Another factor that makes solving Plinkit's problem difficult is that increasing the complexity of Plinkit's software to offer more functionally may increase its difficulty of use for the public librarians involved, many of whom do not have technical expertise.

Even though lack of time and the difficulty of making changes are barriers to improving Plinkit, we recommend that OSL make a Plinkit update a priority. Enough study participants expressed dissatisfaction to suggest that Plinkit may lose dissatisfied members who can identify an alternative. Plinkit's Project Manager should make the planning process transparent and involve Plinkit participants in identifying needed changes and solutions.

3. After Plinkit is improved, OSL should market the new Plinkit to libraries. Many public libraries cannot join Plinkit because they must use city or county web resources. However, with increasing local budget constraints, the refreshed Plinkit might appeal to both former and new participants.

OSLIS

Recommendations: If OSLIS is included in the next five-year plan, OSL might consider the following recommendations:

1. Continue publicity efforts to seek contacts in school buildings and promote linking from school websites to OSLIS.
2. Prepare online tutorials or archive webinars to show potential users the benefits of OSLIS and how to use it.
3. Stabilize the OSLIS website as quickly as possible so that users are not discouraged from use.

Statewide Database Licensing Program

Recommendations: If the Database Program is included in the next five-year plan, OSL might consider the following recommendations**:**

1. OSL should develop more outcome and output measures regarding the use and the impact of databases. OSL spends almost one-quarter of its LSTA funds on database licenses, yet in its last Plan only established one target to measure its use, satisfaction, and impact on libraries and their users. OSL should set targets for training outcomes and database use, and investigate the impact of databases on library users.

2. OSL should address the problem of academic librarians' dissatisfaction with the current database product. This dissatisfaction is no surprise to OSL, the OSL Board, the LSTA Council, and SDLAC. It is not within this evaluation's scope to posit which database is best for Oregon, or offer an opinion whether one database vendor can fulfill the need for a general database for all Oregonians. Our recommendation is to continue to encourage open discussion about this issue before losing the support of academic librarians for this important project.

At the most recent meeting, SLDAC members showed an awareness and concern for this issue. Members expressed an interest in pushing information about their deliberations to the library community to increase librarians' awareness of their decisions' parameters and processes. In addition, members discussed the overarching values and goals of this project. It is our recommendation that the SDLAC enact efforts to publicize their activities. We suggest that they might consider webcasting their meetings, and making these interactive with viewers, by offering a public comment period at the meeting's start. OSL can also archive these webcasts for convenient viewing.

Many study participants from academic libraries said they felt surprised, even shocked, by the decision to switch database providers. Librarians from all types of libraries requested a longer transition time between changes in databases. Academic librarians, in particular, said they had little time to revise online and printed database guides. Adding to the transition problems, the change happened in the summer, a time when most academic libraries are not fully staffed.

*3. OSL should continue database training and measure its effectiveness and impact on library staff members***.** Survey results showed that the respondents gave training a high ranking and that most reported that training improved their understanding of the databases and their ability to help users. This latter finding is particularly significant, because in the focus groups we heard that database use, at least in public and school libraries, is a heavily mediated service. Therefore, without trained staff capable of making library users aware of the databases and of training them, users will not benefit from databases. OSL should evaluate its training and that provided by vendors, not just at the end of the session, but several months later to determine if the training had an impact on the librarians' use of databases.

Continuing Education Projects and the Northwest Central Continuing Education Network

Recommendations: If CE is included in the next five-year plan, OSL might consider the following recommendations:

1. Increase CE offerings for established statewide programs, including archived webinars and tutorials.

2. In addition to any surveys done immediately after training, develop an automatic and consistent evaluation of CE activities, conducted approximately six months after the CE finishes, that asks what changes occurred in the way library work is performed because of the training. Make decisions about CE content and design based on the results of these follow-up surveys.

3. Convene a CE coordinating task force composed of major CE providers in Oregon. This task force's major first activity is to study the extent to which the OSL and its partners, such as OLA, should implement and fund the Metz recommendations.

L-net

Recommendations: If OSL continues the L-net Program in their next five-year Plan, they might consider the following recommendations:

1. OSL should take advantage of L-net competence and experience with collecting information about its users and measuring the impact of its training efforts. L-net sets targets based on data, and then measures and reports if the service meets these targets. L-net staff can consult with other OSL Project Managers about using data to measure satisfaction and use of their programs.

2. OSL should address concerns about the cost and benefits of L-net. Although most evaluation participants appreciate the L-net service and praise its technical support and training, some study participants questioned if L-net was worth the expense. Those who raised questions did not seem to dislike the concept of the service or any parts of its delivery, but suggested that the service could be provided less expensively. Along with this study, OSL should consider if L-net should continue to be operated through contract with Multnomah County Library or administered directly by the State Library. With a new State Librarian and an LSTA plan in the offing, these discussions are particularly timely.

3. L-net must continue to market to libraries. OSL should market L-net to three audiences. One audience is academic librarians who may believe, like one commenter, that, "L-net is not as useful for academic libraries. We feel that our patrons will not be adequately served by the help they can get via L-net." Another audience is those librarians who need reminders to use L-net, stating "My fault it's not used more - I forget to refer people to it,." The final audience is those who feel they should not use L-net because they cannot provide staff to answer questions.

Youth Services

Recommendations: If the Youth Services program is included in the next Five-Year Plan, OSL might consider the following recommendations:

1. OSL has twice considered conducting a study on the impact of early learning programs, which can include the summer reading program. While national data support the benefits of a summer reading program, Oregon research would be a selling point to encourage participation in library Youth Services programs.

2. Develop and distribute through multiple media a message about the value of the summer reading program to children. Endeavor particularly to develop partnerships with schools to encourage their students to participate.

3. Follow up on the impact of the Institute. The audience is "captive" in that OSL knows who attended and how to reach them. Pursue with both the participant and their supervisor the value of the program.

Competitive Grants

Recommendations: If OSL continues the Competitive Grants Program in their next Five-Year Plan, they might consider the following recommendations:

1. *Streamline the grant process.* OSL cannot help each individual find more time to write a grant application, but OSL might reduce the time needed to complete applications. However, streamlining the application presents a dilemma because, for accountability purposes, the form must require enough project information so that the LSTA Council can determine its feasibility and relation to the LSTA purposes. We also recommend that OSL shorten the cycle between the initial proposal and the receipt of project funding.

OSL can seek outside assistance in reviewing these processes from private organizations, such as the Oregon-based Meyer Memorial Trust or from Oregon's universities and colleges that have faculty skilled in the Lean process, a practice focused on eliminating waste to focus on what the customer values. Even though federal grant programs have different parameters than private businesses or non-profit organizations, a process review from those outside of government would be beneficial.

This review should also include a review of the use of the LSTA Council's time. Some members expressed frustration that they do not have the time to monitor projects' progress or review outcomes. Council members spend most of their time reviewing grant applications. They mentioned that their term length prohibits them from seeing a project through from start to finish.

2. *Share information about the grants.* OSL should promote successful grant-funded projects to encourage libraries to replicate them. In addition, OSL could share the methods for outcome-based assessment and project tools, such as Kaboom, through workshops and toolkits to replicate the projects. To increase awareness of LSTA projects to both librarians

and communities, we recommend that OSL make publicity a grant requirement. To help recipients do so, OSL should continue to provide customizable press releases.

Annex G
Outcome Questions Asked by OSL

Outcome Questions

OSL asked that seven outcome questions be addressed in the evaluation. The short explanations below summarize the information in the program sections.

1) What are the program's impacts on consumers served (for all consumers and the various sub-groups)?

      a. What are the impacts of the service or assistance provided (staff and consumer)

Databases	Oregon residents have equal access to information.
Plinkit	Public libraries have uniform, no-cost, quality websites.
L-net	Oregon residents have reference help available through various communication modes
OSLIS	K-12 students have equal access to information.
Northwest Central	Oregon Library staff have access to information about CE activities.
Youth services	Oregon's children have quality programs to stimulate reading and learning.

      b. What type(s) of information assistance is each program most effective at addressing?

Databases	Databases provide effective method to distributing information about multiple topics and at multiple levels to all of Oregon residents.
Plinkit	Plinkit is effective at delivering information about how to create and maintain websites to Oregon's public libraries.
L-net	L-net is effective at providing information for Oregonians who cannot find the information at their libraries.
OSLIS	OSLIS delivers information about the research process and citation making to students and information literacy to teachers. OSLIS also provides them access to the databases.
Northwest Central	This program delivers information about CE events in the Oregon and other states.
Youth services	The Youth services consultant offers quality information about youth services to Oregon's library staff. CSLP provides materials to support the summer reading program.

c. What types of inquiries/services/assistance are most difficult for the program to address?

Databases	Some academic librarians believe that the current general database does not offer sufficient information to meet students' and faculty needs.
Plinkit	Update of Plinkit functionality
L-net	Expansion of program into other libraries
OSLIS	Involvement of schools where there is no school librarian
Northwest Central	Passive aspect of database; lack of CE coordination in the state
Youth services	OSL has only one Youth services consultant and it is difficult to have enough time for in-person visits.

2. What are the program's impacts in relation to effective information assistance alternatives available to consumers?
    a. What is the nature and scope of assistance provided to consumers that they would not otherwise have if the program was not available?

Databases	Some libraries can afford to license databases, but most school and the majority of public libraries could not; therefore, their users would not have access to information.
Plinkit	Some public libraries would have no or inadequate websites.
L-net	Users would not receive answers to their reference questions in some libraries and after library hours in other libraries.
OSLIS	Students would not have access to the same quality of information to support their learning.
Northwest Central	Oregon's library staff would not have convenient and accurate access to CE listings.
Youth services	Children would not have quality programs through their public libraries.

b. To what extent is the program complementary, supplementary or redundant to other programs or services available to consumers?

Databases	In some libraries, databases complement or supplement other offerings, but most school and the majority of public libraries could not afford similar resources.
Plinkit	Some public libraries have not access to affordable website services in their communities; some public libraries do not have the technical expertise to maintain a website.
L-net	L-net services are complementary to existing reference services.
OSLIS	Some larger school library districts may have some databases, but most do not.
Northwest	No other local project organizes CE information. CE is randomly offered or

Central	for a statewide program.
Youth services	Communities would not have an extensive or quality summer reading program or library staff well trained in youth services.

Annex H
List of Acronyms

CE	Continuing Education
COSLA	Chief Officers of State Library Agencies
CSLP	Collaborative Summer Library Program
ESD	Education Service Districts
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
IMLS	Institute of Museum and Library Services
L-net	LSTA-funded 24x7 online reference service
LSTA	Library Services and Technology Act
OASL	Oregon Association of School Libraries
OLA	Oregon Library Association
OSL	Oregon State Library
OSLIS	Oregon School Library Information System
PLINKIT	Public Library Interface Kit
SLAA	State Library Administrative Agency
SDLAC	Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee

REPORT OF FOCUS GROUPS
EVALUATION OF OREGON'S FIVE-YEAR LSTA PLAN

Introduction

This report of the seven focus groups held in Oregon the week of October 17-21, 2011, includes the following sections:

- Description of the focus group process, including attendance and the agenda.
- Description of the collective findings organized by
  - Seven statewide programs
  - Needs and trends
  - Continuation of statewide programs
  - Potential statewide programs

This report presents the results of focus groups with no interpretations or recommendations. These results, along with the results from the survey, interviews, and document review, will form the basis of the Final Evaluation Report, which will contain final interpretations and recommendations.

