

Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

***Amy Kemp, PhD
Dynamic Analysis, LCC***

February 28, 2012

***Arizona State Library, Archives
and Public Records
Library Development Division***

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Cover Page

- State Library Administrative Agency: Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records
- Title of the evaluation: Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation
- Evaluator(s) name and organizational affiliation: Amy Kemp, PhD Dynamic Analysis, LLC
- Date: 2/28/12
- Name of the team, branch, unit, or person commissioning the evaluation: Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records -- Library Development Division

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Table of Contents

Cover Page.....	1
Table of Contents.....	2
Index of Annexes.....	3
Index of Tables.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Section 1: Purpose.....	9
Section 1.1: Purpose.....	9
Section 1.2 Intended Users and Product.....	9
Section 1.3: Evaluation Questions and Issues.....	9
Section 1.4: Guiding Principles.....	10
Section 2: Background.....	11
Section 2.1: Arizona.....	11
Section 3: Approach to the Evaluation and Methodology.....	12
Section 3.1: Framework.....	12
Section 3.2 Primary Data Collection.....	12
Section 3.3: Secondary Data Collection.....	17
Section 3.4: Overall Data Strengths and Weaknesses.....	20
Section 4: Analysis.....	21
Section 4.1: Policy Analysis – Retrospective Questions.....	21
Section 4.2: Primary Data Analysis – Retrospective Questions.....	24
Section 4.3: Summary.....	38
Section 5: Findings – Process and Prospective Questions.....	39
Section 6: Recommendations – Prospective Questions and Looking Ahead to the Next Five Year Plan.....	40
Annexes.....	43

Index of Annexes

Annex A: List of acronyms.....	43
Annex B: American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators.....	44
Annex C: Request for Proposal for Arizona 2008- 2012 LSTA Evaluation	52
Annex D: List of people interviewed.....	62
Annex E: Focus Group Instrument.....	63
Annex F: Interview Instrument	65
Annex G: Online Survey Instrument.....	68
Annex H: LSTA External Subgrant Guidelines for 2011	78
Annex I: Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records Mission and Goals.....	82
Annex J: IMLS LSTA Purpose and Goals.....	83
Annex K: Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan.....	85
Annex L: Descriptive Statistics of Survey Responses.....	115
Annex M: Reporting Guidelines LSTA subgrants.....	127
Annex N: Bibliography of Documents Reviewed.....	128

Index of Tables

Table 1: Background Information on Interview Participants.....	15
Table 2: Arizona LSTA Internal and External Projects Allocations and Expenditures...	18
Table 3: LSTA Expenditures by Goals.....	22
Table 4: LSTA Expenditures by Areas of Need.....	23
Table 5: Online Survey Rating of LSTA Areas of Need.....	29
Table 6: Online Survey Rating of Impact of LSTA	33
Table 7: Online Survey Percentages of Utilization of Professional Development.....	36
Table 8: Online Survey Percentages of Utilization of Professional Development-Staff...	37
Table 9: Online Survey Percentages of Database Importance.....	37

Executive Summary

The purpose of the of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan Evaluation for the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR) is: to examine the effectiveness of the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan in meeting the strategic goals set out in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan, the goals of the LSTA program, the mission and goals of the ASLAPR, and the needs of Arizona's communities.

The major questions addressed in the evaluation are:

- Did the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) reflect the needs of Arizona communities during that time period?
- Are the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) still relevant to the needs of Arizona communities for the future?
- Did the work undertaken related to LSTA from 2008-2012 fulfill the goals identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan:
 - Was there positive impact on customer experience and the enhancement of the user's ability to use information and services?
 - Was there positive impact on community responsiveness and the ability of library staff to provide desired information, services and programs for communities?
 - Was there positive impact on enhancing of Arizona librarians ability to meet the lifespan learning need of Arizonans?
 - Was there positive impact on collaboration and the ability of libraries to extend services, reach new audiences, and better serve their diverse communities?
 - Was there positive impact on Arizonan's view of libraries as a relevant and excellent source of information in-person, digitally, or through collaborations?
- Are these goals still relevant for Arizona's library needs? Are they attainable? Are they sufficiently ambitious?

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- Is the current approach to funding, with a large percentage of Arizona's LSTA allocation being used to fund statewide database projects as well as professional development and another portion allocated to competitive local projects an effective, flexible, and impactful allocation of resources?

Data for these questions were gathered from librarians and library staff through key stakeholder interviews, a focus group, and an online survey. Existing LSTA data, including budget and implementation data, were also examined for this report.

These data were analyzed through qualitative and policy analysis within the framework of: the areas of need and goals of the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan, the mission and goals of the goals of the LSTA program, and the mission and goals of the ASLAPR.

Key findings

- The vast majority of respondents confirm that the needs and goals the LSTA funds are and continue to be meaningful and relevant to Arizona's libraries and communities.
- The majority of respondents regard LSTA plan's needs and goals, and the LSTA-funded projects undertaken with ASLAPR assistance as effective and meaningful.
- The ASLAPR enjoys near-universal appreciation. The processes and supports they have put in place are regarded as user-friendly and flexible while effectively targeting improvement.
- The ASLAPR's flexible approach of subgranting to local libraries is seen as critical to fostering local innovation while remaining flexible to community need and diversity in Arizona.
- ASLAPR's professional development opportunities are highly sought and well-regarded for their centralized planning and administration as well as their interactive, responsive nature.
- The ASLAPR plays a highly-valued role in the acquisition and planning of databases, e content and other technologies.
- The current approach to performance measurement and goal setting for subgrants is too fragmented and dependent upon the capacity of each grantee. Despite ASLAPR's efforts to offer guidelines and technical assistance, the inconsistent nature of result measurement and data reporting still makes assessment difficult and obstructs planning and goal-setting statewide.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Key Recommendations

General Recommendations

Continue flexible subgrants to local libraries. This approach is widely appreciated and is necessary to accommodate the needs of diverse communities and libraries in Arizona. It is also an effective way to encourage and nurture innovation and collaboration. Set a specific target for the amount of funds to be awarded to external subgrants, based upon strategic planning.

Maintain Lifespan Learning Continuum and Virtual Access as areas of need. Maintain Training, Education and Consultant Support as an area of need, all well — but determine whether ASLAPR should pursue it through internal projects only.

Continue to nurture communication and responsiveness to local needs. Arizona LSTA funds serve the needs of diverse libraries that, in turn, serve diverse communities. Each has individual and specific strengths and weaknesses. Special consideration should always be given to consultation and collaboration with tribal communities.

Continue to encourage candid and meaningful discussions about pilot projects that determine what is NOT viable in a community. Spread the message that pilot projects can be very beneficial when they tell us what NOT to do, especially when a full-scale program is being considered.

Recommendations for Consideration of Modified Areas of Need

Consider developing areas of need related to library support for workforce development, and the staff development needed to support it, in the next five-year plan. Set a total cap on funding related to strategic priorities.

Modify the areas of need in Centennial Experiences to a similar area, such as “Arizona History and Archival Preservation.” Set a total cap on the funding related to strategic priorities.

Recommendations for Modifications to Subgrant Proposal and Selection Process

Clearly communicate that Lifelong Learning Continuum, Virtual Access, Workforce Development (if adopted), and Archival and Historical Materials (if adopted) are the recommended areas for external subgrants. Clearly communicate the total amount of funding to be awarded to external subgrants in each of these areas, and in total. Assign targets to the award amounts for each area of need, based on overall strategic priorities.

Assign total funding targets to each area of need. Align funding targets with desired outcomes. Develop desired outcomes for the next five-year plan through a collaborative consensus process.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Use a consensus process to develop program guidelines (e.g. best practice guidelines for selection and preservation of archival materials, scope and sequence of lifelong learning experiences, and alignment of virtual access priorities with overall planning) and consistent outcome measurement guidelines for external subgrant proposals. Outcomes for external subgrants should focus on commonly agreed-upon measurements of circulation, other measures of usage, and deployment of a standardized satisfaction survey.

Consider modifying the subgrant selection process to better encourage collaboration, dissemination, and an outcome-based mentality. Examine the process for reviewing applications. Consider awarding fewer subgrants, and establishing priority awards or bonus points based upon criteria such as innovation, collaboration and communication of findings, and the measurement of results.

Support, require, and enforce consistent and rigorous evaluation for internal and external projects. All project proposals should be reviewed for thorough and realistic evaluation and measurement planning. All implemented projects should continually reflect and report on their measurable outcomes.

Recommendations for Strategic Planning, Dissemination, and the Role of the ASLAPR

Identify forums for peer dissemination of LSTA findings, and opportunities to highlight exemplary projects in a centralized venue.

In addition to encouraging dissemination of subgrant outcomes and findings at the local level, develop an avenue for dissemination and discussion of these findings statewide. This discussion should include: approaches to sustaining LSTA “pilot” projects after LSTA funding; approaches that use the one-year cycle of LSTA projects as a benefit rather than a challenge; and how LSTA results can be used to encourage collaboration, sustainable funding investment, and innovation.

Increase ASLAPR’s role in strategic planning around virtual access and e content including databases. Most stakeholders noted that they valued opportunities to leverage common resources and coordinate planning around investment in digital technology.

Examine the extent to which most of ASLAPR’s internal projects are related to professional development. Use a collaborative process to create an overall plan for professional development which develops a timeline and strategic plan. Establish explicit and standard measurement methods and benchmarks for success. Consider standardized measurement of customer satisfaction as well as retention, recruitment and movement of the library workforce towards continuing education credits, other appropriate certifications, and degree attainment as goals.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

1. Purpose

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan Evaluation for the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR) is: to examine the effectiveness of the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan in meeting the strategic goals set out in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan, the goals of the LSTA program, the mission and goals of the ASLAPR, and the needs of Arizona's communities.

1.2 Intended Users and Product

This evaluation was designed to meet the needs of multiple users and produce a final report (this report) as a product. First, the evaluation was conducted and the report prepared to meet the ASLAPR's requirements of the LSTA grant. To this same end, this work was undertaken to facilitate and support the strategic planning process in the State of Arizona for future allocations of funds and for reflection on the successes and challenges of the current funding cycle of LSTA and beyond. Finally, during the evaluation process, a number of Arizona stakeholders identified the need to disseminate information on the uses and planning related to LSTA funding. This evaluation and report is also intended to be a resource for libraries and library stakeholders across Arizona.

1. 3 Evaluation Questions and Issues

The evaluation questions are:

- Did the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) reflect the needs of Arizona communities during that time period?
- Are the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) still relevant to the needs of Arizona communities for the future?
- Did the work undertaken related to LSTA from 2008-2012 fulfill the goals identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan:
 - Was there positive impact on customer experience and the enhancement of the user's ability to use information and services?
 - Was there positive impact on community responsiveness and the ability of library staff to provide desired information, services and programs for communities?

- Was there positive impact on enhancing of Arizona librarians ability to meet the lifespan learning need of Arizonans?
- Was there positive impact on collaboration and the ability of libraries to extend services, reach new audiences, and better serve their diverse communities?
- Was there positive impact on Arizonan's view of libraries as a relevant and excellent source of information in-person, digitally, or through collaborations?
- Are these goals still relevant for Arizona's library needs? Are they attainable? Are they sufficiently ambitious?
- Is the current approach to funding, with a large percentage of Arizona's LSTA allocation being used to fund statewide database projects as well as professional development and another portion allocated to competitive local projects an effective, flexible, and impactful allocation of resources?

1.4 Guiding Principles

The Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation was designed to be utilization-focused and data driven. The evaluation was undertaken and this present report prepared by Dynamic Analysis, LLC.