Focus Group Process

We held seven, two-hour focus groups across Oregon. Karen Strege conducted three focus groups and Nancy Bolt conducted four focus groups. Table 1 shows a list of the sites of the focus groups and the number in attendance:

Table 1: Focus group locations and number of participants

Location	Number of participants
Eugene (Bolt) Eugene Public Library	8
Grant's Pass (Bolt) Josephine County Library	5
La Grande (Strege) Eastern Oregon Community College (In-person and conference call participants)	6
Lincoln City (Bolt) Driftwood Public Library	6
Madras (Strege) Jefferson County Library	6
Portland (Strege) Midland Library, Multnomah County	7

Wilsonville (Bolt) Wilsonville Public Library	11

We drafted the Focus Group agenda questions, and the Library Development Division staff members provided feedback. The final set of questions is found in Annex 1. In summary, the proposed questions covered:

- A review of statewide programs focusing on the impact of the program.
- Issues facing Oregon and potential library responses to these issues.
- Relation of ongoing funding of statewide programs to competitive grant allocation.
- Possible new statewide programs that might warrant LSTA funding.

Findings

The information below is organized by the major programs discussed and answers to questions about needs and trends, continuation of current programs, and possible new programs. We will fully explore all of these topics in the LSTA Five-Year Plan Evaluation.

Programs and topics explored in the focus groups include:

Programs
- Collaborative Summer Library Programs and Youth Services
- OSLIS
- Continuing education
- Plinkit
- L-net
- Databases
- Competitive grants

Other Topics
- Needs and issues
- Continuation of statewide programs
- Potential statewide programs

For programs that were discussed in at least four of the focus groups, we prepared tables of categorized comments to find commonalities among the different focus groups. The tables identify these commonalities and how many focus groups had participants who made comments on these topics. Participants in other groups may also hold these opinions, but did not express them. Additional topics beyond these common ones are also reported, although fewer focus groups reported them.

Comments on the State Library

Oregon library workers appreciate the efforts of the State Library. They have a lot of good will for the staff members and for the institution. They praised the State Librarian's tenacity, vision, and political acumen.

One group proposed a vision session with the New State Librarian to identify community needs and ways that the State Library can help libraries meet those needs. Other groups expressed concern about how technology, in particular e-books, may influence library collection, services, and facilities. They want leadership, and participation in developing a new Plan.

<u>Collaborative Summer Library Program and Youth Services</u>

Six of the seven focus groups discussed the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) and Youth Services, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Collaborative Summer Library Program and Youth Services

Issue	Number of Focus groups
Positive value of CSLP to the library.	6
Maintains reading scores of children over the summer.	4

Public librarians in six of the seven focus groups (Portland did not discuss summer reading) gave high praise to the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP). Academic and school librarians were also supportive. As elsewhere in the report, verbatim quotes are enclosed with quotation marks; our transcriptions of comments are not. Comments included:

- "With the collaboration we now have quality materials with less work."
- "Materials are professional looking; better than we can do on our own."
- "We can just plug into the theme and use the resources."
- "We don't know what we would do without the CSLP."

We also asked the librarians to comment on the impact of the CSLP on Oregon residents and libraries. Comments included:

- Participants believed CSLP maintains or increases children's reading scores during the summer. "CSLP helps kids avoid the 'summer slump'." While there are only anecdotal studies from Oregon, a great deal of national research shows this. One librarian said that a teacher told her that she could tell which of the children in her class had participated in the summer reading program because their reading ability was maintained or increased over the summer.
- Because of the national collaborative, children from other Oregon libraries and even other states, find the collaborative theme and materials familiar. "We all wear the same

t-shirts." They can continue their reading program in a distant library. This contributes to a national positive image of the library across the country.

- One grandmother reported to the librarian that she was impressed that her ex-son-in-law "actually" helped his son keep up his reading record in order to participate successfully in the library's CSLP. This impressed both the grandmother and the ex-wife.
- "The CSLP saves our library money." Some said they would have no program without CSLP and many said they would probably do a program on their own but it would be more expensive, take time currently spent serving users, and probably not be of as high quality.
- The CSLP builds partnerships. One librarian said she takes books on the CSLP theme to free lunch sites, day-care centers, pre-school, and other sites, particularly where there are low-income families who may have limited access to other reading materials. Even if these children cannot participate fully in the CSLP, they can be exposed to it. Without the provided CSLP program materials, library staff would not have time to make these visits.
- Circulation and library use goes up in the summer. "In 2000, we had 11 children in our summer reading program; in 2011, we had over 400. We could not have done this without the CSLP." The public is very responsive to the program.
- One library reported a companion reading program for parents and grandparents who complete it with their children.

Suggestions

- Librarians in two focus groups suggested that OSL add a statewide storytelling and performance program component to enhance CSLP. One librarian said programming should be "turnkey" like the CSLP materials.
- Public libraries need to work more closely with schools to recruit students.
- One librarian expressed concern that the same children participated every year and suggested additional outreach to "get out of the library building" and bring in new families and children.
- Publicity should stress the value of summer reading programs to children's education.

There were equally positive, although fewer, comments about youth services consulting because fewer librarians had used it. Participants appreciated that the youth consultant represented Oregon on the Collaborative Summer Reading Program national committee and felt that she conveyed their concerns to the national committee. One librarian commented that she frequently called the youth consultant, who was always very helpful, and that her services were of particular use to rural libraries. Another rural librarian said she felt that the youth consultant provided "professional back-up" for her services to youth.

Those librarians who attended the Institute for Children and Youth rated it as very helpful. Comments included:

- Appreciation that the Institute shared both ideas and the research about why programs worked for children.
- Networking was invaluable.
- Cannot afford to send staff and asked if OSL could help pay expenses.
- More information from the Institute should be shared with those who cannot go.

Those libraries that received a visit from the youth consultant felt it made a difference in their service and some expressed a desired for her to make more visits.

There were several suggestions for a new initiative in youth services. Tthese are covered later in this report in the section about Potential Statewide Programs.

OSLIS

There were very few school librarians in the focus groups, and few of the participating public and academic librarians had used OSLIS. This may be why OSLIS was only discussed in three focus groups. Many focus group participants were not aware of OSLIS, what it does, or the website. In one focus group, one member from the host library brought in a computer to show the OSLIS website.

Those who had used OSLIS found the database access the most useful for students, with the citation-maker the second most useful. The focus groups may have occurred at an unfortunate time for OSLIS because several librarians reported that they had tried to use OSLIS, but the website was unavailable. Comments included:

- "OSLIS has been going down a lot. It's hard to get to the databases. If they want people to use it, it has to be stable."
- "OSLIS is virtually a school library with lesson plans and information literacy information. But databases are the most important."
- There should be more coordination with community colleges on information literacy.
- Train staff in Regional Educational Service Districts (ESD) to train teachers and library staff around the state. There are 21 ESDs, but only three have trained librarians. Increase cooperation with ESDs.

Continuing Education

Only three of the focus groups discussed continuing education (CE). While there was almost uniform support for continuing education and staff development in these groups, participants were divided on the role of OSL; the emphasis that should be placed on CE; and the continued benefit of the Northwest Central Database.

One rural group indicated they appreciated that OSL had increased its CE in the last few years with links to Web Junction, College of DuPage, and webinars, and noted that many competitive grants had a training component. Two groups wanted continuing emphasis on CE in the LSTA-funded statewide programs: L-net, databases, OSLIS, and any new

programs. One focus group was very supportive of a more organized and aggressive CE program with leadership from both OSL and OLA. Comments included:

- Target CE to the areas of highest needs expressed in the "Continuing Education for Oregon Library Personnel: Needs Assessment Report and Proposed Model" prepared by Ruth Metz.
- Follow the model established by California's "InfoPeople": determine needs and design or contract for CE that meets those needs.
- Support for the Metz recommendation that the greatest need for CE was in rural areas.
- Work with OLA to deliver regional conferences.
- There are a lot of talented people in Oregon who could deliver CE.
- Archive CE as is done by InfoPeople so library staff can view at their convenience.
- Many obstacles in rural areas need to be overcome for a successful CE program: time, travel, cost, and substitute staffing.
- Pick a theme for CE and hire a "circuit rider" to deliver CE regionally on this topic.
- Increase training in areas of current statewide programs.
- Focus CE on what we want librarians to do well.
- Current training is under-utilized.
- Time to take webinars or attend workshops is limited.

One rural group felt that there were already sufficient CE opportunities and new efforts were not necessary. Another group said that OSL should not spend more funds than they are spending now.

While anecdotal comments about CE indicated a positive impact, no one reported that they evaluated the impact of CE. Participants reported that some workshops and webinars asked for immediate feedback on the value of the training, but no participants reported receiving a follow-up evaluation asking if they had used the training in their work.

In all the focus groups, only a few people indicated they had used the Northwest Central Database. One participant reporting viewing the site, but she did not follow up with registering for an offering. One said she had not found the CE activity she needed on the database.

Plinkit

Plinkit was discussed in four focus groups. Where it was discussed, small and rural librarians who had used it gave it high praise. Comments included:

- Easy to use.
- Provides a threshold website for those libraries without IT staff.
- Vision was uniformity; no matter where you are in the state, the websites look the same.
- Staff can be trained to make changes.

- "Keep it going, please!"
- "We would not have a website without it."
- "It gives our library a professional presence."
- "One of the best services the state offers."

Most participants from larger public libraries have their own websites and are not interested in Plinkit, which is currently not available to any other type of library.

A concern expressed in several groups is that Plinkit's technology is somewhat outdated. Two groups wondered if there is a better, more modern tool available. One librarian said Plinkit was "static." Another said that, while the format provides professional consistency, this consistency also lacks flexibility for local libraries. One librarian requested flexibility and customization options. Another said, "We are now more sophisticated users. We need consistency among the region's libraries, but need to integrate Web 2.0 user-generated information." In another group, there was discussion about making Plinkit available to school libraries and to include OSLIS as a link on the website.

The primary impact suggested for the Plinkit project was that it provided a professional image of the library to its users.

L-net

All seven focus groups discussed L-net, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: L-net

Issue	Number of focus groups
L-net should be evaluated to determine use and "bang for the buck".	4
Need more publicity about L-net.	4

We found participants were generally supportive of L-net, particularly in rural areas. More participants from urban libraries questioned the value received for the cost. Comments included:

Value of L-net

- Available 24-7.
- Provides real-time digital reference with direct online chat.
- Reference service is gone at small libraries and L-net fills the gap.
- "Because of L-net we can spend more time working with individual users."
- Provides a very professional service in small and rural libraries.
- "On our library's webpage and very heavily used."
- "Our patrons thank us for this service."

- People trust L-net to find a good source of information. "Can't trust web resources found through Google."
- "I like that L-net directs students to databases."
- "We have so few staff we have a difficult time covering the reference desk. L-net really helps us out."
- "With our small staff, L-net has a huge positive impact. It allows us to better serve our patrons."
- Truly statewide, serves all types of libraries.

Concerns about L-net

- There seems to be "cost creep." How do we control the costs and is it worth the increased cost? "What is the bang for the buck?"
- What is the cost per user?
- Seeing a rise in instant message services in libraries. Should L-net be upgraded to include Web 2.0? "We should be able to send PDFs to cell phones."
- Concerned that L-net is used primarily by children doing homework. It is not targeted to adults and business. Publicity should be targeted to more audiences.
- L-net local slows down the system because it is cluttered by local questions about hours and how to renew a book. Answering these questions takes time away from regular L-net users waiting with questions.
- OSL needs to look at: Who is being served? What is the total use? What is the cost per transaction? Then OSL should decide if it is worth continuing.
- "Our community college tried it and there was no student use."
- Need more training for para-professional library staff who don't know how to use L-net.
- Need more publicity about L-net. Local libraries should have a direct link on their website.
- Change the name. Nobody knows what it is.