The current evaluation aligns with best practices as identified by the American Evaluation Association (American Evaluation Association, 2012; see Annex B for the complete principles).and its approach is guided by the framework of Utilization-Focused Evaluation. As stated by Michael Quinn Patten (2000), the developer of the approach:

Utilization-focused evaluation begins with the premise that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use; therefore, evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, *from beginning to end*, will affect use.

Utilization Focused Evaluation is a process. In the current evaluation, these guiding principles led to the following collaborations with the ASLAPR: input on the selection of primary evaluation stakeholders, review and input on evaluation instrumentation, review and discussion of overall analysis and evaluation findings, and regular updates on evaluation progress.

Instrumentation, determination of key stakeholders, and analysis findings were openly conducted in collaboration with the ASLAPR in order to assure that the evaluation's primary users were well-informed of the process and actively involved in the development of knowledge and its use. A useful evaluation process requires that data and analysis are believable and valid as well as practical, cost effective, and ethical. With this in mind, the current evaluation was designed to focus on program improvement. It is

intended to offer clear, concise feedback on ongoing programming to guide improvement; to generate findings in anticipation of a new five year LSTA plan; and to generate finding that can inform the ASLAPR's work. These findings – on the needs of libraries, library users, and the effectiveness of current approaches – can then have a positive impact on libraries across the state of Arizona.

2. Background

2. 1. Arizona

The state of Arizona is diverse and dynamic, with vast expanses of sparsely populated land, as well as dense urban centers. There are communities with high population growth and communities with flat or decreasing populations. All of these areas have experienced increased poverty and unemployment during the current recession. The economic downturn has increased the necessity for efficient and effective public services with greater fiscal constraints.

Arizona's 2010 population was 6,392,017, a 24.6% increase from 2000. The state covers 113,594.08 square miles and includes communities as diverse as Phoenix, Yuma, Nogales, Safford, Peach Springs, and Window Rock. (U. S. Census, 2011).

According to 2009 data from the National Center for Children in Poverty, Arizona has 780,069 families, with 1,695,461 children. Forty eight percent (806,272) of children live in low-income families, as compared with the national rate of 42%. "Low-income" is defined as income below 200% of the federal poverty level. The federal poverty level for a family of four with two children was \$22,050 in 2010; \$22,050 in 2009; and \$21,200 in 2008.

This rate of poverty – both national and statewide – is staggering. But when poverty in Arizona is broken out by ethnic/racial groups and geography, the statistics are even more disturbing. In Arizona,

- 30% (209,975) of white children live in low-income families.
- 55% (39,034) of black children live in low-income families.
- 64% (469,553) of Hispanic children live in low-income families.
- 21% (8,496) of Asian children live in low-income families.
- 73% (56,817) of American Indian children live in low-income families.
- 46% (643,002) of children in urban areas live in low-income families.
- 56% (86,343) of children in rural areas live in low-income families (National Center for Children in Poverty, 2011).

These facts provide the context in which Arizona's libraries exist. These are the communities and people libraries serve and the diverse needs they intend to meet. Libraries certainly play an important role in supporting Arizona's families and improving the economic potential and literacy and information richness of the State. This role offers numerous challenges, along with great potential.

The challenges have increased in recent years. Arizona has experienced one of the highest rates of foreclosures in the U.S. (in August 2011, the rate was four foreclosures per 1000 units) as well as a dramatic and devastating increase in unemployment, from 3.8% 2007 to 9.9% in 2010 (First Things First, 2011). These changes have affected libraries not only in the increased needs of the communities they serve but also in the financial resources available to sustain previous levels of service.

3. Approach to the Evaluation and Methodology

3.1 Framework

The purpose of the of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan Evaluation for the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR) is: to examine the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan's effectiveness in meeting its strategic goals, the goals of the LSTA program, the mission and goals of the ASLAPR, and the needs of Arizona's communities.

Data for these questions were gathered from librarians and library staff through key stakeholder interviews, a focus group, and an online survey. Existing LSTA data, including budget and implementation data, were also examined for this report.

These data were analyzed through qualitative and policy analysis within the framework of: the areas of need and goals of the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan, the mission and goals of the goals of the LSTA program, and the mission and goals of the ASLAPR.

The ASLAPR solicited potential independent evaluators for the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan Evaluation by releasing a Request for Proposals through the Arizona State Procurement Office (Request for Proposal can be found at Annex C). At the completion of that process, ASLAPR staff solicited additional proposals from independent evaluators and firms including Dynamic Analysis, LLC. The Dynamic Evaluation, LLC proposal was reviewed on the following criteria: evaluator experience; proposed approach to the evaluation; ability to carry out a statewide project; and ability to carry out the project as demonstrated by the proposed plan and timeline for completion. After review, ASLAPR staff negotiated with Dynamic Analysis, LLC on final timeline and products and the proposal was accepted. Dynamic Analysis, LLC completed all data collection and analysis described in this present report.

3.2 Primary Data Collection

Primary data collection for this evaluation focused on the perception of needs related to library services, the perception of effectiveness and outcomes of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan and LSTA funding during 2008-2012 and the perceptions on areas of improvement or modification. Primary data were collected via four mechanisms:

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- Key stakeholder interviews with State Library staff members Laura Stone, Arizona State Library Consultant; Holly Henley, Arizona State Library, Library Development Division Director; and Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library, Acting State Librarian on November 2, 2011, with additional follow-up through March 2012. (A list of people interviewed can be found in Annex D).
- A focus group of Arizona County librarians on November 28, 2011 (A list of people interviewed can be found in Annex D).
- Eleven telephone interviews of county, city/town, academic, and tribal librarians conducted between November 29, 2011 and January 10, 2012.
- Online survey of 965 library stakeholders with a final response rate of 16% for 159 total responses. The survey was released December 22, 2011 and closed January 16, 2012.

Respondents were assured their responses would be confidential and reported only in aggregate. So, with the exception of ASLAPR staff, names of survey and interview respondents are not reported.

3.2.1. Interview and focus group methodology and limitations

Key stakeholder interview

The key stakeholder interview with State Library staff members Laura Stone, Arizona State Library Consultant; Holly Henley, Arizona State Library, Library Development Division Director; Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library, Acting State Librarian and Amy Kemp, PhD of Dynamic Analysis, LLC on November 2, 2011 was open-ended, with a primary focus on an overview of LSTA history, purpose, needs and goals and a definition of the evaluation's purpose. Follow-up discussion with ASLAPR staff was primarily for the purpose of obtaining updates and additional detail on LSTA programming and accessing secondary data (more detail in section 3.2.2).

The data obtained in these meetings and communications were used to prepare the survey, focus group and interview instrumentation as well as identify respondents for all data collection. Data gathered from ASLAPR staff on the purpose of LSTA funds – especially funding priorities – were triangulated with perceptions of librarians throughout Arizona and LSTA application and budget documentation.

The key stakeholder interview had limitations, including the small interview sample size and an evaluation timeline that fell mostly over the holiday season. Most importantly, State library staff members as primary administrators of LSTA funds, have a particular viewpoint on LSTA uses and history. This limitation was balanced through the triangulation of data from Arizona librarians and survey respondents. However, the

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

orientation provided by ASLAPR staff – which was fundamental to the construction of the evaluation – could not be eliminated entirely. However, readers will observe a pronounced consistency in responses about the purpose, success, and importance of LSTA throughout the analysis. Therefore, these data can be viewed as credible for analytic and planning purposes.

Focus group

The focus group of Arizona County librarians on November 28, 2011 was a mix of constructed, open-ended questions and group generated responses (focus group instrument can be found at Annex E). Eleven librarians participated in the focus group, one of which was present for only the final 15-20 minutes. The focus group was held at the general meeting of county librarians at the Arizona Library Association Conference at the Westin La Paloma conference center in Tucson, Arizona (the Arizona State Library directory can be found at <http://www.lib.az.us/alts/Directory.aspx>).

The focus group was facilitated by Amy Kemp, PhD of Dynamic Analysis, LLC. ASLAPR staff identified this forum and group of stakeholders, ASLAPR equipment was used to record input, and ASLAPR stakeholders had access to the recording. All focus group participants were aware of these conditions and gave their consent. With the exception of one person to monitor recording equipment, ASLAPR staff was not present for the focus group, though they rejoined the regular meeting at its conclusion.

The purpose of the focus group was to gather data on the perception of library service needs, perception of effectiveness and outcomes of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan, and ideas on areas of improvement or modification. The focus group was also intended to refine the survey and interview instrumentation and focus and triangulate understanding of LSTA programs with key issues on the part of the evaluator. However, consistent agreement on key issues and purposes of funding from focus group participants led to minimal instrumentation changes.

The Arizona County librarian focus group had limitations. It included only county librarians, rather than all librarians. County librarians have different perspectives than city/town, academic or tribal librarians (this was born out to some extent in the interviews). Therefore, the evaluation would have benefited from the presence of these other groups, especially in cross-dialogue. Most importantly, the focus group was held in the midst of the County Librarians' meeting, so the potential influence of ASLAPR staff and their access to the raw data could have been a factor. But respondents were fully aware of the recording, key ASLAPR staff were not present during the focus group, and the evaluator did not perceive any lack of candor from participants. The narrow scope of participants and the potential for outside influence cannot be eliminated entirely. However, readers will observe a pronounced consistency in responses about the purpose, success, and importance of LSTA throughout the analysis. Therefore, these data can be viewed as credible for analytic and planning purposes.

Interviews

The eleven telephone interviews of county, city/town, academic, and tribal librarians conducted between November 29, 2011 and January 10, 2012 were a series of constructed, open-ended questions (interview instrument can be found at Annex F). Participants included librarians and library staff, but were primarily library directors. Table 1. below summarizes respondent background. Interview respondents represented a range of library types – urban, rural and tribal as well as county, city, special and school libraries. Overall, respondents were highly educated veterans of library work, with the majority holding a Master's or Master's in library science and serving in their current position or library service for over ten years with many having served over 25 years.

Table 1. Background Information on Interview Participants

Affiliation	Title	Degree	Years in Current position	Years in Library field
K-12 School Library	Teacher/librarian	Masters of Science	25 years	25 years
Special Library	Education Administrator	Doctorate educational administration	3 years	30 years
Academic Library	Assistant Division Director	Doctorate	6 months	11 to 12 years
County Library	Library Director	Masters of Library Science	7 years	30 years
City Library	Leisure and Library services Director	Masters of Library Science	6 months	6.5 years
County Library	Library District Development Officer	Masters of Library Science	10 years	28 years
City Library	Director of Library Services	High School Diploma	5 years	11 years
County Library	Director of Library District	Masters of Library Science	14 years	34 years
City Library	Library Director and Library Manager	Masters of Library Science Masters of Library Science	25 years 3 years	31 years 17 years
Tribal Library	Library Director	Masters of Science	27 years	27 years
Tribal Library	Librarian	Masters of Library Science	3 years	3 years

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Participants were identified in discussions between Amy Kemp, PhD of Dynamic Analysis, LLC and ASLAPR staff. They were selected to reflect both the geographic diversity of Arizona and all types of public libraries in the state. Stakeholders were identified using the following criteria:

- Geographic distribution throughout Arizona (e.g. rural, urban, tribal)
- Types of libraries (e.g. county library, school library, academic library)
- Familiarity with the LSTA program
- Amount of time in current position

Interviews, arranged between Dr. Kemp and each individual, were conducted via telephone. Originally scheduled for an hour, the interviews generally ran one-half hour. All participants were informed of their purpose and consented to have their responses noted (no recordings were made) with the understanding that they would not be reported with any names or identifiers.