One interesting opinion came from a librarian who did not use L-net. She said she felt it was unprofessional for her to use L-net to answer a reference question or to put it on her website because she could not afford the staff to answer questions for the entire state. She said she felt like a "leech" to use L-net and did not participate. Other members of the focus group assured her that the purpose of L-net was to answer reference questions for librarians and Oregon residents.

Another concern surfaced in the discussion of L-net about a possible impact on local library staffing if funding authorities discovered that Oregon residents could get questions answered through a statewide program. Would this impact local library staffing? One librarian said statewide programs like "L-net and databases are in competition with local libraries. We could succeed ourselves to death." In response, another participant said it would be "sad to deny service just to keep our doors open." Another said the message should be that the statewide services are an adjunct to local service.

Impact

All the information on L-net's impact was anecdotal. Many participants, particularly in rural areas, used and appreciate the service. Participants said L-Net saves staff time and assists particularly where staff are untrained or few. As with other programs, participants asked for more data on amount of use. One participant wondered about the response to the pop-up survey. Another wanted to know the details of L-Net funding. Although no specific impact data emerged during the focus groups, some comments showed a perception that L-net had a positive impact on Oregon libraries and residents.

- "We analyze the transcripts and use the information to train our reference staff."
- "This is a positive step toward closing the digital divide."

Databases

There was tremendous support in all of the focus groups for state contracts for databases. All seven focus groups discussed databases at length. Topics of discussion are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Databases

Issue	Number of focus groups
Need EBSCO databases.	5
Opinions on usage, ask for analysis.	5
We would not have databases without these.	4
Need more PR.	4
Need more training.	4
When shift from EBSCO to GALE, had to change all training materials.	4
Equalizes service across the state.	4

Value of databases

    Money

- Saves the library money.
- "We can't afford and we need more."
- Replaced our reference collection budget.
- "We were able to buy other databases, e-books, and non-fiction books. The savings really filled a need."
- "The price is right."
- Databases have replaced print references. "Our reference librarians use it every day."

    Equality of resources and usage

- Like the common suite of databases available all across the state. "Equalizes all library access across the state."
- "A boon to small libraries, we would not have databases without them." School library budgets have been cut and they would not have databases without those from the state.

Other comments

- A school librarian reported she knew databases were successful when she saw students skipping Google and going straight to the databases for research.

- A public librarian reported she goes to schools without a school librarian and teaches the students how to use databases.
- Students transition to college easier because of the experience with databases in school and public libraries.
- Full text reference gets a lot of use. When staff is trained, they are more comfortable with databases and they make patrons comfortable with them as well.
- Helps the L-net and OSLIS projects.
- Several groups expressed satisfaction with Learning Express.

Issues

The two biggest concerns were the switch from EBSCO to Gale databases and the amount of advance time allowed to make the switch. The academic librarians were the most concerned with the change from EBSCO to Gale. They said that the EBSCO databases were of such importance to the academic library community that they had to continue these subscriptions with their own funds. One participant commented that the library had become dependent on one set of databases and the change to a new one affected many collection management decisions. Another participant asked for a longer comment time from the library community the next time the contract is negotiated.

The academic librarians were also the most concerned about the amount of time available to prepare for a change in the databases. The change occurred during the summer when academic libraries have fewer staff to manage changes in programs. The academic librarians were also more likely to have developed online or print tools to help students use the databases and they reported they did not have enough time to create new tools. One participant asked for at least double the lead time.

Some participants asked for additional flexibility and specificity in the selection of databases. A lengthy discussion in one of the focus groups included these comments:

- What criteria are used for choosing databases?
- "Why these titles? Would other titles be more useful to special groups in the state?"
- More databases that meet more library needs; have more full-text; and include more titles for business.
- Look at how content in databases benefits libraries and people.
- "Some databases don't have a lot of hits. Why does OSL keep subscribing to them?"
- Need to target more specific audiences such as career development.

One member of the group pointed out the contradiction in those comments; for example, the recommendation to buy more databases that meet the needs of specific groups conflicts with the comment to buy only databases that are heavily used. This person asked how OSL can purchase the databases that are best for the most people. There did not seem to be general awareness of the criteria used to select databases. This same focus group asked for an analysis of the return on investment for databases, looking particularly at how easy it is

to find information, amount of full-text documents, profile of users, number of people who retrieve full-text, and so on.

Participants suggested more marketing of databases with suggestions including providing PR materials to local libraries; mounting a statewide campaign using billboards; and other mass media focusing on special groups, such as teachers. Many participants requested additional training in how to use the databases, for both librarians and the public. One librarian reported that his library had received an LSTA grant to prepare tutorials for database use. The tutorials were shared mainly with community colleges and received 95,000 visits to date. Participants from public libraries were not aware of these tutorials, asked why the results of this LSTA-funded grant had not been more widely shared, and asked how they could access the tutorials for their staff and users. Another participant commented, "Tutorials need to be simple, easy, short, quick, available any time, and kept up to date."

Other concerns included:

- Desire for a more flexible menu of databases to meet identified local needs.
- Fear that the state budget will be cut: "Databases are crucial; we would share the cost if we had to."
- Fear that local funding authorities will cut the local library budget since they are saving money on database contracts.
- Databases are hard to use. "We don't use them." Harder to use than Google.
- Make the databases more user friendly, like Google. "Users are overwhelmed by the complexity" of the databases.

Impact

Participants reported two primary impacts of databases. First, participants, particularly those from rural libraries, think that they could not offer these resources without the state's support. The second impact is the usage of the databases. Participants in several interest groups asked for additional information on usage. They had different opinions about who used the databases:

- Less use by public than students and librarians, need more training for public; underutilized in public libraries. "It takes time in a public library to learn how to use [databases] and make it comfortable."
- Geared more to public than academic libraries – not really robust enough for academic libraries.

Competitive Grants

All focus groups discussed competitive grants. A major theme in the discussion of competitive grants was the desire to have more sharing of the results of these grants, particularly training packages to allow replication of successful grants.

Many participants supported the concept of competitive grants although some participants questioned if the money could be better spent in statewide projects and asked what criteria were used to decide priorities for LSTA programs. Categories of comments about competitive grants are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Competitive Grants

Issue	Number of focus groups
Value of LSTA grants to local libraries.	6
Need to share results of LSTA grants.	5
Percent of LSTA funding that should go to competitive grants. How to decide the priorities and allocation of LSTA.	5
Comments on the LSTA process for awarding grants.	5
Difficulty of small groups to apply for grants.	5

Perceived value of competitive grants

Participants in six groups indicated the reasons why they value competitive grants. They felt competitive grants allowed experimentation, innovation, and encouraged cooperation. Comments included:

- Allows experimental and innovative projects to occur.
- It's OK to experiment and fail.
- Encourages cooperation.
- Allows projects to get started outside of normal budget.
- LSTA funds can be used as leverage to bring in additional funding.
- Available statewide, an equalizer.
- Sharing statewide can enhance the value of a grant and spread the benefits to smaller libraries.
- Without competitive grants, where would innovative projects get funding?
- "Our library would not be automated without competitive grants."
- Competitive grants have been essential for district establishment.
- Sage was created with LSTA funds. "Sage has benefited our region."
- Grants would be easier if the grants were coordinated with the academic and K-12 calendar.

The need to share the results of LSTA grants

Five groups raised this as an issue. Participants believe the value of LSTA grants could be enhanced by systematic sharing of the results of LSTA grants, particularly those that were successful and that libraries could replicate. They agreed that many OLA programs featured successful LSTA projects; however, participants requested intentional sharing. They asked that OSL select programs to share and help libraries by providing guides for replication. The project about the database training tutorial discussed before in this report illustrates the need for wider sharing of results. Comments included:

- "We need to know best practices."
- Need an intentional effort by OSL to create a program or "showcase' at OLA.
- "Competitive grants should focus on variety, scalability, and replication. Should be replicable across the state."
- Need specific programs at OLA that show what can be replicated.
- Libraries need to know what is required to replicate a project.
- "State library's role should be to identify, publicize, and tell how to replicate."

Percent of LSTA funding supporting competitive grants

One set of participants felt that LSTA funds could better be spent on statewide programs. Another set felt that the competitive grants program was necessary and asked for OSL's criteria used in deciding the percentage of LSTA dollars for competitive grants and for statewide programs. Comments included:

- Competitive grants take money from statewide programs that benefit more libraries.
- "Should there be competitive grants at all? Shouldn't the money be used for all?
- What are the priorities for statewide projects if funds are reduced? What criteria will be used and what is the assessment of the most effective use of the money?

The LSTA grant award process

Participants made mixed comments on the LSTA process. Some participants reported that the process worked fine. Some believed that the process took too long or must be coordinated with school and academic library calendars. Participants praised the help of OSL in coaching people who were writing grants. A participant suggested that OSL make more of an effort to facilitate cooperative grants.

Participants identified a number of changes to make the process easier, such as more coordination with local calendars, and less paperwork intensive (see below for other ideas). Even though participants made these suggestions, they understand that grants have requirements attached to them by the federal government, which OSL may not be able to change. This understanding reflects the general good will that library workers have for OSL. Comments include:

- Process works fine.

- Earlier evaluation of grants could lead to more cooperation and collaboration between similar grants. Sometimes grants are given to one organization when collaboration would be better. An example was given of a digitization grant.
- The State Library does a good job of coaching people for grants.
- Short application is good, but some concern that evaluators are "uninformed when the grant writer thought it was clear." Might have an "oral review" to answer questions.
- Final proposal writing is time-consuming.
- "The paperwork was onerous! Staggering staff issue for a small library."
- Peer evaluation is very useful. "It helps the Commission know IMLS uses and purposes."
- "We need changes in the calendar, which requires planning way in advance of funding."

Difficulty of small and rural libraries to apply for grants

Some participants reported that small and rural libraries had more difficulty applying for LSTA grants than larger libraries, because small libraries have fewer staff experienced in grant writing and less time to write the grants. Some said that, despite these limitations, small and rural libraries could benefit from LSTA grants to larger libraries if they could be shown how to replicate the project. One suggestion was that OSL establish a special grant category for small libraries with a limited maximum award amount and minimal requirements. Only small and rural libraries could apply.

In addition to the five common themes, participants offered many additional comments about competitive grants. Many raised issues of concern, often about the process. Comments included:

- LSTA encouraged cooperation among libraries to work on projects and, in turn, that cooperative projects were a higher priority for OSL.
- The same libraries seem to get grants over and over.
- Sustainability is an issue. There is no real requirement for sustainability. When the grant is over, there is often no funding to continue it. How long should the state continue to fund a grant and what criteria should they use to do it? Database projects are not kept up to date. Grant staff leave and knowledge is lost. It would be difficult for OSL to require sustainability because sometimes you have to prove the worth of the project first.
- One participant wanted more information on how LSTA funds are spent and who is a repeat grantee, but was uncomfortable asking the question because of concern that OSL would think he was being critical. Would like more transparency.
- "We have never been asked how OSL should spend LSTA funds."
- Accountability an issue; OSL needs to follow-up on reports and peer evaluations; put activity reports on line
- Need to rethink criteria for grants, particularly about paying for staff. Need to look at need and expected outcome before denying staff
- A lot of money was used to try to create library districts but it failed. LSTA should be used for projects that will have a lasting impact.

Impact of competitive grants

There was no impact data available from participants on competitive grants. However, group members did raise some issues related to impact measurement.

- No training in how to assess grants.
- For research projects, it's difficult to know the impact for 2 or 3 years after the project, when there is no money for evaluation.
- No standard reporting.
- "We need data on ineffective statewide programs."