These telephone interviews had limitations. First, the participants were a non-random sample of public librarians. Initially 16 librarians were selected for interviews with a final sample of eleven calls (with two participating on one call for a total of twelve respondents). Secondly, participants included librarians and library directors from multiple types of public libraries, but their perspective may not represent all librarians or library users. Also, timeline required that interviews be conducted primarily over the 2011-2012 holiday season, which may have impacted availability of some librarians.

With a non-random sample of twelve public librarians, the potential for bias cannot be entirely eliminated. However, this sample was constructed to represent a diversity of opinions and perspectives on library needs and the effectiveness of LSTA in meeting them. This set of librarians was chosen for their familiarity with LSTA and therefore, may be more knowledgeable than a random sample. With these limitations in mind, readers will note a pronounced consistency in responses about the purpose, success, and importance of LSTA throughout the analysis.

3.2.2. Survey methodology and limitations

The LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012 online survey of 965 library stakeholders was released December 22, 2011 and closed January 16, 2012. The survey was distributed to 965 people, via the online survey tool Zoomerang. The distribution list consisted of:

- Staff from public libraries (including library Directors, librarians and library assistants)
- Staff from special libraries (such as museum or foundation libraries)
- Staff from academic libraries (including university and public school – K-12)
- Library-related organizations
- School library faculty and staff

The final response rate was 16%. This includes 159 completed surveys and 37 partial completions for 196 total responses. Partial responses were excluded – generally, these respondents completed only the first few items and did not include any information about themselves (education level, year in library service) or their library or community (urban rural, etc). Comparison of partial and completed surveys showed a response pattern so similar there was no reason to believe that partial responders were a different population than completers.

The online survey was a series of constructed, closed-ended questions (survey instrument can be found at Annex G). In pilot testing, the survey was estimated to take between four and eight minutes to complete, depending upon the responses-to-skip patterning. All participants were informed of the purpose of the data collection and consented to have their responses noted with the understanding that their responses would not be reported with their names or the names of their community or library.

The purpose of the focus group was the systematic gathering of data on perception of needs related to library services, perception of effectiveness and outcomes of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan and LSTA funding during 2008-2012 and perceptions of areas of improvement or modification.

The online survey had limitations. First, the participants were a non-random sample of public library stakeholders. The email distribution list was created from an already-existing ASLAPR list of stakeholders. An initial survey was sent, along with one reminder, and the due date was extended into January to increase potential respondents. Secondly, the final response rate – though within the expected range – was still a small percentage of the total distribution list. There is a clear potential that only respondents familiar with the LSTA program and/or notably pleased or discouraged with it were the primary respondents, which would lead to a biased response sample. Finally, the evaluation was conducted primarily over the 2011-2012 holiday season. So it is highly likely this impacted the availability of some librarians. However, one extension and an email reminder were sent to respondents to encourage completion.

Potential bias cannot be entirely eliminated in any survey. This sample of library stakeholders represented a diversity of opinions and perspectives on library needs and effectiveness of LSTA in meeting them. With these limitations in mind, readers will note a pronounced consistency in responses about the purpose, success, and importance of LSTA throughout the analysis.

3.3 Secondary Data Collection

Secondary data collection for this evaluation focused on the review of documentation, including budgets and planning information, from the ASLAPR. The review of documents was divided into three categories:

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- External (local library) project proposals, budgets and their reported outcomes
- Internal project proposals, budgets and their reported outcomes, including statewide professional development opportunities and database project budget and planning documentation
- Guidelines and evaluation criteria for selection of competitive proposals.

This analysis made reference to LSTA and other planning documents from projects before 2008. However, to reflect the goals of this evaluation, the focus of review and analysis of planning, implementation, and budget documents is for 2008 – 2010. There is also discussion of the status and planning for 2011. But, because those projects are currently in implementation phase, there is no complete summary. Planning for 2012 funding is also discussed. But because this evaluation is due in 2012, before disbursement of the funds, there is only general discussion of those potential projects.

Overall, the ASLAPR awards and expends between 25 and 30 percent of its total LSTA allocation to external subgrant projects and about 70 to 75 percent of internal projects. Table 2 below presents allocation and expenditures of Arizona LSTA and the division of funds between internal and external projects.

Table 2. Arizona LSTA Internal and External Project Allocations and Expenditures.

Fiscal year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Internal projects	Grants funded: 47 Total awarded: \$2,251,482	Grants funded: 38 Total awarded: \$2,403,116	Grants funded: 45 Total awarded: \$2,680,110	Not yet funded	Not yet funded
External subgrant projects	Grants funded: 47 Total awarded: \$977,124	Grants funded: 75 Total awarded: \$1,086,548	Grants funded: 59 Total awarded: \$942,319	Grants funded: 44 Total awarded: \$882,828 (preliminary)	Not yet funded
TOTAL	\$3,228,606	\$3,489,664	\$3,622,429	\$3,324,148 (allocation only)	

3.3.1 External Subgrant Project Proposals

As seen in Table 2 above, between 25 and 30 percent of the total Arizona LSTA allocation is expended through external subgrant projects. Table 2 also shows the number of external subgrant projects, which have ranged in this LSTA funding period between 44 (2011 data are preliminary) and 75.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

External subgrants are competitively awarded to local libraries throughout Arizona. Grant award periods begin on October 1 of the respective fiscal year, and grant awards are issued from IMLS after the Federal budget is signed by the President. At that point, ASLAPR staff begin to implement the plan already developed for competitive external proposals. This includes finalizing grant guidelines, offering guidance and training on the preparation of competitive and measurable proposals, and administering the proposal review and award process in early fiscal year. Once selected and awarded in late March and April, these local projects begin notifications in May, clarifications in June, and complete programming the following year (completed by August, all reports submitted by September). A grant recipient workshop is held in June to clarify implementation focus and support data driven and outcomes focused planning.

Libraries applying for LSTA subgrants are encouraged to form partnerships and all partners must benefit. Funds are primarily for new projects that serve as models or pilots. Libraries may apply for subsequent phases of a project that is underway. Libraries may also apply for funding for an ongoing project if it reaches new audiences, incorporates new technologies, or significantly expands the project's reach.

The ASLAPR provides technical assistance and implements proposal selection guidelines designed to bring about change in target audience skills, attitudes, knowledge, behaviors, statues or life conditions. Matrix 2 of the Arizona LSTA 2008 – 2012 Plan identifies program and measurement guidelines (see Annex K).

Annex H presents the proposal guidelines for 2011 funding. As can be seen in Annex H, the ASLAPR lays out three areas for funding: Centennial Experiences, Lifespan Learning, and Virtual Access. For each area, project models, with descriptions, outcomes, and evaluation mechanisms are presented. For example, in the area of Virtual Access:

Innovative Virtual Service:

Description: Libraries launch innovative virtual services, accessible by both wired and wireless devices, to serve targeted audiences.

Outcome: Community leaders and educators value virtual services and resources provided by Arizona libraries.

Evaluation: Community leaders and educators are surveyed about their awareness of new, innovative virtual services.

A thorough review of ASLAPR documentation, as well as the IMLS Program Report Summary, reveals that most external subgrants were made to public libraries. In addition to public libraries, 2008-2010 saw small numbers of awards to school, academic, special and other libraries overall. The acceptance rate was very high for public libraries, with the overall rate at about 95%. The lower number of applications meant the acceptance rate for other libraries was lower – at about one-third to one-half. However, for all applications, the vast majority were accepted.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Dynamic Analysis, LLC reviewed the documentation in the 2008, 2009 and 2010 Program Report Summaries; ASLAPR budget and planning documents; and internal and external project proposals into the ASLAPR paper files for this evaluation.

3.3.2 Internal Project Proposals

Overall, the ASLAPR awards and expends about 70 to 75 percent of its allocation on internal projects. The process for internal project proposals is similar to that for external projects, though less formal. External projects are competitive proposals from local libraries to meet community needs and develop technological infrastructure and innovative programming within LSTA guidelines. Internal projects are those identified by ASLAPR staff that also fit the LSTA priorities. Internal staff members who propose a project must complete a proposal form similar to that for external projects.

In addition to projects in the external priority areas, internal areas also include training, education, and consultant support projects. Internal projects generally begin later than external projects, most commonly in October of the fiscal year.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC reviewed the documentation in the 2008, 2009 and 2010 Program Report Summaries; ASLAPR budget and planning documents; and internal and external proposals into the ASLAPR paper files for this evaluation.

3.4 Overall data strengths and weaknesses

The primary data for this evaluation was collected through focus group, interviews, and an online survey. Each data collection method has limitations, as discussed. However, the consistency in findings between groups can be considered to generally represent the perceptions of stakeholders. It should be noted, however, that all primary data collection is based on perception rather than a systematic gathering of outcome data directly related to LSTA priorities.

Additionally, perception data was gathered only on library stakeholders, rather than the general Arizona population. A survey of the library-going public was not undertaken -- as it was for the preparation of the 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan – to gather their perception of library services.

The inclusion of more feedback from actual library patrons may have increased the strength of this evaluation. But, considering the weaknesses of perception data in general, its lack is not believed to harm the overall conclusions.

Again, the most important limitation on this evaluation is that all primary data collection is based upon perception rather than a systematic gathering of outcome data directly related to LSTA priorities. Despite the guidelines put into place by the ASLAPR,

awarded external and internal projects vary substantially in their focus, scale, and potential for individual measurability. (This will be discussed further in Section 4.) Given that each project varies substantially in its potential impact and assessment of outcomes, an overall determination of the systematic impact of all projects is not currently available.

Individual project summaries, as well as overall perceptions from stakeholders, indicate that LSTA funds are widely appreciated and there is a nearly-universal consensus that the funds improve library outcomes in the LSTA priority areas.

Secondary data also make up an important component of this analysis. Existing information, including documentation and budgets related to LSTA, were reviewed. As in all secondary data analyses, the primary limitation is the accuracy/thoroughness of the existing data. ASLAPR records and information were thorough and open to the evaluator. Recommendations for how to make this information more amenable to analysis in terms of strategic planning and outcomes measurement are presented in the recommendations of this report. This will be explored in the following section.

4. Analysis

The purpose of the of the Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan Evaluation for the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR) is: to examine the effectiveness of the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan in meeting the strategic goals set out in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Annex K), the goals of the LSTA program (Annex J), the mission and goals of the ASLAPR (Annex I), and the needs of Arizona's communities. Major questions addressed in the evaluation are found in section 1.3.

4. 1. Policy Analysis – Retrospective Questions

The policy analysis presented here takes the following goals, missions and guidelines as the framework against which implementation and outcomes of LSTA should be compared. LSTA funding and implementation in Arizona is compared with these metrics and the adequacy of efforts to meet those goals is discussed. Potential alternative approaches are explored in the recommendations section.

Targeted Funding

As seen in Table 2 above, external subgrant projects comprise about 30% of Arizona LSTA allocations and expenditures and that proportion has remained stable over the current planning period, though the external subgrant percentage was decreased somewhat (26%) in 2010.

As detailed in Section 3.3, internal and external LSTA projects are awarded through a proposal process. Content and guidelines for the proposals, as well as technical assistance, are provided by the ASLAPR.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC**Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation**

Tables 3 and 4 below present the total expenditures for completed fiscal years by LSTA goals. These figures are based upon ASLAPR records, and proposals and funds are categorized into these goals based on each bidder's self-identification.

Table 3. LSTA Expenditures by Goals.

	2008	2009	2010
Customer Experience	\$1,038,134.33 (33%)	\$753,639.11 (23%)	\$624,764.93 (19%)
Community Responsiveness	\$147,083.19 (5%)	\$616,744.77 (18%)	\$491,301.34 (15%)
Continuous Progress	\$170,133.02 (5%)	\$62,626.48 (2%)	\$157,113.64 (5%)
Collaboration	\$296,039.23 (10%)	\$213,909.82 (6%)	\$162,334.20 (5%)
Connections	\$1,448,738.44 (47%)	\$1,704,661.17 (51%)	\$1,792,917.28 (56%)
Non admin total	\$3,100,128.33	\$3,351,581.35	\$3,228,431.39

Table 3 shows that the Arizona Plan's LSTA goals are not all funded at the same level. While trends do exist in larger funding areas, there is also substantial variation from year to year. Over the 2008-2010 cycles, Connections has consistently received about half or slightly more than half of all the non-administrative funds. Continuous progress has consistently received five percent or less. Customer Experience, Community Responsiveness and Collaboration have either increased or decreased over the same period.

It should be noted again: these goals are designated by the bidders themselves. While the ASLAPR does provide guidance on the meaning of these designations and types of programs most suited for them, a review of the documentation reveals substantial variation in the actual programs implemented as well as the intended and measured outcomes.

Table 4. LSTA Expenditures by Areas of Need.

	2008	2009	2010
Centennial Experiences	\$613,550.07 (20%)	\$353,139.57 (11%)	\$563,900.61 (17%)
Lifespan learning Continuum	\$790,277.18 (25%)	\$887,049.97 (26%)	\$839,492.58 (26%)
Training, Education and Consultant Support	\$395,132.06 (13%)	\$305,712.58 (9%)	\$287,217.74 (9%)
Virtual Access	\$1,301,169.02 (42%)	\$1,805,679.23 (54%)	\$1,537,820.46 (48%)
Non admin total	\$3,100,128.33	\$3,351,581.35	\$3,228,431.39

Table 4 shows that the Arizona Plan's LSTA areas of need are not all funded at the same level. And though trends exist within the larger funding areas, there is also substantial year-to-year variation. Over the 2008-2010 cycles, Virtual Access has consistently received approximately 40 - 55 percent of the total non-administrative funds and Lifespan Learning Continuum has received about 25 percent. Training, Education and Consultant Support has, according to the self-reported designations, received about ten percent and Centennial Experiences has varied between ten and twenty percent.

Proposed and Implemented projects

As identified above, designation of a project's identified goals and areas of need of is based on bidder self-determination. A review of these proposals established that the types of projects undertaken, and their alignment with goals and areas of need, varied from project to project. The variation in designated goals and areas of need makes it challenging to conduct long-term planning to measure achievement and evaluate outcomes. In addition to self-designation of goals and areas of need, the funded projects' mechanism for measuring and reporting of outcomes was also developed by the individual respondents, based upon ASLAPR guidelines. These also varied from project to project in their approach and quality.

When measurable outcomes were described and data collection undertaken to assess them, some general trends were observed. Surveys of knowledge development and satisfaction were the most common measurement tools in areas like Excellence in Service or Professional Development of Library Staff. Areas related to technology access, lifelong learning and Centennial experiences generally focused on usage statistics and surveys of skills improvement and/or satisfaction. In some cases, measurement also integrated analyses of outcome findings for specific demographic groups of clients.

The quality of measurement from individual LSTA projects varies dramatically overall. In most cases, it appears that subgrantees were thoughtful and reflective of the implementation successes and outcomes of each project, and the measurement undertaken was helpful in determining its merit.

However, this wide variety in measurement quality makes it difficult to illustrate the efficacy of particular projects or offer common metrics that gauge the overall success or impact of LSTA projects in Arizona.

Summary

The tables above show that, based on the self-assigned categories, a substantial variation exists in the funding allotted to each goal or area of need. This variation in funding does not link to clear selection choices or performance metrics in the LSTA granting or implementation process. More importantly, these designations are based on bidder self-determination. While generally consistent with the matrix of programs and measures identified in the Arizona LSTA 2008-2012 Plan (see Annex K) they can vary dramatically from project to project. This variation in type of project, designation of project, and measurement of project impact makes it challenging to set consistent priorities or determine outcomes of the implemented programs. The current process undertaken by the ASLAPR is clear and thorough, but this report makes recommendations in Section 6 for movement towards more measurable outcomes, including recommendations for granting and establishing common measurement metrics for proposals.

4.2 Primary Data Analysis – Retrospective Questions

In this section, primary data are analyzed with respect to major questions addressed in the evaluation. The following sections present focus group, interview, and survey data as well as applicable administrative and policy data related to the following key questions:

- a. Did the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) reflect the needs of Arizona communities during that time period?
- b. Are the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) still relevant to the needs of Arizona communities for the future?
- c. Did the work undertaken related to LSTA from 2008-2012 fulfill the goals identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan: Was there positive impact on customer experience and the enhancement of the user's ability to use information and services? Was there positive impact on community responsiveness and the ability of library staff to provide desired information, services and programs for

- communities? Was there positive impact on enhancing of Arizona librarians ability to meet the lifespan learning need of Arizonans? Was there positive impact on collaboration and the ability of libraries to extend services, reach new audiences, and better serve their diverse communities? Was there positive impact on Arizonan's view of libraries as a relevant and excellent source of information in-person, digitally, or through collaborations?
- d. Are these goals still relevant for Arizona's library needs? Are they attainable? Are they sufficiently ambitious?
 - e. Is the current approach to funding, with a large percentage of Arizona's LSTA allocation being used to fund statewide database projects as well as professional development and another portion allocated to competitive local projects an effective, flexible, and impactful allocation of resources?

Qualitative methodology

Interview and focus group data were analyzed for themes within each subject or interview. Then individual or group responses were sorted by themes around primary questions (A, B, C, etc). All primary question responses were reviewed for commonalities and trends, with majority and minority opinions also presented.

Interview and Focus Group Demographics

The key stakeholder interview, on November 2, 2011 with State Library staff members Laura Stone, Arizona State Library Consultant; Holly Henley, Arizona State Library, Library Development Division Director; Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library, Acting State Librarian; and Amy Kemp, PhD of Dynamic Analysis, LLC, was open-ended with a primary focus on an overview of LSTA history, purpose, and goals and understanding the evaluation's purpose. Additional follow-up was primarily to obtain updates, additional detail on LSTA programming and secondary data (more detail in section 3.2.2).

The focus group of Arizona County librarians on November 28, 2011 was a mixture of constructed, open-ended questions and group-generated responses (focus group instrument can be found at Annex E). Eleven librarians participated, one of whom was present for only the final 15-20 minutes. It was held at the general meeting of county librarians at the Arizona Library Association Conference at the Westin La Paloma conference center in Tucson, Arizona (the Arizona State Library directory can be found at <http://www.lib.az.us/alts/Directory.aspx>).

The eleven telephone interviews of county, city/town, academic, and tribal librarians conducted between November 29, 2011 and January 10, 2012 was a series of constructed, open-ended questions (interview instrument can be found at Annex F). The participants included librarians and staff but were primarily library directors. Table 1 presents a summary of respondent backgrounds. Interview respondents represented a range of library types -- urban, rural, tribal as well as county, city, special and school libraries.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Overall, the respondents were highly educated library veterans with most holding a Master's or Master's in library science and serving in their current position or library service for over ten years. Many had served over 25 years (see table 1 for additional demographic information).

Survey demographics

The LSTA survey was distributed to 965 people through the online survey tool Zoomerang. The distribution list consisted of:

- Staff from public libraries (including library directors, librarians and library assistants)
- Staff from special libraries (such as museum or foundation libraries)
- Academic libraries (including university and public school – K-12)
- Library related organizations
- Library school faculty and staff

One hundred fifty nine respondents completed the survey, for a response rate of 16%. Thirty-seven respondents completed only part of the survey.

While, this response rate places limitations on the survey, the respondents roughly represent a cross section of potential respondents, with 61 librarians (39%), 32 library directors (21%); and 62 others, including library assistants (41%).

Eighty four responses (or 53% of respondents) served urban and suburban libraries; 56 (or 36%) served rural counties, six (or 4%) served tribal communities and eleven (7%) served other communities. The majority of respondents (70%) work in county, city or town libraries. Full demographic tables can be found in annex L.

Respondents were, overall, highly educated veterans of library service. Fifty-nine percent hold a Masters in Library Science; 70% (including those with a Masters in Library Science) hold a Master's degree or higher. Seventy percent had worked in library service for more than ten years, with 52% having been in their current position for more than five years.

Seventy-one percent of survey respondents reported that their organization had applied for LSTA funds, with 15% stating their organization had not applied and 14% who did not know. Of those, 70% and 71% respectively indicated that the application process was user-friendly and the goals clear, with the vast majority of the remaining respondents indicating they did not know. Of those who had applied, 96% percent indicated their organization had received funds, and 92% reported their organization had received funds since 2008. Again, the vast majority agreed LSTA funds had supported their development of new and innovative initiatives (90%) and they believed their organization would apply again (90%). See Annex L for additional survey data.

4.2.1 Primary Questions A and B

Did the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) reflect the needs of Arizona communities during that time period?

Are the areas of need identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan (Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences) still relevant to the needs of Arizona communities for the future?

Focus group and interview responses

The vast majority of respondents in the focus group and interviews believed that the areas of need in to Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan reflected and continue to reflect the needs of Arizona communities.

Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support were universally identified as critical areas during the current LSTA period and into the future.

All stakeholders spoke of the importance of innovative programming supported in the area of **Lifespan Learning Continuum**.

In terms of **Virtual Access**, some stakeholders noted that their communities were not yet demanding access to digital content. But in those cases, they agreed that these were future needs. The majority agreed that access to virtual resources was a current and critical need.

As for professional development supported in **Training, Education and Consultant support**, all stakeholders agreed that the content provided by the ASLAPR through LSTA is excellent and in wide demand. Many noted concerns with finding time and staff coverage to allow library staff to participate. While some suggested that webinars and other digital delivery methods would be helpful, many noted the importance of in-person networking to professional development training.

Centennial Experiences was seen as time limited (with Arizona's Centennial occurring in 2012). A number of respondents, however, believe strongly that document preservation, oral history and local history projects like those supported under Centennial experiences would continue to be critical to their communities in the future. This was a predominantly strong need in rural Arizona communities.

When asked to identify areas for inclusion or future focus, discussion centered around workforce development or a similar area to reflect the library's roles in providing

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

resources (intranet, computers, etc) and support for job searches (librarian assistance with searches, account set up and resume and document submission). While only a small number of stakeholders mentioned this as a possible future area of need in LSTA, these functions are performed repeatedly by rural, tribal and urban libraries – especially during this economic downturn.

When asked if the areas of need allowed sufficient **flexibility**, the majority of stakeholders voiced concern over challenges that LSTA funds could not assist them with. Common concerns included:

LSTA funds, with their single-year cycles, do not assist with sustaining initiatives – so planning cannot be done for more than a one-year period. While most librarians and other stakeholders noted the desirability of additional fund sources to support infrastructure costs (staffing, facilities, technology maintenance and updates), many noted that even innovative LSTA-compliant initiatives could not always be implemented, evaluated, and disseminated in a one-year cycle. Most understood that the purpose of LSTA funds was to do pilot programs or initial startup of innovative initiatives. But many also noted that, in the current environment of budget cuts, bringing pilot programs to scale or sustaining new and innovative projects was often a challenge. Many noted that additional time may be needed to show the efficacy of innovative projects – especially given the increased reticence to pursue new programs.