Most participants in the focus group, though appreciative of many competitive grants and their results, are open to using LSTA in ways that would carry out any state-wide projects identified in a long-range plan which, they said, must be based on a participative planning process. Although participants were open to the idea of centralizing LSTA funds to pay for statewide projects, most wanted some LSTA funds left in the competitive grants program.

Needs and Trends

One question asked of the focus groups was to identify the needs of Oregon residents and trends in Oregon's future. Issues identified included:

- Education- higher cost, less support, growth in distance learning.
- Privatization of government.
- The digital divide," have and have-nots" both by income and by experience with technology.
- E-government; "E-everything."
- Poverty and hunger.
- Changing demographics, particularly baby boomers aging.
- People without library service.

One concern was the impact of the closing of Oregon school libraries or staffing them with untrained library aides. Participants talked about this in a number of ways. First, they expressed concern about the education of children and their lack of information literacy skills. Second, they wondered about the future impact on colleges when these students reach college age. Third, public libraries are concerned about more immediate impact on their services.

Underlying the concern for school libraries is a worry about the public's view of the importance of libraries and librarians in general. Participants identified a concern that the public is unwilling to pay more taxes but at the same time, unwilling for any current services to be cut. The cost of education at the college level was also discussed.

Continuation of Statewide Programs

Only two groups addressed this directly and they felt that these programs should receive ongoing support from LSTA funding because of the benefit they provided across the state:

- Collaborative Summer Library Program and youth services
- OSLIS
- Plinkit
- L-net
- Databases

Although only two focus groups specifically advocated for assured funding, almost all the focus groups indicated positive opinions toward these programs. There was also a call for continued evaluation of the programs; assurance that they were indeed serving all libraries in the state or all types of libraries; and continued improvement in response to suggestions.

Potential New Statewide LSTA Programs

One of the final questions asked was if there were additional ideas for statewide programs that would benefit all libraries in the state or one type of library. A complete list of ideas suggested is presented in Table 6, followed by a discussion of the ideas mentioned by two or more groups.

Table 6: Potential new statewide LSTA programs

Issue	Number of focus groups
A statewide ILS	5
Statewide library card	4
Statewide E-book contract	4
Advocacy/Marketing	4
Broadband Equipment Deployment	2
Continuing Education	2
Enhanced children's programming	2

A Statewide ILS

This was mentioned by five groups. Four of the five suggested extending Sage statewide. One said that current Innovative Interfaces contracts were ending, so this was a good time to consider shifting to a statewide ILS. Participants in two groups explicitly said that they did not expect LSTA funding to pay all of the costs. They expect to cost share, but said that with the support of the state, libraries could still save money over current costs. Contracting IT support to a common vendor was also a very attractive idea to some participants. Several participants acknowledged the difficulty of picking one vendor or software that allowed searching across vendors.

A Statewide Library Card, Statewide Reciprocal Borrowing Card, a State Portal

The concept of wider access to libraries by Oregon's residents was mentioned by four groups. After more in-depth probing, the discussion about this topic became more nuanced. During the discussion, three groups expressed concern about Oregon residents who lived in an area that did not pay any taxes for library service. If they could use a library without having to pay taxes, what incentive is there for their community to establish a new library or join an existing one? There was an added concern that communities currently supporting libraries might reduce funding if their residents could get free library service elsewhere. Thus the general conclusion is that reciprocal borrowing should be limited to an agreement between existing libraries supported with local taxpayer funds.

A State portal that provided access to services funded by LSTA, including L-net, databases, or OSLIS, was viewed a little differently. There was support that these projects were not necessarily tied to an individual library and that the federal taxes paid by Oregon residents helped to pay for them. However, participants from small libraries were concerned that these services, described as competition by one participant, would impact local funding. One participant said "Don't compete with local libraries," and another that the priority should be to strengthen local libraries.

Statewide E-book contract

Four groups asked OSL to negotiate a statewide E-book contract. Academic librarians said specifically that such a contract should make these books available to academic as well as public libraries. Some public librarians asked that the contract include interactive learning materials for children.

Advocacy and Marketing

Four groups suggested that the state library conduct an advocacy or marketing campaign. Participants in one group wanted the marketing targeted at encouraging communities without library service to join existing libraries. Other participants suggested that current statewide services be publicized, either directly through a statewide campaign, or by providing materials to local libraries to use. Yet another suggested that a campaign focus on benefits to the library user of unique information available, such as digitized historical collections.

Broadband Equipment Deployment, Continuing Education, and Enhanced Service to Children

Two groups supported each of these ideas for a statewide program.

Those supporting broadband equipment deployment asked for equipment to help them increase their broadband and provide better service to their users.

Continuing education was discussed in several groups. Those who supported the expansion of CE suggested that the report written by Ruth Metz be the basis of expanded continuing education throughout the state with an emphasis on rural libraries.

Finally, two groups advocated for a statewide initiative that focused on services to children and teens. They wanted databases that assisted teens, interactive learning programs for children, and another program similar to the Families Reading Together program.

Annex 1: Agenda for Focus Groups
Evaluation of Oregon LSTA Five-Year Plan

1. Introductions

2. Explanation of the evaluation project
    a. Purpose of Evaluation Project and focus groups
    b. Agenda
    c. Process agreements

3. Since 2008, the Oregon LSTA Plan has placed a high priority on awarding LSTA grants in seven areas. We'd like to have you talk about the impact those grants have had on library services in Oregon and on library users.
    a. Competitive grants to local libraries to allow them to conduct special projects
    b. Online, real time, reference service – L-Net
    c. A project to support student learning - OSLIS
    d. A project to help local libraries develop a local website – Plinkit
    e. A project to support services to youth through consulting, the Summer Reading Program, and the Institute for Children and Youth
    f. Online databases
    g. Continuing Education

    For each of these seven areas, we'd like you to address:
    i.   What do you like about this program?
    ii.   What would you change?
    iii. What is the impact of the program on libraries and library users?
    iv.   How do you define and measure success in the program?
    v.   Is there anything else you would like to tell us about this program?

4. Future
    a. What trends do you see impacting Oregon in the next five years?
    b. How can libraries address these trends?
    c. What do you need from the State Library to help you address these trends?

5. Some states use most or all of their LSTA dollars for statewide projects. Should Oregon use more of its money for statewide initiatives as opposed to competitive grants? Why or why not?

6. OSL is currently allocating LSTA funds for these statewide projects: L-net; OSLIS; Plinkit; Summer Reading and other youth programs; Databases. Are there other areas of library service that should be funded as statewide projects? If yes, which current projects or competitive grants might be funded less in order to fund a new project?

Evaluation of 2008-2012

Five-Year LSTA Plan

Oregon State Library

Results of Constituent Survey

Submitted by

Nancy Bolt & Associates

Nancy Bolt

Karen Strege

November 4, 2011

Revised January 10, 2012

Results of Constituent Survey

This report summarizes the responses to the LSTA Evaluation Survey, conducted between September 19 and October 8, 2011. Strege and Bolt wrote the initial questions and the State Library's Library Development Services staff members provided comments and feedback, which we incorporated into the final survey questions. Dr. Rachel Applegate reviewed the questions and provided the analysis below. **This report does not interpret survey results**. The final evaluation report combines these results with the information from focus groups, interviews, and document review. .

Contents

- Respondent demographics
- Priorities
- Programs:
  - Competitive grant
  - Statewide Database Licensing (including training)
  - L-Net, statewide online reference service
  - Plinkit, websites for public libraries
  - Youth Services
  - NW Central Network, an online clearinghouse for library continuing education
  - OSLIS, the Oregon school libraries information services
- Technical Note

Within each of these sections, we provide a summary of all responses, followed by the results that **differed** by groups. Groups tested for differences include the following:

- By library type: public, academic and school, omitting other and special
- By job: administration, reference, and children's/youth, omitting all others such as access services and one-person libraries
- By region: Most Respondents were from the Metro Portland and Willamette Valley areas. Respondents from other regions numbered 24 or fewer. These very few responses from these areas should not be used to 'represent' or be generalized to others in those areas.
- By MLS or non-MLS
- For a few topics, size of library was analyzed, but not systematically for all.

The five-item, Likert scales we used are assigned a value from 1 to 5; 1 is the extreme negative, 3 is neutral, and 5 is the extreme positive. We assigned these numeric values to all scales including the following: low priority to high priority; very poor to excellent; and strongly disagree to strongly agree. In scales of this type, the *average* score—the actual midpoint of replies--tends to be midway between neutral and best, or a 4 on a 5-point scale. This is because in surveys, most respondents are 'agreeable', in general, to questions asked. Therefore, a lower-than-average score would be one that is below 4.0 and a very bad score

would be one that is 3.0 or lower. Scores averaging 3.0 or below mean respondents did not agree with a statement, or did not value something, or did not rate something highly. The technical note at the end of this report explains the rational and process for isolating these groups.

<p style="text-align:center">Respondents</p>

There were 296 library staff and 4 public library trustee respondents. By region, respondents were roughly equally divided among Metro Portland, the Willamette Valley, and the other locations. By the type of library, respondents were almost one-half public, a third academic, a fifth school, and a small amount of 'others.' Others included consultants and a few school library workers who reported they worked in elementary schools.

Respondents by Regions	Number	%	Type	Number	%
Metro Portland	109	37%	Public	132	45%
Willamette Valley	106	36%	Academic	94	32%
Coastal, Central, Eastern, Southern	81	27%	School	58	20%
Total	296		Other	12	4%

In which type of library do you work?	In which part of Oregon do you work?						
	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Public	11	14	47	36	15	9	132
Academic	2	1	36	46	3	6	94
Special	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
K-12 School	2	5	21	19	5	6	58
Other	0	0	4	2	1	0	7
Totals	15	21	109	106	24	21	296

Respondents by library size: Most respondents worked in small libraries, with between less than one and 10 FTE.

Type of library	What is the number of full-time equivalent staff that work in your library?						
	< than 1 to 10	11 to 30	31 to 50	51 to 100	101 to 200	Over 200	Total
Public	67	30	10	10	5	10	132
Academic	21	28	9	16	16	4	94
K-12 School	57	0	0	1	0	0	58
Special	3	0	2	0	0	0	5
Other	5	0	2	0	0	0	7
Number	**153**	**58**	**23**	**27**	**21**	**14**	**296**
Percent in that size library	**52%**	**20%**	**8%**	**9%**	**7%**	**5%**	

Respondents by primary job: Administrators were the most frequent respondents.

	Other	One-person library	Admin	Tech. Serv.	Circ.	Ref. Serv.	Child YA	Tech-nology
Public	12	6	39	7	15	21	29	3
Academic	12	3	18	23	7	29	0	2
Special	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
K-12 School	7	36	3	0	0	0	11	1
Other	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total	34	47	63	30	22	51	40	9

Respondents by MLS or not: Over half of the respondents have an MLS degree *except for schools* where a MLS is rare.

	Do you have a MLS or MLIS degree?			
Type of library	Yes	No	Total	% of type
Public	80	52	132	61%
College or University	72	22	94	77%
Special	4	1	5	80%
K-12 School	12	46	58	21%
Other	5	2	7	71%
Total	173	123	296	58%

Priorities

Overall, the highest priorities for all respondents are for databases, summer reading, and early literacy. Respondents were less likely to choose consulting and Plinkit.

Priorities by library type: Respondents identified their priorities for the use of LSTA funds for 2013 through 2018. Answers differed significantly by the respondents' library type. School librarians tended to value each priority more than other groups, with OSLIS being most important. Academic librarians were lukewarm on most priorities except databases.