In a related commentary, stakeholders noted that the LSTA timelines present strategic planning challenges beyond a one-year period. Some noted that this decreases the potential for collaboration.

While LSTA supports virtual access projects, many stakeholders mentioned the continuing need to update technology and provide materials in a growing number of formats (DVD, Blu-Ray, eBook, text, etc). They acknowledged the critical role LSTA plays in supporting initial equipment acquisition, but again noted challenges in sustaining and keeping current with evolving technologies.

Many also noted the need for funding sources to update their library facilities. Funding is needed to support new digital technologies and also to increase and improve provision of programming and community usage. Many stakeholders enthusiastically discussed the community support and increased innovation enabled by a teen or children's room in the library. Some lamented that LSTA funds could not support these construction initiatives.

Survey responses

The vast majority of respondents agreed that the LSTA areas of need are important or very important in their communities. There was no area that over 2% of respondents designated “not important”. The areas with greater percentages (10 % or over) of respondents indicating “somewhat important” or “not important” were: digital resources for those under 30 years of age; preservation of Arizona centennial and historical materials, and increasing access to Arizona centennial and historical materials. While

variations in percentages are not statistically significant, Table 5 lists areas with the highest percentages of respondents indicating “very important” or “important.”

Table 5. Online Survey Rating of Importance of LSTA Areas of Need.

	Percent indicating “important” or “very important”	Ranking
Supporting learning and skill development from birth throughout life	94%	2 (note two responses had the same percentage)
Increasing community awareness of digital resources	92%	3 (note two responses had the same percentage)
Digital resources and education for those under 30 years of age	86%	5
Digital resources and education for those 30 years of age or older	96%	1
Professional development for library staff	92%	3 (note two responses had the same percentage)
Professional development for library staff related to digital resources	94%	2 (note two responses had the same percentage)
Preservation of Arizona Centennial and historical materials	83%	6
Increasing access to Arizona Centennial and historical materials	90%	4

Data were reviewed for trends based upon library type (e.g. county library, university library); county of library; geography of library (e.g. urban, rural); the respondent’s organization and its history with LSTA funds; and tenure and position of respondent (years in current position, years in library service, and position, e.g. library director, librarian).

Trends by library type

Pursuant to primary questions A and B, libraries that are neither county nor city libraries (including K-12 school libraries, community college libraries, and university libraries) tend to find different areas of importance. For example, K-12 libraries are less likely to rate the importance of skill development over the lifetime, digital resources and education of those 30 years of age and older. K-12 libraries rate increasing community awareness of digital resources very important, as compared to other respondents; similarly, community college libraries are less likely to rate increasing community awareness of digital resources, preservation of Arizona centennial and historical materials and increasing access to Arizona centennial and historical materials as very important. Conversely, each

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

library type has specific focus areas which they rate as more important than other libraries. These include: the importance of digital resources and education for those under 30 for community college libraries; professional development for library staff for K-12 libraries; and increasing access to Arizona centennial and historical materials for university libraries. Overall, state library respondents rate the importance of LSTA focus much higher when compared to other stakeholders.

Trends by county and geography

Responses by some libraries serving rural Arizona (outside of Maricopa and Pima counties) tended to identify different areas of importance than the overall trend. For example, respondents from La Paz, Navajo, and Yavapai counties were more likely to specify that LSTA did not assist in the development of new and innovative programming, and that increasing community awareness of digital resources is “very important.” But rural counties were also more likely to find digital resources for those under or over 30 years of age, professional development for library staff in general and related to digital resources, and preservation and access to Arizona centennial and historical materials “important.” These same trends are reflected in the reporting by geography (urban, rural, suburban, tribal), with tribal communities assigning higher importance to supporting learning and skill development throughout life, digital resources for those over and under 30 and professional development for library staff, as compared to other groups. On the other hand, suburban libraries were less likely to report high importance for digital resources for those under 30, professional development for library staff related to digital resources and preservation and access to Arizona centennial and historical materials.

Trends by application for funds

Overall, responses on the importance of the LSTA focus areas were similar between those whose organization had applied for funds and those that had not. However, organizations that had not applied were less likely to report supporting learning and skill development from birth throughout life, and increasing community awareness of digital resources as “important” or “very important.”

Trends by respondent background

Throughout the inquiry, library directors tended to be more familiar with LSTA while less senior staff (librarians and library assistants) were more likely to respond “I don’t know,” especially regarding usage of LSTA professional development. While there are no statistically significant differences in the responses, a larger portion of respondents with five to ten years of library experience identified professional development in general and digital resources as “very important,” compared to the overall sample.

See Annex L for survey responses to Items 12-19 relating to the importance of LSTA areas of need in communities.

Summary

The vast majority of all respondents in the focus group, interviews and survey believed that the areas of need in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan reflected and continue to reflect the needs of Arizona communities.

Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support were universally identified as critical areas during the current LSTA period and into the future.

In the online survey, all of these areas were seen as “important” or “very important” by the vast majority of respondents. The interviews and focus groups show us, however, that there is strong consensus on the centrality of digital resources for those 30 years of age and older, supporting learning and skill development from birth throughout life, increasing community awareness of digital resources, professional development for library staff in general and related to digital resources.

While the vast majority agrees that these areas are important, there appears to be more diversity of opinion on digital resources for those under 30 years of age as well as preservation and increasing access to Arizona Centennial and historical materials. This pattern is most likely due to the differences in priority areas by the different library stakeholders that participate in LSTA. In other words, all libraries engage in lifespan learning, professional development and access to digital resources. But for some, such as K-12 libraries, virtual access for those over 30 is not a focus area. Similarly, rural libraries have a stronger focus on Arizona’s historical and centennial materials while suburban libraries are less likely to find it very important. In other words, the slight variations in the importance of different areas are more likely due to the diversity of the libraries than the areas themselves. It does imply, however, that some areas are nearly universally important and others have more focused audiences.

When asked to identify areas for inclusion or future focus, some discussion centered around workforce development or a similar area to reflect the library’s roles in providing resources (intranet, computers, etc) as well as support for job searches (librarian assistance with searches, account set up assistance, resume and document submission). While only a small number of stakeholders mentioned this as a possible future area of need in LSTA, these functions are repeated over and over in rural, tribal and urban libraries – especially in the current economic downturn.

4.2.2 Primary Question C and D

Did the work undertaken through LSTA in 2008-2012 fulfill the goals identified in the Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan?

Are these goals still relevant for Arizona’s library needs? Are they attainable? Are they sufficiently ambitious?

Focus group and interview responses

The vast majority of respondents had personally participated in preparing a proposal for LSTA funds. Those with less involvement were in K-12 libraries and other special libraries. But even in those cases where applications were less likely, most stakeholders who had been in their positions for more than 5 years had at least participated in LSTA collaborations.

Again, the vast majority of stakeholders found the LSTA application process clear and user-friendly. Many enthusiastically mentioned the ASLAPR's assistance providing grant writing support. Many cited this support for its focus on outcomes-based thinking and clarifying the application process. The vast majority of those who said they had applied had also received funds. In those cases where funds were not received, the stakeholder noted that the request was primarily for equipment; outside the grant priorities.

The vast majority of stakeholders also reported that implementation and budget reporting were clear and user friendly.

Stakeholders were enthusiastic and in near-unanimous consensus about the importance, usefulness and efficiency of the LSTA grants process in Arizona. The only exceptions being those who believed the requirements were too narrow to accommodate equipment and staffing needs, and a few who believed the application and reporting process was overly burdensome. But these were minority opinions.

While only a minority of stakeholders identified the inability to use LSTA funds for equipment and staffing as a negative factor, a number did point out that aging facilities – especially those without infrastructure to support digital upgrades or community meeting space – detracted from the overall impact of LSTA funds.

While some stakeholders expressed the wish that LSTA funds could meet all of their funding needs, the vast majority found the LSTA funds extremely useful, especially in support of innovation. Many recounted successes such as collaborations between K-12 teachers, university instructors, and public school, county, city and university libraries to bridge the gap between high school and college; the development of curriculum materials for check-out by grade school teachers from the library; development and dissemination of teen, child, and oral history projects. Some stakeholders also emphasized the critical importance of finding that pilot projects were NOT a good fit for their community. One stakeholder noted that very few LSTA applications, especially those in her county, were for projects that were new to library science. They were, instead, pilots to see if these projects were a good fit for a particular community. She spoke clearly about a project to support after-school use of the high school library, to offer technology access and homework help, which had been successful in many communities. She stated that it was a very successful outcome of LSTA funding to learn that program was unlikely to succeed in her community because the extremely long bus rides made after-school programs virtually impossible. She noted how efficacious it was to learn this in a pilot project rather than in full-scale implementation.

Comments on how to improve LSTA competition and fund impact generally focused on logistics and coordination rather than the purposes of the funds (which all agreed were very good). Some stakeholders held preliminary discussions on the potential for more local and trans-local collaboration on LSTA projects (rather than silo-ing). It was noted that while local communities might learn about the usefulness and best practices in implementing new initiatives from LSTA, this information was not widely shared. Many cited short grant periods and tight timelines for decreasing the potential for more collaboration and communication.

Survey responses

The vast majority of respondents indicated that the LSTA funding areas of need and goals was important in their communities. In no area did over 3% of respondents indicate “disagree”. The areas with greater percentages (8% or over) of respondents indicating “somewhat agree” or “disagree” were: LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities impacted by the economic downturn; LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities that are increasingly diverse; and LSTA funds and programs encourage collaboration. While variations in percentages are not statistically significant, Table 6 below presents the listing of areas with the highest percentages of respondents indicating each area as “strongly agree” or “agree.” For all responses, from 6 – 11% of respondents indicated they “don’t know.”

Table 6. Online Survey Rating of Impact of LSTA Areas.

	Percent indicating “important” or “very important”	Ranking
LSTA funds and programs help maintain services and resources my community needs.	87%	2 (note two responses had the same percentage)
LSTA funds and programs help bring new services and resources to my community.	87%	2 (note two responses had the same percentage)
LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities impacted by the economic downturn.	84%	4 (note three responses had the same percentage)
LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities that are increasingly diverse.	82%	5
LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of families and individuals with lower economic and educational attainment.	84%	4 (note three responses had the same percentage)
LSTA funds and programs encourage collaboration.	81%	6

Dynamic Analysis, LLC**Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation**

LSTA funds and programs improve digital resources.	85%	3
LSTA funds and programs increase access to digital resources.	84%	4 (note three responses had the same percentage)
LSTA funds and programs help keep libraries relevant.	90%	1

Data were reviewed for trends based on library type (e.g. county library, university library); county of library; geography of library (e.g. urban, rural); the respondent's organization and its history with LSTA funds; and tenure and position of respondent (years in current position, years in library service, and position, e.g. library director, librarian).

Trends by library type

Related to primary questions C and D, libraries that are neither county nor city libraries (including K-12 school libraries, community college libraries, and university libraries) tend to vary in their responses. In general, non-county/city libraries are less likely to report "strongly agree" or "agree" that LSTA had designated impacts, and more likely to report "somewhat disagree," "disagree" or "don't know."

Trends by county and geography

Responses by libraries serving rural Arizona (outside of Maricopa and Pima counties) tend to be similar to the more urban counties and areas, but there is variation among all counties and no clear trends overall.

Trends by application for funds

Responses from those who had not applied for LSTA funds were much more likely to be "don't know" or "somewhat agree" and less likely to "strongly agree" or "agree." This trend is less pronounced for questions relating to access to digital resources, which all libraries receive regardless of application.

Trends by respondent background

Throughout the inquiry, library directors tended to be more familiar with LSTA while less senior staff (librarians and library assistants) were more likely to respond "I don't know," especially regarding overall usage of LSTA professional development. While there are no statistically significant differences in the responses, a larger portion of respondents with five to ten years of library experience identified professional development in general and that on digital resources was "very important," compared to the overall sample.

See Annex L for survey responses to items 25-33 relating to the impact of LSTA in communities.

Summary

Focus group and interview respondents were enthusiastic and in near-unanimous consensus about the importance, usefulness and efficiency of the LSTA grants process in Arizona. The only exceptions being those who believed the requirements were too narrow to accommodate equipment and staffing needs, and a few who believed the application and reporting process was overly burdensome. But this was a minority opinion.

Comments on how to improve LSTA competition and fund impact generally focused on logistics and coordination rather than the purposes of the funds (which all agreed were very good). Some stakeholders began a preliminary discussion on the potential for more local and trans-local collaboration on LSTA projects (rather than silo-ing). It was also noted that, while local communities might learn about the usefulness and best practices in implementing new initiatives from LSTA, this information was not shared as widely as it should be. And many noted that the short grant periods and tight timelines decreased the potential for collaboration and communication.

The survey findings bear out the trends in the qualitative findings. Overall, the vast majority of respondents find LSTA resources “important” or “very important” in community impact. While there was no statistical significance, the areas where the most respondents assigned importance were related to basic library needs such as maintaining services, resources and relevancy, and digital resources. The area with the lowest percentage of importance was encouraging collaboration. This may bear out the qualitative comments on the potential for increasing the sharing of LSTA results and the challenges the LSTA timelines present to collaborative efforts.

4.2.5 Primary Question E

Is the current approach to funding, with a large percentage of Arizona’s LSTA allocation being used to fund statewide database projects as well as professional development and another portion allocated to competitive local projects an effective, flexible, and impactful allocation of resources?

Focus group and interview responses

Stakeholders were enthusiastic and nearly unified in their support and appreciation of the strategic planning around LSTA funds in Arizona. Respect and admiration for ASLAPR staff was commonly expressed, especially their abilities to communicate well, identify needs, build consensus, and encourage collaboration.

In focus group responses, county librarians – the stakeholders most familiar with planning and strategies for statewide databases and other initiatives – felt strongly that libraries could acquire better digital resources through group planning and collective negotiations, rather than one library or district trying to obtain the resources on their own.

Databases

Stakeholders in rural and tribal communities indicated that they see less database usage, but they strongly believe in their importance for librarians. They also feel that, through consistent and steady dissemination of information and support to the community, patrons will come to recognize these resources as important and helpful.

School and university librarians in particular noted the importance of database resources. Their clients tend to start using database resources for academic purposes, but once they become familiar with the usefulness of the resources, they can be directed to the public resources provided by county and city libraries. Most stakeholders noted indirectly the need for library support to guide clients and help them utilize resources to the fullest -- and library staff development was often necessary to accomplish this.

Professional development

Stakeholders shared a strong and unified voice regarding the usefulness and high quality of professional development offered through the ASLAPR and LSTA funds. They noted its importance for veteran library staff, new library staff, and managers/directors. While the content was praised, stakeholders noted challenges in accessing the resources. These included the travel required to attend trainings, as well as the difficulty of allowing leave time for library staff to pursue these opportunities. While many stakeholders felt that more digital content delivery would be helpful, others believed that might detract from the overall benefit of networking.

Survey responses

Overall, a little less than half of respondents indicated they, or members of their staff, (48% and 43% respectively) had participated in professional development funded by LSTA. One-quarter to over one-third indicated they did not know, and about 20-25% indicated they had not (see tables 7 and 8 below). Of those reporting that they or their staff had participated, the majority rated the quality to be “very good” (80 and 77% respectively).

Table 7. Online Survey Percentages on Utilization of Professional Development.

Have you utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?				
Yes			76	48%
No			40	25%
Don't know			43	27%
Total			159	100%

Table 8. Online Survey Percentages on Utilization of Professional Development –Staff.

Have other members of your staff utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?				
Yes			68	43%
No			33	21%
Don't know			58	36%
Total			159	100%

On the subject of access to databases and technology resources from LSTA, 54% strongly agreed that those resources were critical, only 5% disagreed (see table 9 below).

Table 9. Online Survey Percentages on Database Importance.

Access to EBSCO and other technology resources through LSTA is critical for my library.				
Strongly agree			85	54%
Agree			42	27%
Somewhat agree			12	8%
Disagree			8	5%
Don't know			11	7%
			158	100%

Data were reviewed for trends based on library type (e.g. county library, university library); county of library; geography of library (e.g. urban, rural); the respondent's organization and its history with LSTA funds; and tenure and position of respondent (years in current position, years in library service, and position, e.g. library director, librarian).

Trends by library type

For city and county libraries, about 50% of respondents and their staff had used professional development funded by LSTA. About 30 to 40 percent (respectively) did not know if they or their staff had attended, and between 10 and 23% had not attended. For other libraries (university, community college K-12) the percentage that did not know or had not used the professional development was at least 65% (between 65% and 100%). Again, for those that had participated, the overall quality rating was very high. On the subject of databases and digital resources, other libraries expressed agreement on their importance, but a larger percentage of respondents disagreed that the resources were critical (23% and 25% respectively for university library and community college library).

Trends by county and geography

Responses by some libraries serving rural Arizona (outside of Maricopa and Pima counties) were generally similar to the more urban counties and areas; there is an overall variation among all counties and no clear trends.

Trends by application for funds

Respondents from organizations which had not applied for LSTA funds were much more likely to report that they had not utilized LSTA-funded professional development (38%

percent of those who had not applied as opposed to 25% of those who had applied); they were also less likely to report they “don’t know.” The overall percentage of those using LSTA-funded professional development was about 55% for both groups. This trend is similar to staff use of professional development (54% of non-applicants reported “no” while 17% of applicants reported “no”), with a dramatic difference in the percentage reporting “yes” – 50% of applicants stated members of their staff had attended professional development, while 21% of non-applicants responded the same. On both of these items, the vast majority of respondents (80% or above, regardless of application status) reported the professional development to be a very good quality. Among both applicants and non-applicants, similar majorities responded that digital databases were critical (about 75%).

Trends by respondent background

Throughout the inquiry, library directors tended to be more familiar with LSTA while less senior staff (librarians and library assistants) were more likely to report “I don’t know,” especially regarding overall usage of LSTA professional development. While there are no statistically significant differences in the responses, a larger portion of respondents with five to ten years of library experience identified professional development in general and that on digital resources was “very important” as compared to the overall sample.

See Annex L for survey responses to items 20-24 relating to the impact of LSTA in communities.

4.3 Summary

Focus group and interview stakeholders indicated less use of databases in rural and tribal communities. But they strongly believe in their importance for librarians. They also feel that, through consistent and steady dissemination of information and librarian support, patrons will recognize these resources as important.

School and university librarians in particular noted the importance of database resources. Clients use them first only for school and academic purposes, but once these patrons become familiar with their usefulness, they can be directed to the public resources provided by county and city libraries. Most stakeholders noted indirectly the need for library support to guide clients and help fully utilize the resources – and that library staff development was often necessary to accomplish this.

Survey respondents agreed with focus group and interview respondents about the importance of databases and technology. Fifty-four percent strongly agreed that access to databases and technology resources from LSTA was critical. Only 5% disagreed.

Stakeholders shared a strong and unified voice regarding the usefulness and high quality of professional development offered through the ASLAPR and LSTA funds. They noted its importance for veteran library staff, new library staff, and managers/directors. While

the content was praised, stakeholders noted challenges in accessing the resources. These included the travel required to attend trainings, as well as the difficulty of allowing leave time for library staff to pursue these opportunities. While many stakeholders felt that more digital content delivery would be helpful, others believed that might detract from the overall benefit of networking.

Survey responses indicated that many stakeholders have not taken advantage or could not access LSTA supported professional development, or that they are unaware of this resource for their professional development. Survey responses agree with the qualitative findings – that those who access professional development are generally very positive about its quality and usefulness. Overall, a little less than half of survey respondents indicated they or members of their staff (48% and 43% respectively) had participated in professional development funded by LSTA. One-quarter to over one-third indicated they did not know, and about 20-25% indicated they had not. Of those reporting that they or their staff members had participated, the majority rated the quality to be “very good” (80 and 77% respectively). Libraries other than city or county libraries were more likely to report not using or not knowing if they had accessed LSTA professional development. Those respondents reporting they had applied for LSTA funds were much more likely to use LSTA-funded professional development.

5. Findings – Process and Prospective Questions

No modifications were made to the ASLAPR plan for 2008 - 2012.

In Arizona there are a tremendous number of effective practices and successes related to LSTA.

The vast majority of respondents confirm that the needs and goals the LSTA funds are and continue to be meaningful and relevant to Arizona’s libraries and communities.

The majority of respondents regard LSTA plan’s needs and goals, and the LSTA-funded projects undertaken with ASLAPR assistance as effective and meaningful.

The ASLAPR enjoys near-universal appreciation. The processes and supports they have put in place are regarded as user-friendly and flexible while effectively targeting improvement.

The ASLAPR’s flexible approach of subgranting to local libraries is seen as critical to fostering local innovation while remaining flexible to community need and diversity in Arizona.

ASLAPR’s professional development opportunities are highly sought and well-regarded for their centralized planning and administration as well as their interactive, responsive nature.

The ASLAPR plays a highly-valued role in the acquisition and planning of databases, e content and other technologies.

The current approach to performance measurement and goal setting for subgrants is too fragmented and dependent upon the capacity of each grantee. Despite ASLAPR's efforts to offer guidelines and technical assistance, the inconsistent nature of result measurement and data reporting still makes assessment difficult and obstructs planning and goal-setting statewide.

6. Recommendations – Prospective Questions and Looking Ahead to the Next Five Year Plan

Key Recommendations

General Recommendations

Continue flexible subgrants to local libraries. This approach is widely appreciated and is necessary to accommodate the needs of diverse communities and libraries in Arizona. It is also an effective way to encourage and nurture innovation and collaboration. Set a specific target for the amount of funds to be awarded to external subgrants, based upon strategic planning.

Maintain Lifespan Learning Continuum and Virtual Access as areas of need. Maintain Training, Education and Consultant Support as an area of need, all well — but determine whether ASLAPR should pursue it through internal projects only.

Continue to nurture communication and responsiveness to local needs. Arizona LSTA funds serve the needs of diverse libraries that, in turn, serve diverse communities. Each has individual and specific strengths and weaknesses. Special consideration should always be given to consultation and collaboration with tribal communities.

Continue to encourage candid and meaningful discussions about pilot projects that determine what is NOT viable in a community. Spread the message that pilot projects can be very beneficial when they tell us what NOT to do, especially when a full-scale program is being considered.

Recommendations for Consideration of Modified Areas of Need

Consider developing areas of need related to library support for workforce development, and the staff development needed to support it, in the next five-year plan. Set a total cap on funding related to strategic priorities.

Modify the areas of need in Centennial Experiences to a similar area, such as “Arizona History and Archival Preservation.” Set a total cap on the funding related to strategic priorities.

Recommendations for Modifications to Subgrant Proposal and Selection Process

Clearly communicate that Lifelong Learning Continuum, Virtual Access, Workforce Development (if adopted), and Archival and Historical Materials (if adopted) are the recommended areas for external subgrants. Clearly communicate the total amount of funding to be awarded to external subgrants in each of these areas, and in total. Assign targets to the award amounts for each area of need, based on overall strategic priorities.