Library Type	Public	Academic	School
Summer reading program	4.53	3.65	4.14
Statewide databases	4.44	4.16	4.73
Early literacy programs	4.39	3.89	4.10
CE for library staff	3.95	3.35	3.97
Plinkit	3.74	3.00	3.54

OSLIS	3.55	3.38	4.69
Expanding consulting services	3.24	2.98	3.41

Priorities by primary job: Note that administrators view expanding consulting serves as not a priority.

By job	Admin	Reference	Child/YA
Summer reading program	4.30	3.84	4.67
Early literacy	4.22	4.07	4.58
Competitive grants	4.00	3.25	3.63
Reaching unserved residents	3.39	3.85	4.15
OSLIS	3.55	3.55	4.12
Expanding consulting services	2.33	2.95	3.48

Priorities by region: There were no significant differences in priority ratings among regions.

Priorities by MLS or non- MLS: Three items were rated statistically significantly higher by non-MLS than MLS.

By MLS or no MLS	MLS	Non
Summer reading program	4.04	4.40
OSLIS	3.63	4.09
Providing CE for staff	3.61	3.96

Priorities by library size: Four priorities differed significantly by size of library. The smallest libraries valued each of these (databases, OSLIS, continuing education, and providing websites (Plinkit)) more highly than those from larger libraries.

Library staff size	Databases	OSLIS	CE	Plinkit
Less than 1 to 10	4.55	4.12	3.92	3.72
11 to 30	4.36	3.46	3.80	3.32
31 to 50	4.00	3.38	3.20	3.21
51 to 100	4.47	3.33	3.50	3.15
101 to 200	4.07	3.55	3.38	3.09
Over 200	4.00	3.75	3.38	3.25
Total	4.41	3.81	3.74	3.47

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

The survey contained a section with questions about individual statewide programs and the competitive grants program. These sections were structured in the following way: a question asked if the respondents used the service or program, if respondents answered yes, then they continued to provide feedback about their satisfaction and to identify the results of the particular program. If the respondents answered that they did not use a program or service, then they were asked to identify reasons for non-use. The following charts only highlight results when there are significant differences between responder groups, such as library type or size.

The difference between areas was tested with the chi-square test. The respondents from areas other than Metro Portland and the Willamette Valley are too small to draw conclusions.

Competitive Grant Program

Highlights

- 76% (224 of 295 respondents) know about the competitive grants program.
- Responders least likely to have heard about this program are from the Willamette Valley. Responders from the Coast are most likely to know about this program.
- Only 62% of the school responders know about the LSTA grant program; 82% of the responders from public libraries report knowing about this program.
- School library respondents rated elements of the competitive grants process more highly than respondents from other types of libraries.
- Only school library respondents thought the peer evaluations were very helpful (rated above 4.0, agreed); respondents from other types of libraries rated these evaluations as 3.5 or below.
- 34% of all respondents say they have applied for a grant.
- Of those who said they did not apply, they selected these reasons most often.
  - 27%, no time to write
  - 17% no ongoing funding
  - 17% don't know
  - No other choice was above 10%.

Competitive Grants by library type:

By library type: do you know about?	Yes	Percent Yes	Total
Public	107	82%	131
Academic	69	73%	94
School	36	62%	58
Special or other	9	90%	10
Total	221	75%	293

Applicants by library type:

Have you applied?	Yes Percent	Why not? Major Reason	Percentage of Response
Public	46%	No time to write proposal	40%
Academic	41%	No ongoing funding	20%
School	25%	Didn't know about eligibility	22%

Rating of the LSTA Competitive Process: Ratings of the process are not statistically different by library type *except* for the following: Peer evaluations are helpful (public, 3.61, academic, 3.38, school, 4.37).

Competitive Grants by primary job: Administrators are significantly more likely (55% of respondents, vs. 24% of reference, 35% of child/YA) to report that they applied for a grant. Competitive Grants by region: We found a significant difference in knowledge about this program: 83% yes for Metro Portland and 70% for Willamette Valley. There were no differences in ratings among other regions.

Know about OSL's LSTA competitive grants Program?	Coastal	Central	In which part of Oregon do you work? Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	14	11	91	74	18	16	224
No	1	10	18	31	6	5	71
Total	15	21	109	105	24	21	295
Percent yes	93%	52%	83%	70%	75%	76%	

Competitive Grants by MLS or non- MLS: Those with an MLS (88%) were much more likely to apply for a grant than those without a MSL (59%). MLS respondents are more likely to have heard about the program through colleagues, and non-MLS through contact from the State Library.

<div align="center">

Statewide Database Licensing Program

</div>

Highlights

- Most respondents to this question know about the database program (92% of public respondents, 78% of academic, 85% school).

Know about the database program?	Coastal	Central	In which part of Oregon do you work? Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	14	11	91	74	18	16	224
No	1	10	18	31	6	5	71

Total	15	21	109	105	24	21	295
Percent yes	93%	52%	83%	70%	75%	76%	

Frequency of use	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Daily	11	5	11	28
At least once a week	33	18	17	70
At least once a month	16	11	6	33
A few times a year	22	15	8	49
I do not use	8	6	4	19
Total	90	55	46	199

Database Training
- 2/3 of public, ¾ of school, and ½ of academic respondents had participated in database training.
- The most prevalent reasons for *not* participating were that they already knew how to use them (48%), "no time" (39%), "didn't know" (33%). 78% of academic library respondents answered that they "already knew" compared to 29% public and 22% school.
- About 22% of both public and school library respondents (who did not use training) cited that the in-person workshops were too far; *no* academic library person said too far.
- No staff coverage was a problem for public library respondents (25%) and school (22%) but not academic (7%).
- By region, those in Metro Portland (54%) and Willamette Valley (59%) were the least likely to have participated in database training. "Already know" and "no time" were the most important reasons for not attending. 46% of Metro Portland respondents said they did not know about the training

Participated in Gale or Learning Express training?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	7	10	33	36	13	14	113
No	4	4	28	25	3	2	66
Total	11	14	61	61	16	16	179
Percent yes	64%	71%	54%	59%	81%	88%	63%

Number selecting reason for not attending:

Why not? By Region	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
No time	1	4	10	10	1	0	22

F2F too far	1	3	1	2	1	0	8
Didn't know	2	3	13	3	0	1	22
Library can't do webinars	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Don't like webinars	1	0	3	1	0	0	5
Already know	2	1	14	12	2	1	32
Don't use	0	0	3	5	1	0	9
Don't know enough	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
No staff coverage	1	1	3	5	1	0	11
Other	2	3	19*	14*	2	0	40

*Some of the "other" responses include "I did attend training."

Ratings for training providers were overall relatively positive except academic librarians who rated Gale negatively, (1= poor, 5= excellent).

Rating of training providers by library type:

Trainer	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Gale	3.66	2.90	4.23	3.68
Oregon State Library	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.12
Learning Express	3.55	3.20	4.11	3.53
A combination	3.57	4.00	4.20	3.70

Database impacts (includes training) and overall ratings:

Because of training	Overall
Improved understanding	4.09
Improved ability to help users	4.04
Because of program	**Overall**
Saved money on print	3.83
Saved money on online	3.92
More use	3.38
Could not offer equivalent	3.82
Essential part	3.77
Users depend on databases	3.56
Promotional materials effective	3.24

Database impacts and ratings by library type: Ratings differed by library type (except for OSL and Learning Express training). Academic libraries rated all impact statements lower.

By library type	Public	Academic	School
Database training offered by Gale	3.66	2.90	4.23

DB training improved my understanding	4.10	3.67	4.36
DB training improved ability to help	4.06	3.38	4.38
Library saved money on print	3.96	3.24	4.35
Library saved money on online	4.02	3.40	4.39
Library receives more use	3.55	2.86	3.63
Couldn't provide equivalent	4.13	2.85	4.43
DBs are an essential part of my lib	4.13	2.79	4.23
Users depend on the DBs	3.80	2.70	4.18
Promotional materials effective	3.33	2.67	3.80

Other significant differences in responders' answers to the database impact questions:

By Library Type	Public	Academic	School
Percentage who know about DB program	92%	78%	85%
Participating in training	66%	47%	79%
Why not training, proportional responses except			
I already know how to use	8	21	2

Database impacts by primary job: Children's Librarians and Administrators are enthusiastic about the database impacts but Reference workers are far less so.

Ratings by job	Admin	Reference	Children/YA
Impacts of Training			
DB training improved my understanding	4.24	3.68	4.18
DB training improved my ability to help	4.16	3.58	4.13
Impacts of Databases			
Library has saved money on print	4.11	3.40	4.13
Library has saved money on online	4.29	3.46	4.09
Library receives more use	4.29	3.46	4.09
Without DBs library could not offer as much	4.13	3.05	3.94
Library's users depend on the DBs	3.74	3.31	3.90
Promotional materials are effective	3.31	2.73	3.52

Database impacts by region: No real differences by region except that respondents from Metro Portland more often said they did not know about availability of training than Willamette Valley respondents, but there were only a few respondents overall who did not know about the databases.

Database impacts by MLS or non- MLS: MLS respondents were more likely to know about the database program (94% vs. 75% of Non-MLS), although the frequency of their usage is not different. Non-MLS responders were more likely to have participated in training (71% vs. 58% for MLS). Ratings were similar except for the following four items; MLS respondents rated these lower than non-MLS.

MLS or non-MLS	MLS	Non-MLS
Ratings of database training from Gale	3.50	3.95
Improved ability to assist users	3.86	4.26
Could not offer equivalent	3.60	4.25
Promotional materials effective	3.05	3.59

L-net, Statewide Online Reference

Highlights

- The most important sources of information about L-net ("where did you first hear" choose only one) were conferences (22%, especially for school librarians) and colleagues (22%, especially for public and academic). Email was the next most important (13%, more for public and academic).
- Usage is even across library types with 45% of the total of respondents answering that they used L-Net.
- Only 5 respondents said they had tried the service and were unhappy. More common reasons for not using it were, do not know enough about the service (for public), and can answer ourselves (all types, especially school).
- Schools were almost never L-net partners (3 respondents yes, 43 no; the other types, evenly divided).
- For public and academic library respondents, the most important reasons for being an L-net partner were giving back for what the library receives (especially for public) and wanting to contribute to statewide needs. Public library respondents were more likely (not tested statistically) to say they like networking and it makes the job more interesting.
- Most were satisfied with the process of giving answers, and with the answers they received, (all above 4.3, but this question had few respondents).
- In general, users rated most aspects highly, but were skeptical of its impacts on users; they praised tech support and training.
- On the impacts rating questions, users were generally positive with all scores above 3.35. The lowest had to do with whether it increases visibility or users depend on L-net: scores were 3.35 to 3.49. L-net "local" questions received higher scores. (Not tested statistically)

How respondents heard about L-net:

Overall	Number	Percent of respondents
I am not aware of this program.	33	12%
Colleague	60	22%
Conference or meeting	59	22%
Email message or listserve	37	14%
I don't recall	34	13%
Contact from the State Library	21	8%
Brochure or newsletter	6	2%
Other (please specify)	20	7%
Total	270	

L-Net impacts and other questions by library type: Academic respondents were slightly less likely to have heard about L-net (17% do not know, vs. 12% overall). Regarding **L-net *local*,** which is a program to provide online chat reference services to their local community, responses from different types of libraries showed significant differences:

Do you use L-net local?	Public	Academic	School
Percent using L-net local	23%	29%	9%
Percent who are an L-net partner	47%	54%	7%

L-net by library type: Responses about L-net's impacts do not differ by type except for the following.

L-net impacts	Public	Academic	School
Users are better served	4.35	4.27	3.83
L-net is an essential part of my lib	4.00	3.96	3.26

L-net use and impacts by primary job: The ratings of L-net elements do not differ by job. However, the use of L-net and L-net local does vary by job.

L-net & L-net by Type	Administration	Reference Services	Children or Y/A Services
Use L-net to answer reference questions	49%	68%	42%
Do you use L-net Local	15%	45%	27%
Is your library an L-net Partner	40%	59%	33%

L-net use and impacts by region: Usage differs by region. 56% percent answered yes from Metro Portland and 38% for the Willamette Valley. Respondents from Metro Portland were more likely to learn about it from email message/listserv and those from Willamette Valley learn about L-net by contact from the State Library. All ratings are the same by region except:

How did you first hear about L-net?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
I am not aware of this program	1	4	10	14	1	3	33
(Chose a method)	13	17	90	82	21	14	237

Do you use L-net Local?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	2	2	26	18	0	2	50
No	10	14	62	64	20	12	182
Total	12	16	88	82	20	14	232

Is your library a L-net partner?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	4	6	44	30	5	4	93
No	8	10	43	52	14	10	137
Total	12	16	87	82	19	14	230

L-net Rating		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	East	South	Total
Overall satisfaction with L-net reference services.	Average	4.40	3.83	4.24	4.04	4.71	4.00	4.18
	N	5	6	46	27	7	7	98
Overall satisfaction with the staff member response.	Average	5.00	4.67	4.81	4.25	4.60	4.50	4.60
	N	4	3	32	24	5	4	72
Increased visibility in community because of L-net.	Average	3.75	3.75	3.37	3.61	3.71	3.20	3.50
	N	4	4	38	28	7	5	86
Users are better served because we use L-net.	Average	4.40	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.57	4.00	4.24
	N	5	4	42	28	7	6	92
L-net is an essential part of my library's services.	Average	3.75	4.00	3.90	3.76	4.14	3.67	3.86
	N	4	4	41	29	7	6	91

Users depend on L-net to find the information resources	Average							
		3.25	4.00	3.45	3.29	3.67	3.80	3.45
Total	N	4	4	40	28	6	5	87

L-Net local Rating		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Southern	Total
Overall rating of the L-net Local technical support	Average	5.00	4.50	4.56	4.22		4.48
	N	2	2	16	9	0	29
Overall rating of the L-net Local training	Average	.	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.00	4.34
	N	0	2	17	8	2	29
Overall satisfaction with L-net Local.	Average	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.18	4.00	4.38
	N	1	2	18	11	2	34
Increased visibility in our community because of L-net Local.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.15	3.82	5.00	4.11
	N	1	2	20	11	1	35
Users are better served because we use L-net Local.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.45	3.85	5.00	4.26
	N	2	2	20	13	1	38
L-net Local is an essential part of my library's services.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.15	3.58	4.50	4.03
	N	1	2	20	12	2	37
Users depend on L-net Local to find the information resources	Average	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.45	5.00	3.91
	N	1	2	19	11	1	34

The following are the **only** areas that regional differences that are statistically significantly. For the above ratings, either numbers (N) were too small or the differences in ratings were too small

L-Net Satisfaction	Metro Portland	Willamette Valley
Satisfaction with staff member's response	4.81	4.25

L-Net use and impacts by MLS or non-MLS: Use is significantly higher for MLS respondents (52% vs. 32% for non-MLS). 27 non-MLS respondents said that their reason not to use L-Net

was "don't know enough." In addition, MLS and non-MLS rated four impacts differently. Note that in contrast to databases and database training, non-MLS rated L-net items *lower*.

L-Net impacts	MLS	Non-MLS
Users better served, using L-Net	4.34	3.96
L-net essential part	4.03	3.38
Overall satisfaction with L-net Local	4.50	3.83
Users better served, L-Net local	4.41	3.50

Plinkit, Website for Public Libraries

Highlights

- 70 respondents gave reasons why they did not use Plinkit; 28 answered that they were 'satisfied with own website'; 26 choose 'other;' and 16 said that they, 'don't know enough.' Willamette Valley respondents were more likely to say 'satisfied with own website.'
- Respondents most often chose these ways that they learned about Plinkit: conference (10 respondents), colleague (15), and state library contact (11).
- Regarding Plinkit's impacts, ratings were relatively homogenous, most 'agreeing' at the "4" level that their library saved money, users are better served, and that Plinkit is essential. Overall ratings are lower than for databases and for L-net but higher than for academic library ratings of databases.

Plinkit Ratings & Impacts	Overall
Tech support	4.20
Materials like the manual	3.81
Training	3.91
Saved money on web services	4.30
Users are better served	4.09
Plinkit is essential	4.07

Because Plinkit is a public library project, we did not perform a library-type analysis. Respondents from different regions did not answer differently concerning use and ratings. Many more MLS respondents said the reason not to participate was "are satisfied" with own website: 25 respondents (vs. only 3 non-MLS).

Youth Services

Highlights:

- 75 respondents said they had used the services of the State Library Youth services consultant (almost all of these were from public and school). 48% of public library respondents and 30% of school library respondents said they used these services.

- 44 said they (11) or another person from their library (33) attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute.
- School respondents were most likely to have asked for resources; public library respondents also asked for resources, but also had questions about services for children and youth.
- Many public library respondents (34) had attended training.
- School people who asked for resources (11) received (10). Those who attended training (38) also said it improved services (38) (possibly not the same people.)
- Relatively few reported that they attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults. 11 said they attended, and 33 said that someone attended from their library.

Focus Institute Impacts from 10 that answered the question	Self	Employee
Changed the way I served	7	16
Developed network of colleagues	4	9
Learned valuable info	8	3
Other	1	4

Representation by the OSL in the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP): Almost all who participated valued that the OSL paid their fees. Respondents are unclear about the role of the State Library in representing them.

How do the OSL and OLA represent you in CSLP?	
I appreciate and have seen changes	46
I don't fully understand but need it for a SRP	36
I appreciate efforts but CSLP is too big	5
Not representing me effectively	1
Other	11

Most said they would still run summer reading programs but they would not be as extensive:

If OSL did not pay for part in CSLP and you did not get manual etc.	
Library would not have a SRP	2
Library would develop own at reduced level	57
Library would develop own and could continue at full level	27
Other	14

Impacts: Most were enthusiastic about the program and its impacts, with ratings above 4.0 (agree) for every item (except Metro Portland, 'materials'), and ratings above 4.5 for parents' appreciation and that participants had fun. (See details in impacts section at end).

Youth services by library type (Academic omitted): There were no differences by type for what might happen if OSL did not pay SRP fees.

Youth services by primary job: Administrators (43%, 24) and Children/YA (76%, 26) are much more likely to use Youth services consultant than Reference staff (9%, 4). Reference staff also rate the Summer Reading Program lower (4.0) than Administrators (4.3) and Children/YA (4.6)

Youth services Impacts (not analyzed statistically):

Have used:	Admin	Children/YA
Asked a question about a service	17	18
Asked for resources	10	18
Asked for a visit	2	3
Consultant called	4	2
Attended training	9	19
Impacts		
Received helpful answer	19	17
Received resources	13	21
Used training to improve service	9	19
Good suggestions from consultant	3	4
Saw no impacts	0	1

Differences in evaluating OSL and OLA with respect to CSLP by job:

OSL and OLA in CSLP	Admin	Ref	Children	Total
Other (please specify)	5	2	1	8
I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP.	11	3	21	35
I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts.…	14	6	2	22
I appreciate the efforts of the representative, but CSLP is so large, that I don't think that they can represent me.	2	1	0	3
They are not representing me effectively in CSLP and need to make changes.	1	0	0	1
Total	33	12	24	69

Youth Services by region: No significant differences in the use of programs, opinions, or in impacts responses, except:

SRP materials rating	Metro Portland	Willamette Valley
Rating of the SRP materials provided	3.82	4.26

SRP Rating by Region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Overall opinion of the SRP	Av.	4.33	4.08	4.26	4.25	4.69	4.75	4.31
	N	9	12	39	36	13	4	113
Overall rating of the SRP materials	Av.	3.89	4.30	3.83	4.26	4.54	4.40	4.13
	N	9	10	35	34	13	5	106
SRP participants had a lot of fun & read many books.	Av.	4.75	4.50	4.56	4.40	4.77	5.00	4.56
	N	8	10	36	35	13	5	107
SRP participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	Av.	4.71	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.54	4.80	4.36
	N	7	10	35	34	13	5	104
More children used the library over the summer because of the SRP.	Av.	4.75	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.60	4.44
	N	8	10	37	34	13	5	107
The parents in the community appreciated the SRP.	Av.	4.63	4.40	4.62	4.50	4.77	4.80	4.59
	N	8	10	37	34	13	5	107
The teachers in the community appreciated the SRP.	Av.	4.50	4.00	4.42	4.39	4.46	4.00	4.36
	N	6	9	36	33	13	5	102

What is your opinion of how the OLA & OSL and represent you in CSLP?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP.	4	2	13	16	9	2	46
I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts.	3	7	11	9	4	2	36
I appreciate the efforts of the representative, but CSLP is so large, that I don't think that they can represent me.	0	0	3	2	0	0	5

	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
They are not representing me effectively in CSLP and need to change.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other (please specify)	1	1	6	3	0	0	11
Total	8	10	33	31	13	4	99

If OSL did not pay for your library's participation in the CSLP what would your library do?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
The library would not have a SRP	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
The library would develop its own, less-extensive SRP	6	6	16	18	9	2	57
The library would develop its own program and could continue	1	2	12	9	2	1	27
Other (please specify)	1	1	6	3	2	1	14
Total	8	10	34	31	13	4	100

Youth Services by MLS or no MLS: **No significant differences**

Northwest Central Continuing Education Network

Highlights

- 71 people said they had heard of it (equally through email and conferences); 39 used it to find an event, and 16 participated in one in the last year.
- Only Metro Portland and Willamette had more than 10 people rating "the quality of the event you found," at 3.80 (5= excellent) and 4.20 respectively. Overall (38 ratings) the quality was 3.90.

CE rating by region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Rate the quality of the CE event that you found on the NW Central database.	Av	3.80	3.00	3.80	4.20	4.25	3.50	3.90
	N	5	1	15	10	4	4	39

NW C**entral by library type:** Only 1 academic library respondent answered this question (and did know about it); only 12 school librarians answered it (of which only 2 knew about it). 102 public library respondents answered, of which 64% knew about it.

NW Central by region: Respondents from Metro Portland was more likely to know about NW Central (73%) compared to Willamette Valley respondents (49%: percent of those saying 'yes' vs. total answering the question).

NW Central by MLS or no MLS: MLS were more likely to say they knew about NW Central, 81% vs. 26%, 59 MLS said they knew vs. only 12 non-MLS said they knew.

OSLIS, Oregon School Library Information Service

Highlights

- Schools are the most frequent, but not the only users of the OSLIS portal. School respondents overwhelmingly found out about it from conferences (27, vs. 8 for 'colleague')
- In reasons for not using, the most important for academic library respondents was resources not relevant; for public respondents, the reason most cited for not using is that they don't know enough about it.
- Most of the school library respondents (43 of 51) said they had a link to OSLIS; only 14 public and 2 academic library respondents did.

Why not use OSLIS?	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Resources not relevant	10	46	2	62
Don't know enough	41	14	2	58
Would use if I had training	6	1	1	8
DBs difficult to use	0	0	1	1
Website difficult to use	2	0	1	4
Other	26	15	4	45

- Few said that they did not use it because the website was difficult to use, but there was unanimous rating of 'disagree' that it was easy to find information on the website (overall, 2.32). Differences are not statistically significant between library types.
- Most did appreciate the training (overall rating of 4.11, no significant differences by type).