Assign total funding targets to each area of need. Align funding targets with desired outcomes. Develop desired outcomes for the next five-year plan through a collaborative consensus process.

Use a consensus process to develop program guidelines (e.g. best practice guidelines for selection and preservation of archival materials, scope and sequence of lifelong learning experiences, and alignment of virtual access priorities with overall planning) and consistent outcome measurement guidelines for external subgrant proposals. Outcomes for external subgrants should focus on commonly agreed-upon measurements of circulation, other measures of usage, and deployment of a standardized satisfaction survey.

Consider modifying the subgrant selection process to better encourage collaboration, dissemination, and an outcome-based mentality. Examine the process for reviewing applications. Consider awarding fewer subgrants, and establishing priority awards or bonus points based upon criteria such as innovation, collaboration and communication of findings, and the measurement of results.

Support, require, and enforce consistent and rigorous evaluation for internal and external projects. All project proposals should be reviewed for thorough and realistic evaluation and measurement planning. All implemented projects should continually reflect and report on their measurable outcomes.

Recommendations for Strategic Planning, Dissemination, and the Role of the ASLAPR

Identify forums for peer dissemination of LSTA findings, and opportunities to highlight exemplary projects in a centralized venue.

In addition to encouraging dissemination of subgrant outcomes and findings at the local level, develop an avenue for dissemination and discussion of these findings statewide. This discussion should include: approaches to sustaining LSTA “pilot” projects after LSTA funding; approaches that use the one-year cycle of LSTA projects as a benefit rather than a challenge; and how LSTA results can be used to encourage collaboration, sustainable funding investment, and innovation.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC**Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation**

Increase ASLAPR's role in strategic planning around virtual access and e content including databases. Most stakeholders noted that they valued opportunities to leverage common resources and coordinate planning around investment in digital technology.

Examine the extent to which most of ASLAPR's internal projects are related to professional development. Use a collaborative process to create an overall plan for professional development which develops a timeline and strategic plan. Establish explicit and standard measurement methods and benchmarks for success. Consider standardized measurement of customer satisfaction as well as retention, recruitment and movement of the library workforce towards continuing education credits, other appropriate certifications, and degree attainment as goals.

Annex A

List of Acronyms

ASLAPR - Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records

LSTA – Library Services and Technology Act

IMLS – Institute of Museum and Library Services

Annex B

American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators
Revisions reflected herein ratified by the AEA membership, July 2004

Preface: Assumptions Concerning Development of Principles

A. Evaluation is a profession composed of persons with varying interests, potentially encompassing but not limited to the evaluation of programs, products, personnel, policy, performance, proposals, technology, research, theory, and even of evaluation itself. These principles are broadly intended to cover all kinds of evaluation. For external evaluations of public programs, they nearly always apply. However, it is impossible to write guiding principles that neatly fit every context in which evaluators work, and some evaluators will work in contexts in which following a guideline cannot be done for good reason. The Guiding Principles are not intended to constrain such evaluators when this is the case. However, such exceptions should be made for good reason (e.g., legal prohibitions against releasing information to stakeholders), and evaluators who find themselves in such contexts should consult colleagues about how to proceed.

B. Based on differences in training, experience, and work settings, the profession of evaluation encompasses diverse perceptions about the primary purpose of evaluation. These include but are not limited to the following: bettering products, personnel, programs, organizations, governments, consumers and the public interest; contributing to informed decision making and more enlightened change; precipitating needed change; empowering all stakeholders by collecting data from them and engaging them in the evaluation process; and experiencing the excitement of new insights. Despite that diversity, the common ground is that evaluators aspire to construct and provide the best possible information that might bear on the value of whatever is being evaluated. The principles are intended to foster that primary aim.

C. The principles are intended to guide the professional practice of evaluators, and to inform evaluation clients and the general public about the principles they can expect to be upheld by professional evaluators. Of course, no statement of principles can anticipate all situations that arise in the practice of evaluation. However, principles are not just guidelines for reaction when something goes wrong or when a dilemma is found. Rather, principles should proactively guide the behaviors of professionals in everyday practice.

D. The purpose of documenting guiding principles is to foster continuing development of the profession of evaluation, and the socialization of its members. The principles are meant to stimulate discussion about the proper practice and use of evaluation among members of the profession, sponsors of evaluation, and others interested in evaluation.

E. The five principles proposed in this document are not independent, but overlap in many ways. Conversely, sometimes these principles will conflict, so that evaluators will have to choose among them. At such times evaluators must use their own values and knowledge of the setting to determine the appropriate response. Whenever a course of

action is unclear, evaluators should solicit the advice of fellow evaluators about how to resolve the problem before deciding how to proceed.

F. These principles are intended to supercede any previous work on standards, principles, or ethics adopted by AEA or its two predecessor organizations, the Evaluation Research Society and the Evaluation Network. These principles are the official position of AEA on these matters.

G. These principles are not intended to replace standards supported by evaluators or by the other disciplines in which evaluators participate.

H. Each principle is illustrated by a number of statements to amplify the meaning of the overarching principle, and to provide guidance for its application. These illustrations are not meant to include all possible applications of that principle, nor to be viewed as rules that provide the basis for sanctioning violators.

I. These principles were developed in the context of Western cultures, particularly the United States, and so may reflect the experiences of that context. The relevance of these principles may vary across other cultures, and across subcultures within the United States.

J. These principles are part of an evolving process of self-examination by the profession, and should be revisited on a regular basis. Mechanisms might include officially-sponsored reviews of principles at annual meetings, and other forums for harvesting experience with the principles and their application. On a regular basis, but at least every five years, these principles ought to be examined for possible review and revision. In order to maintain association-wide awareness and relevance, all AEA members are encouraged to participate in this process.

The Principles

A. Systematic Inquiry: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.

1. To ensure the accuracy and credibility of the evaluative information they produce, evaluators should adhere to the highest technical standards appropriate to the methods they use.
2. Evaluators should explore with the client the shortcomings and strengths both of the various evaluation questions and the various approaches that might be used for answering those questions.
3. Evaluators should communicate their methods and approaches accurately and in sufficient detail to allow others to understand, interpret and critique their work. They should make clear the limitations of an evaluation and its results. Evaluators should discuss in a contextually appropriate way those values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses significantly affecting the interpretation of the evaluative findings.

These statements apply to all aspects of the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.

B. Competence: Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.

1. Evaluators should possess (or ensure that the evaluation team possesses) the education, abilities, skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed in the evaluation.
2. To ensure recognition, accurate interpretation and respect for diversity, evaluators should ensure that the members of the evaluation team collectively demonstrate cultural competence. Cultural competence would be reflected in evaluators seeking awareness of their own culturally-based assumptions, their understanding of the worldviews of culturally-different participants and stakeholders in the evaluation, and the use of appropriate evaluation strategies and skills in working with culturally different groups. Diversity may be in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, socio-economics, or other factors pertinent to the evaluation context.
3. Evaluators should practice within the limits of their professional training and competence, and should decline to conduct evaluations that fall substantially outside those limits. When declining the commission or request is not feasible or appropriate, evaluators should make clear any significant limitations on the evaluation that might result. Evaluators should make every effort to gain the competence directly or through the assistance of others who possess the required expertise.
4. Evaluators should continually seek to maintain and improve their competencies, in order to provide the highest level of performance in their evaluations. This continuing professional development might include formal coursework and workshops, self-study, evaluations of one's own practice, and working with other evaluators to learn from their skills and expertise.

C. Integrity/Honesty: Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.

1. Evaluators should negotiate honestly with clients and relevant stakeholders concerning the costs, tasks to be undertaken, limitations of methodology, scope of results likely to be obtained, and uses of data resulting from a specific evaluation. It is primarily the evaluator's responsibility to initiate discussion and clarification of these matters, not the client's.
2. Before accepting an evaluation assignment, evaluators should disclose any roles or relationships they have that might pose a conflict of interest (or appearance of a conflict) with their role as an evaluator. If they proceed with the evaluation, the conflict(s) should be clearly articulated in reports of the evaluation results.

3. Evaluators should record all changes made in the originally negotiated project plans, and the reasons why the changes were made. If those changes would significantly affect the scope and likely results of the evaluation, the evaluator should inform the client and other important stakeholders in a timely fashion (barring good reason to the contrary, before proceeding with further work) of the changes and their likely impact.
4. Evaluators should be explicit about their own, their clients', and other stakeholders' interests and values concerning the conduct and outcomes of an evaluation.
5. Evaluators should not misrepresent their procedures, data or findings. Within reasonable limits, they should attempt to prevent or correct misuse of their work by others.
6. If evaluators determine that certain procedures or activities are likely to produce misleading evaluative information or conclusions, they have the responsibility to communicate their concerns and the reasons for them. If discussions with the client do not resolve these concerns, the evaluator should decline to conduct the evaluation. If declining the assignment is unfeasible or inappropriate, the evaluator should consult colleagues or relevant stakeholders about other proper ways to proceed. (Options might include discussions at a higher level, a dissenting cover letter or appendix, or refusal to sign the final document.)
7. Evaluators should disclose all sources of financial support for an evaluation, and the source of the request for the evaluation.

D. Respect for People: Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders.

1. Evaluators should seek a comprehensive understanding of the important contextual elements of the evaluation. Contextual factors that may influence the results of a study include geographic location, timing, political and social climate, economic conditions, and other relevant activities in progress at the same time.
2. Evaluators should abide by current professional ethics, standards, and regulations regarding risks, harms, and burdens that might befall those participating in the evaluation; regarding informed consent for participation in evaluation; and regarding informing participants and clients about the scope and limits of confidentiality.
3. Because justified negative or critical conclusions from an evaluation must be explicitly stated, evaluations sometimes produce results that harm client or stakeholder interests. Under this circumstance, evaluators should seek to maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur, provided this will not compromise the integrity of the evaluation findings. Evaluators should carefully judge when the benefits from doing the evaluation or in performing certain evaluation procedures should be foregone because of the risks or harms. To the extent possible, these issues should be anticipated during the negotiation of the evaluation.

4. Knowing that evaluations may negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
5. Where feasible, evaluators should attempt to foster social equity in evaluation, so that those who give to the evaluation may benefit in return. For example, evaluators should seek to ensure that those who bear the burdens of contributing data and incurring any risks do so willingly, and that they have full knowledge of and opportunity to obtain any benefits of the evaluation. Program participants should be informed that their eligibility to receive services does not hinge on their participation in the evaluation.
6. Evaluators have the responsibility to understand and respect differences among participants, such as differences in their culture, religion, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation and ethnicity, and to account for potential implications of these differences when planning, conducting, analyzing, and reporting evaluations.

E. Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare: Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

1. When planning and reporting evaluations, evaluators should include relevant perspectives and interests of the full range of stakeholders.
2. Evaluators should consider not only the immediate operations and outcomes of whatever is being evaluated, but also its broad assumptions, implications and potential side effects.
3. Freedom of information is essential in a democracy. Evaluators should allow all relevant stakeholders access to evaluative information in forms that respect people and honor promises of confidentiality. Evaluators should actively disseminate information to stakeholders as resources allow. Communications that are tailored to a given stakeholder should include all results that may bear on interests of that stakeholder and refer to any other tailored communications to other stakeholders. In all cases, evaluators should strive to present results clearly and simply so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results.
4. Evaluators should maintain a balance between client needs and other needs. Evaluators necessarily have a special relationship with the client who funds or requests the evaluation. By virtue of that relationship, evaluators must strive to meet legitimate client needs whenever it is feasible and appropriate to do so. However, that relationship can also place evaluators in difficult dilemmas when client interests conflict with other interests, or when client interests conflict with the obligation of evaluators for systematic inquiry, competence, integrity, and respect for people. In these cases, evaluators should explicitly identify and discuss the conflicts with the client and relevant stakeholders, resolve them when possible, determine whether continued work on the evaluation is

advisable if the conflicts cannot be resolved, and make clear any significant limitations on the evaluation that might result if the conflict is not resolved.