Impacts	Overall
Easy to find info on OSLIS site	2.32
Rate OSLIS training	4.11
Library increased visibility	3.66

Users better served	4.33
OSLIS is essential	3.95
More use	3.64
Could not offer equivalent	4.10
	n = 58-64

OSLIS by library type: *not analyzed*

OSLIS by primary job: Reference respondents were significantly less enthusiastic.

OSLIS	Admin.	Ref.	Children Y
OSLIS training	4.57	3.33	4.56
Increased visibility in school	3.75	2.50	3.67
Users better served	4.00	3.40	4.58
OSLIS is essential	3.38	2.83	4.25
Library receives more use	3.38	2.40	3.75
Could not offer equivalent	3.75	2.83	4.27

OSLIS by region: No significant difference in usage or ratings by region except: Do you use information literacy lessons, 18 from Metro Portland said yes and 9 from Willamette Valley.

Do you use the OSLIS web portal?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	4	8	37	32	7	7	95
No	9	10	58	63	12	9	161
Total	13	18	95	95	19	16	256
Percent yes	31%	44%	39%	34%	37%	44%	37%

Do you use OSLIS to access:	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Citation Maker	3	6	26	22	5	5	67
Information literacy lessons	1	5	18	9	3	3	39
Professional resources	3	3	16	13	3	3	41

Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your school?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total

Other (please specify)	0	0	12	4	1	0	17
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	3	3	13	18	4	3	44
Citation Maker	1	3	8	7	2	3	24
Information literacy lessons	0	2	2	1	0	0	5
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90

Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Other (please specify)	0	1	12	8	1	1	23
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	4	3	17	18	3	4	49
Citation Maker	0	3	3	3	2	0	11
Information literacy lessons	0	1	3	1	1	1	7
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90

Have you participated in OSL training about OSLIS?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Yes	3	4	14	18	5	3	47
No	1	4	21	12	2	3	43
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90
Percent yes	75%	50%	40%	60%	71%	50%	52%

OSLIS Rating by Region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
OSLIS training	Av.	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	3.50	4.11
	N	3	3	14	18	5	2	45
Increased its visibility in our school because of OSLIS.	Av.	3.33	3.25	3.90	3.41	3.83	4.33	3.66
	N	3	4	20	22	6	3	58
My library users are better served because of OSLIS.	Av.	4.25	4.60	4.32	4.28	4.00	4.80	4.33
	N	4	5	22	25	6	5	67

OSLIS is essential for my library.	Av.	3.67	4.20	4.14	3.72	3.67	4.75	3.95
	N	3	5	22	25	6	4	65
	N	3	5	22	25	6	4	65
My library receives more use, because of OSLIS.	Av.	3.67	4.25	3.60	3.48	3.50	4.67	3.64
	N	3	4	20	23	6	3	59
If my library did not have OSLIS, my library could not offer the same information resources.	Av.	3.67	4.40	4.13	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.10
	N	3	5	23	25	7	5	68

OSLIS by MLS or non-MLS: No significant differences

<div align="center">

Technical Note

Analysis by Groups

</div>

We created four types of groups.

- By library type: public, academic and school, omitting other and special. Represents 96% of the whole.
- By position: administration, reference, and children's/youth, omitting all others such as access services and one-person libraries. Represents 52% of the whole.
  - Tech services people are almost exclusively academic; one-person libraries, almost all K-12 school.
- By region: Metro Portland and Willamette, omitting all others. Represents 73% of the whole
- Data for most regions is based on so few respondents that it may be easily misinterpreted. An 'average rating' of 4.0 may be based on only four people. All items requested by OSL have been provided.
- By MLS or non-MLS. Includes all responders, expect trustees.

Overall results include answers from each person answering the question. For the group analysis, only those respondents who fell into each group named were included. That means the "MLS/non" numbers were the highest because everybody (but not a trustee) answered that question.

Why omit the other categories, for example, special libraries or the other regions? They were omitted **only** for the group comparisons. In these comparisons, we wanted to provide OSL with reports on only those group differences that are statistically significant. Statistical significance does not simply mean that there is a difference or that that difference is big (the 'magnitude' of

a difference.)   Instead, statistical significant mainly means that there IS a difference instead of a difference simply being by chance.

Detecting a statistically significant difference depends on three things: the magnitude of the actual difference, the amount of data, and fuzz. First, a difference in a rating between 3.3 and 3.4 would usually not be statistically significantly different, but one between 3.3 and 3.9 might be. Second, if there are few respondents in any group, there is not enough data to determine statistical significance. This is one reason for eliminating some regional group respondents. In addition, if we know how respondents from academic libraries answered a question, we also know what respondents who work in technical services responded because the academic library group includes most of the technical services respondents. Third, if we left respondents from these small groups into the math of the analysis, this would create a 'fuzz' that makes detecting differences among the major groups difficult. We found only enough respondents in the named groups to make our analysis meaningful.

All questions with answers except "select any that apply" were tested for statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. For scale questions (ratings), this was a one-way ANOVA and for categories (including yes/no) this was a chi^2 test.

Roughly speaking this means there is high confidence (95% certainty) that an observed *difference* is real, that, for example, a difference between 3.3 and 3.9 is meaningful.

Statistical significance does not refer to the magnitude of a difference, but to the certainty that it is not just sampling error. Thus, something is not *very* statistically significant. A difference can be *very large,* and statistically significant.

For questions with answers that allow the respondents to "select any that apply", e.g. what are reasons to be an L-net partner, we reviewed the responses to see if they were roughly proportionate. For example, if 60% of respondents overall were from public libraries and 30% from academic, then if 20 public and 10 academic respondents selected something, their responses were proportionate. We noted those where the responses were **not** proportionate.

1. Welcome to the Oregon LSTA Survey

Library Services and Technology Act Evaluation Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your responses will help the Oregon State Library evaluate the use of Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Funds in Oregon as specified in its LSTA Long Range Plan, 2008-2012.

Your answers will also provide information to use when the LSTA Advisory Council and the State Library Board create the new LSTA Plan, which will guide the use of these funds in 2013 to 2018.

IMPORTANT! All opinions and information that you provide in this survey will remain completely confidential. We will combine your responses with all others to analyze the results and will not link any response with an individual.

This survey will ask you for information about yourself and your opinions about the following programs. If you have no knowledge about a particular program, you may skip that section. However, we encourage all responders to answer the last section about the future of LSTA funds in Oregon.

• The State Library's LSTA competitive grant program
• The Online databases provided by the State Library
• The L-Net (Virtual Reference Services) program
• The Plinkit (Website Hosting) program
• The OSLIS Website (Oregon School Library Information System)
• The Northwest Central Website for Continuing Education Opportunities
• The State Library's Youth Services program
• Priorities for Oregon's LSTA program

We estimate that you will spend 10 to 20 minutes completing this survey, depending on how many sections that you answer.

You may work in a branch library, if so, please answer the survey from the perspective of your experiences in that library, not the larger organization.

After you complete the survey, you may enter a drawing for a $25 Gift Card to Powell's Books.

If you have any questions, please contact Ann Reed at 503-378-5027 or at ann.reed@state.or.us.

*1. Are you a public library trustee?

⬜ Yes

⬜ No

2. Information about Survey Respondents

*1. In which part of Oregon do you work?

- [ ] Coastal
- [ ] Central
- [ ] Metro Portland
- [ ] Willamette Valley
- [ ] Eastern
- [ ] Southern

*2. In which type of library do you work?

- [ ] Public
- [ ] College or University
- [ ] Special
- [ ] K-12 School
- [ ] Tribal
- [ ] Other (please specify)

[   ]

*3. Which of the following areas best describes the area in which you work? We know that some of you perform more than one job; please choose the area in which you work most of your time.

- [ ] One-person library
- [ ] Administration
- [ ] Technical Services
- [ ] Circulation Services
- [ ] Reference Services
- [ ] Children or Young Adult Services
- [ ] Technology Services
- [ ] Other (please specify)

[   ]

*4. How long have you worked in libraries?

- 3 years or less

- 4-10 years

- 11-19 years

- 20 or more years

*5. What is the number of full-time equivalent staff that work in your library?

- Less than 1 to 10

- 11 to 30

- 31 to 50

- 51 to 100

- 101 to 200

- Over 200

*6. Do you have a MLS or MLIS degree?

- Yes

- No

3. LSTA Competitive Grants Program

Each year, the State Library awards about $800,000 in competitive grants to legally established libraries, or non-profit entities serving libraries. One of the main criteria in awarding a grant is if it supports Oregon's LSTA Five-Year Plan.

*1. Do you know about the State Library's LSTA competitive grants program?

- Yes

- No

4. Competitive Grants Program

＊1. How did you first hear about Oregon's LSTA competitive grants program?

- Search engine, like Google
- Email message or listserve
- Conference or meeting
- Brochure or newsletter
- Colleague
- Contact from the State Library
- I don't recall
- Other (please specify)

＊1. On behalf of your library or for another organization, have you applied for a LSTA grant?

- Yes
- No

*1. If no, why has your library not applied for a LSTA grant? (Check all that apply)

- No need
- The process is too complicated
- I didn't know that my library was eligible
- No time to write the proposal
- The program is only for public libraries
- My library could not provide ongoing funding for a potential project
- I don't know
- Other (please specify)

1. Please answer the following about the LSTA competitive grants program. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
t				⊡	⊡
The grant cycle timetable is reasonable.	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡
				⊡	⊡
State Library staff members helped me when I asked for help with our grant application.	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡
en I				⊡	⊡
I understood the process used to review and evaluate my application.	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡
, and				⊡	⊡
The peer evaluations of the LSTA-funded projects help others understand the value of each project.	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡	⊡

2. What, if anything, would you change about the LSTA competitive grants process?

3. What resources would you find useful as you prepare and submit a LSTA grant application?

4. Please share any comments that you may have about the LSTA competitive grants program.

The State Library uses LSTA funds to pay for statewide subscriptions to the Gale and Learning Express database products. The following questions concern your use of the databases, training, and the value of these products to your library.

* 1. Do you know about the State Library's Database program?

◌ Yes

◌ No

* 1. I use at least one of the databases (Gale or Learning Express)

◌ Daily

◌ At least once a week

◌ At least once a month

◌ A few times a year

◌ I do not use.

The State Library and the Database vendors offer training on these products. The next questions are about this training.

* 1. Have you participated in any training about the Gale or Learning Express products?

◌ Yes

◌ No

* 1. Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not participated in database training? (Check all that apply)

- I don't have the time.
- In-person trainings are too far from my library.
- I didn't know about their availability.
- My library's technology does not support webinars.
- I don't like to participate in webinars.
- I don't need this training; I already know how to use databases.
- I don't use databases.
- I don't know enough about what is in the databases.
- My library doesn't have enough employees to cover in my absence.
- Other (please specify)

1. Please rate the database training provided by the following organizations. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Gale					
Oregon State Library					
Learning Express					
A combination of these trainers					

2. Please answer the following about database training. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Database training improved my ability to help library users understand the databases and their features.					

1. Please answer the following about the impact of the databases. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				☐	☐
My library has saved money on online journals and magazines subscriptions because of the State Library's databases.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐			☐	☐
If my library did not have the State Library's databases, my library could not offer the equivalent information resources.	☐ ☐		☐	☐	☐
	☐			☐	☐
My library's users depend on the State Library's databases to find the information resources that they need.	☐ ☐		☐	☐	☐
	☐				
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

atabase Program.

The L-net Program, Oregon's statewide reference service, provides a centralized online reference service for everyone who lives, works, or goes to school in Oregon, as well as staff training and support for Oregon libraries to provide that service.

L-net also provides software tools so that local libraries can provide the same service to local libraries. Any library in Oregon may use L-net Local to provide online chat reference service to their local community or in partnership with other Oregon libraries.

L-net services are supported in part through LSTA funds administered by the State Library.

* 1. How did you first hear about L-net?

- I am not aware of this program.
- Search engine, like Google
- Email message or listserve
- Conference or meeting
- Brochure or newsletter
- Colleague
- Contact from the State Library
- I don't recall
- Other (please specify)

* 1. Do you use L-net services to answer reference questions?

- Yes
- No

* 1. Why do you or your library not use the L-net service? (Check all that apply)

- I don't know enough about L-net
- My library can answer all our users' reference questions
- We used L-net, but stopped because we were not happy with the service.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

1. Please answer the following questions. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
If you have used L-net to answer a reference questions, please rate your overall satisfaction with L-net reference services.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If you have contacted L-net staff members to answer a question about L-net, please rate your overall satisfaction with the staff member's response.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Please answer the following about the impact of using L-net to answer reference questions. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My library increased its visibility in our community because we use L-net.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My library's users are better served because we use L-net.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
L-net is an essential part of my library's services.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My library's users depend on L-net to find the information resources that they need.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

18. L-net Local

Any library in Oregon may use L-net Local to provide online chat reference service to their local community or in partnership with other Oregon libraries.

*1. Do you use L-net Local?

☐ Yes

☐ No

19. L-net Local

1. Please answer the following questions. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Overall, what is your rating of the L-net Local technical support?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall, what is your rating of the L-net Local training?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Please rate your overall satisfaction with L-net Local.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Please answer the following about the impact that L-net Local has made to your library. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
L-net				▢	▢
My library's users are better served because we use L-net Local.	▢	▢	▢	▢	▢
				▢	▢
My library's users depend on L-net Local to find the information resources that they need.	▢	▢	▢	▢	▢

3. Please share any comments that you have about L-net Local.

[text box]

＊1. L-net partners are those libraries that contribute staff time to answer reference questions or promote L-net in their communities.

Is your library a L-net partner?

▢ Yes

▢ No

＊1. Why is your library not a L-net partner? (Check all that apply)

☞ My library does not have staff time to contribute.

☞ My reference staff members do not have enough experience in reference work.

☞ My library does not employ reference librarians.

☞ I don't know enough about L-net.

☞ Other (please specify)

[text box]

1. Please answer the following questions. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Overall, what is your rating of the L-net Partner Program?	⬚	⬚	⬚	⬚	⬚
Overall, what is your rating of the L-net Partner training?	⬚	⬚	⬚	⬚	⬚

2. Why are you (or your library) an L-net Partner?

- I like networking with other reference librarians.
- It makes my job more interesting.
- I want to contribute to library service statewide.
- My library benefits from L-net and I want to give back.
- This is a job requirement.
- Other (please specify)

3. Please share any comments that you have about being a L-net Partner.

The State Library offers public libraries free website and hosting, training, and support through the Plinkit program. This program is supported by LSTA funds.

*1. Only public libraries are eligible for Plinkit. Please select one:

- My library is not a public library.
- My library is a public library, but does not use Plinkit.
- My library uses Plinkit.

* 1. Why does your library not participate in Plinkit?

- Plinkit is too expensive.

- I don't know enough about Plinkit.

- We are satisfied with our library's website.

- Other (please specify)

* 1. How did you first hear about the Plinkit project?

- Search engine, like Google

- Email message or listserve

- Conference or meeting

- Brochure or newsletter

- Colleague

- Contact from State Library

- I don't recall

- Other (please specify)

2. Please answer the following questions. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Overall, what is your rating of the technical support provided by the State Library to implement and maintain Plinkit?					
Overall, what is your rating of the support materials, for example, the Plinkit manual, provided by the State Library?					
Overall, what is your rating of training provided by the State Library about how to use Plinkit?					

3. Please answer the following about the impact of Plinkit. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				⬕	⬕
My library users are better served because of our Plinkit Website.	⬕	⬕	⬕	⬕	⬕
				⬕	⬕

4. Please share any comments that you have about Plinkit.

[text box]

The Youth Services Consultant at the State Library provides consulting services to local libraries, plans the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute, and provides information and resources to support the Statewide Summer Reading Program.

*1. Have you used the services of the State Library Youth Services consultant?

⬕ Yes

⬕ No

*1. Which consulting services have you used? (Check all that apply)

🖝 I asked a question about a service to children or teens.

🖝 I asked for resources I was trying to find.

🖝 I asked for a visit to my library.

🖝 The consultant called me when she was in my area and offered to visit my library.

🖝 I attended training.

🖝 Other (please specify)

[text box]

*2. What was the impact of the consulting services? (Check all that apply)

- I received a helpful answer to my question about services to children or teens.

- I received the resources and used them to improve an existing service or develop a new service successfully.

- I used the training to improve an existing service or develop a new service.

- The Youth Services Consultant visited my library and made suggestions that improved service to children and teens.

- I received an answer, resources, training, or a visit, but did not find it useful.

- I saw no impact.

- Other (please specify)

3. Please share any comments that you may have about the services from the Youth Services Consultant.

*1. Have you or one of your library's employees attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute?

- Yes, I attended.

- Yes, one of my library's staff attended.

- No

1. If you attended, what was the impact of the Focus Institute on you? (Check all that apply)

- I returned to my library and changed the way I served children and teens.

- I developed a network of colleagues in which we continue to provide each other with professional support and advice.

- I learned valuable information and received good resources that I want to use in the future.

- I learned valuable information and received good resources, but will not use it in the future.

- The information and resources were not valuable to me and have no impact on my delivery of services to children and teens.

- Other (please specify)

2. If an employee from your library attended, what was the impact of the Focus Institute? (Check all that apply)

- The employee returned to my library and changed the way that he or she served children and teens.

- The employee developed a network of colleagues that continues to provide with professional support and advice.

- The employee learned valuable information and received good resources that he or she wants to use in the future.

- The employee learned valuable information and received good resources, but will not use it in the future.

- The information and resources were not valuable to the employee and had no impact on the delivery of services to children and teens.

- Other (please specify)

3. Please share any comments that you have about the Focus Institute.

*1. Does your library participate in the Statewide Summer Reading Program?

- Yes

- No

1. Please answer the following questions. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Overall, what is your opinion of the Summer Reading Program?	▥	▥	▥	▥	▥
Overall, what is your rating of the Statewide Summer Reading Program materials provided by the State Library and its summer reading partners (such as, manuals, vendor's catalog, certificates, and sweepstakes materials)?	▥	▥	▥	▥	▥

2. The State Library pays the membership fees to the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) and purchases CSLP summer reading manuals for all public, volunteer, and tribal libraries in Oregon.

Do you value that the State Library pays for membership in CSLP and purchases summer reading manuals for libraries?

▥ Yes

▥ No

3. What is your opinion of how the State Library and the Oregon Library Association represent you in CSLP?

▥ I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP as a result of their efforts.

▥ I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts because my library wouldn't be able to have a summer reading program without the CSLP summer reading manual and CD of clip-art.

▥ I appreciate the efforts of my CSLP representatives, but I don't think they or anyone else can effectively represent me because CSLP is too big.

▥ They are not representing me effectively in CSLP and need to makes changes in how they gather feedback and communicate important information in order to better represent me.

▥ Other (please specify)

4. If the State Library did not pay for your library's participation in the CSLP and you did not receive a summer reading manual or CD of clip-art, what would your library do?

- The library would not have a Summer Reading Program.

- The library would develop its own Summer Reading Program, but would significantly reduce the scope and activities.

- The library would develop its own program and could continue it at the same level as now.

- Other (please specify)

5. Please answer the following about the impact of the Summer Reading Program. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				🔲	🔲
The SRP participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	🔲	🔲	🔲	🔲	🔲
P.				🔲	🔲
The parents in the community appreciated the SRP.	🔲	🔲	🔲	🔲	🔲
				🔲	🔲

6. Please share any comments that you may have about the Statewide Summer Reading Program.

The Northwest Central database is an online clearinghouse for library continuing education and collaboration serving library staff in Oregon and Washington. Northwest Central is supported, in part, by LSTA funds.

* 1. Do you know about the NW Central database?

- Yes

- No

* 1. How did you first hear about the NW Central database?

- Search engine, like Google

- Email message or listserve

- Conference or meeting

- Brochure or newsletter

- Colleague

- Contact from State Library

- I do not recall

- Other (please specify)

* 1. Have you used NW Central database to find a CE event?

- Yes

- No

* 1. In the last year, did you participate in at least one CE event that you found on the NW Central database?

- Yes

- No

* 2. Please answer the following.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
) the					

3. If you have entered information about a continuing education event in the NW Central database, has that increased the number of participants in your events or courses?

- Yes

- No

- I don't know

4. Please share any comments that you may have about the NW Central database.

OSLIS is a web portal to statewide licensed databases, information literacy lessons, and a citation creation tool designed for K-12 students and teachers while maintaining the school library at the heart of student research. OSLIS is supported, in part, by LSTA funds.

* 1. Do you use the OSLIS web portal?

- Yes
- No

* 1. How did you first hear about the OSLIS project?

- Search engine, like Google
- Email message or listserve
- Conference or meeting
- Brochure or newsletter
- Colleague
- Contact from State Library
- I don't recall
- Other (please specify)

*1. Why does your library not use OSLIS? (Check all that apply)

- OSLIS' resources are not relevant to me or my library's users.
- I don't know enough about OSLIS.
- My library's internet connection is not fast enough.
- I would use OSLIS if I had the training.
- The databases are difficult to use.
- Citation Maker is difficult to use.
- The information literacy lessons are difficult to use.
- The OSLIS website is difficult to use.
- Other (please specify)

*1. Do you use OSLIS to access (Check all that apply)

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy lessons
- Professional resources

*2. Does your school or library webpage have a link to OSLIS?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

*3. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your school?

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy lessons
- Other (please specify)

*4. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy lessons
- Other (please specify)

5. Please answer the following.

	Very Easy	Easy	Sometime I find the information that I want.	Hard	Very Hard
d on					

*6. Have you participated in training given by State Library staff about OSLIS?

- Yes
- No

7. If yes, please answer the following.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Please rate OSLIS training.					

8. Please answer the following about the impact of OSLIS. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				⬛	⬛
My library users are better served because of OSLIS.	⬛	⬛	⬛	⬛	⬛
				⬛	⬛
My library receives more use, such as increased website traffic or in-person visits, because of OSLIS.	⬛	⬛	⬛	⬛	⬛
				⬛	⬛

9. Please share any comments that you may have about the OSLIS program.

The State Library will adopt a new plan covering Federal Fiscal Years 2013 to 2018 to guide the use of LSTA funds. This Plan must be based on priorities set by Congress in the Library Services and Technology Act, which is administered by the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The following questions ask you to identify your priorities for the use of LSTA funds during this time.

1. Please rate the following areas for LSTA funds priority. You can skip any item for which you have no opinion or information.

	Not a priority	Low priority	Average priority	Above average priority	High priority
		☐	☐	☐	☐
Statewide virtual reference (L-Net program)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
arning		☐	☐	☐	☐
Expanding the state library's consulting services for libraries	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		☐	☐	☐	☐
Extending library services to special populations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ӕ		☐	☐	☐	☐
The competitive grants program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
gon's		☐	☐	☐	☐
OSLIS – Oregon School Libraries Information System	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		☐	☐	☐	☐
Providing continuing education opportunities for library staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. What other priorities can you identify for the use of LSTA funds?

3. Thank you for completing this survey. We value your opinions and feedback.

If you would like to enter a drawing for a $25 gift card from Powell's books, please provide your name and your email address below