5. Evaluators have obligations that encompass the public interest and good. These obligations are especially important when evaluators are supported by publicly-generated funds; but clear threats to the public good should never be ignored in any evaluation. Because the public interest and good are rarely the same as the interests of any particular group (including those of the client or funder), evaluators will usually have to go beyond analysis of particular stakeholder interests and consider the welfare of society as a whole.

Background

In 1986, the Evaluation Network (ENet) and the Evaluation Research Society (ERS) merged to create the American Evaluation Association. ERS had previously adopted a set of standards for program evaluation (published in New Directions for Program Evaluation in 1982); and both organizations had lent support to work of other organizations about evaluation guidelines. However, none of these standards or guidelines were officially adopted by AEA, nor were any other ethics, standards, or guiding principles put into place. Over the ensuing years, the need for such guiding principles was discussed by both the AEA Board and the AEA membership. Under the presidency of David Cordray in 1992, the AEA Board appointed a temporary committee chaired by Peter Rossi to examine whether AEA should address this matter in more detail. That committee issued a report to the AEA Board on November 4, 1992, recommending that AEA should pursue this matter further. The Board followed that recommendation, and on that date created a Task Force to develop a draft of guiding principles for evaluators. The task force members were:

William Shadish, Memphis State University (Chair)
Dianna Newman, University of Albany/SUNY
Mary Ann Scheirer, Private Practice
Chris Wye, National Academy of Public Administration

The AEA Board specifically instructed the Task Force to develop general guiding principles rather than specific standards of practice. Their report, issued in 1994, summarized the Task Force's response to the charge.

Process of Development. Task Force members reviewed relevant documents from other professional societies, and then independently prepared and circulated drafts of material for use in this report. Initial and subsequent drafts (compiled by the Task Force chair) were discussed during conference calls, with revisions occurring after each call. Progress reports were presented at every AEA board meeting during 1993. In addition, a draft of the guidelines was mailed to all AEA members in September 1993 requesting feedback; and three symposia at the 1993 AEA annual conference were used to discuss and obtain further feedback. The Task Force considered all this feedback in a December 1993 conference call, and

prepared a final draft in January 1994. This draft was presented and approved for membership vote at the January 1994 AEA board meeting.

Resulting Principles. Given the diversity of interests and employment settings represented on the Task Force, it is noteworthy that Task Force members reached substantial agreement about the following five principles. The order of these principles does not imply priority among them; priority will vary by situation and evaluator role.

- A. **Systematic Inquiry:** Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries about whatever is being evaluated.
- B. **Competence:** Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
- C. **Integrity/Honesty:** Evaluators ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- D. **Respect for People:** Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of the respondents, program participants, clients, and other stakeholders with whom they interact.
- E. **Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare:** Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of interests and values that may be related to the general and public welfare.

Recommendation for Continued Work. The Task Force also recommended that the AEA Board establish and support a mechanism for the continued development and dissemination of the Guiding Principles, to include formal reviews at least every five years. The Principles were reviewed in 1999 through an EvalTalk survey, a panel review, and a comparison to the ethical principles of the Canadian and Australasian Evaluation Societies. The 2000 Board affirmed this work and expanded dissemination of the Principles; however, the document was left unchanged.

Process of the 2002-2003 Review and Revision. In January 2002 the AEA Board charged its standing Ethics Committee with developing and implementing a process for reviewing the Guiding Principles that would give AEA's full membership multiple opportunities for comment. At its Spring 2002 meeting, the AEA Board approved the process, carried out during the ensuing months. It consisted of an online survey of the membership that drew 413 responses, a "Town Meeting" attended by approximately 40 members at the Evaluation 2002 Conference, and a compilation of stories about evaluators' experiences relative to ethical concerns told by AEA members and drawn from the *American Journal of Evaluation*. Detailed findings of all three sources of input were reported to the AEA Board in *A Review of AEA's Guiding Principles for Evaluators*, submitted January 18, 2003.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

In 2003 the Ethics Committee continued to welcome input and specifically solicited it from AEA's Diversity Committee, Building Diversity Initiative, and Multi-Ethnic Issues Topical Interest Group. The first revision reflected the Committee's consensus response to the sum of member input throughout 2002 and 2003. It was submitted to AEA's past presidents, current board members, and the original framers of the Guiding Principles for comment. Twelve reviews were received and incorporated into a second revision, presented at the 2003 annual conference. Consensus opinions of approximately 25 members attending a Town Meeting are reflected in this, the third and final revision that was approved by the Board in February 2004 for submission to the membership for ratification. The revisions were ratified by the membership in July of 2004.

The 2002 Ethics Committee members were:

Doris Redfield, Appalachia Educational Laboratory (Chair)
Deborah Bonnet, Lumina Foundation for Education
Katherine Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Anna Madison, University of Massachusetts, Boston


In 2003 the membership was expanded for the duration of the revision process:

Deborah Bonnet, Lumina Foundation for Education (Chair)
Doris Redfield, Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Katherine Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Gail Barrington, Barrington Research Group, Inc.
Elmima Johnson, National Science Foundation

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex C

Request for Proposal for Evaluation – Arizona 2008- 2012 LSTA Evaluation

	<p align="center">REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL Arizona 2008-12 LSTA Evaluation RFP NO: ASLAPR – LSTA2011</p>	<p align="center">Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, 1700 W. Washington, Suite 200, Phoenix, AZ 85007 A division of the Arizona Secretary of State</p>	<p align="center"><i>ASLAPR Use Only Do not write or staple in this space</i></p>
<p align="center">Quotations will be accepted until 3 p.m., Arizona Time, Sept. 16, 2011</p>			<p align="center">Date: 08/03/11 Page 1 of 9</p>
<p align="center">VENDOR NOTICE</p>			
<p align="center">THIS IS NOT A PURCHASE ORDER OR CONTRACT AWARD</p> <p>The “Arizona 2008-12 LSTA Evaluator or Evaluation Team” (hereafter “Offerors”) should review and understand the attached instructions before preparing a proposal. The proposal shall be: in writing and in accordance with the delivery schedule; cover letter, written plan, required attachments and project budget. Return the proposal by the above time and date to the above address. Electronic submissions will not be accepted. Please reference the RFP number on the outside of the envelope. Questions? Contact LSTA Coordinator: (602) 926-3469. Contact Name: Laura Stone.</p>			
<p>A contract will be awarded with preference to the following. Please check as many as applicable:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I/we am/are an Arizona evaluator and/or evaluation company.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I/we intend to use an Arizona evaluator.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I/we have a proven record of project evaluation.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I/we have a proven record of working with libraries in a professional capacity.</p>			
<p>Company/Evaluator Name</p>			
<p>Address</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>State</p>	<p>Zip Code</p>
<p>Arizona Transaction (Sales) Privilege Tax License No.</p>		<p>Federal Employer Identification No.</p>	
<p>For clarification of this offer, contact:</p>			
<p>First Name</p>		<p>Last Name</p>	
<p>Business Phone # (include area code)</p>		<p>E-mail address</p>	
<p align="center">Signature of Person Authorized to Sign Offer:</p>			
<p>Sign Here</p>		<p>Print Name Here</p>	
<p>Title of person authorized to Sign Offer:</p>		<p>Date of Signing</p>	

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Instructions to Evaluator or Evaluation Team

Arizona 2008-12 LSTA Plan Evaluation

RFP NO: ASLAPR – LSTA2011

1. Introduction: This document is a Request for Proposal issued by the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (ASLAPR), a division of the Arizona Secretary of State to complete a written evaluation of the Arizona 2008-12 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan, in accordance with guidelines provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), and under the direction of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. For additional information, see a copy of the plan at: <http://www.lib.az.us/lsta/>; and a discussion about the program at: <http://www.imls.gov/programs/programs.shtm>.
2. An effective evaluation is one that is both rigorous and objective (carried out free from outside influence). The offeror, or anyone working for the offeror should not have directly benefited from 2008-12 LSTA funds, including writing an Arizona LSTA grant proposal; working on an LSTA-funded project in Arizona; or being paid from LSTA funds in Arizona.
3. Offeror assumes the sole responsibility for any contracts or agreements made with subcontractors in relationship to this RFP and shall disclose all such agreements if requested.
4. Contact: Direct all questions in regard to this RFP to the name on the front page of this RFP. It is the responsibility of the offeror to examine the entire RFP and seek clarification of any requirement that is unclear; and to check their quotation for accuracy before submitting it to ASLAPR. No quotation shall be altered, amended, or withdrawn after the specified date and time for receiving quotations as specified herein. Negligence by the Offerors in preparing the Quotation confers no right for the withdrawal of the Quotation after it has been opened.
5. Requirements for Submission:
 1. Proposal: Only one RFP can be submitted per Offeror or Offeror team.
 2. Proposal Package. The Offeror shall:
 - i. Complete, sign and attach Page 1 of this document;
 - ii. Create and attach a cover letter (see sample). This letter certifies to the accuracy and completeness of the RFP;
 - iii. Attach a resume and biography including documentation of prior experience and three references with contact information;
 - iv. Identify any other people who will be working on the project, and include resume and biography for each.
 - v. Attach a written plan detailing how the offeror will carryout the evaluation, based on the Institute of Museum and Library Service Evaluation Guidance provided within this document. The offeror is encouraged to take advantage of public meetings and minutes of librarians across the state, such as the county librarians' meeting,

- the Maricopa County Library Council, and meeting in other counties, as well as webinar software available through the State Library, in responding to this RFP;
- vi. Provide a proposed timeline for the evaluation process and completion, and indicating that the report will be completed and finalized by Feb. 28, 2012;
 - vii. Provide an itemized estimate for project expenses, not to exceed \$30,000, which must include all personnel, office, travel and transportation fees, insurance all applicable taxes and any other evaluation costs.
 - viii. Provide any terms or conditions with which the Offeror is not able to comply and the reasons why the compliance cannot be met. If an Offeror does not disclose any terms or conditions under this section, it is assumed that all terms and conditions as specified herein are accepted by the Offeror.
 - ix. Provide any other supplemental materials the Offeror feels will enhance his or her chances of being awarded a contract.
6. Submission: An original proposal shall be submitted in a sealed envelope with the offerer's name and RFP number clearly legible on the outside of the offer. An offeror may submit only one application. Each proposal must include the original and five copies of full proposal. ASLAPR will accept RFPs until the time and date cited on page 1:
- 1. ASLAPR must be in actual possession of RFP on or prior to the time and date, and at the location indicted in this document.
 - 2. Quotations will not be accepted or considered after the date and time specified in the solicitation due date.
 - 3. Failure to provide all requested materials, supplies or instruments in accordance to specifications or failure to meet the stated delivery commitment may be cause for rejection of the solicitation.
 - 4. The proposal and the related materials will not be returned.
7. Disclaimer:
- 1. Accuracy of information: Every effort has been made to include accurate information, instructions, and specifications necessary to tender an offer. If the solicitation requires modification or augmentation, ASLAPR will issue an official written agreement. ASLAPR takes no responsibility for other information. Any information, requirement or stipulation contained in prior documents or evaluation actions taken in preceding solicitations is not relevant to this RFP. Vendors who trust information not specifically contained in this RFP, do so at their own risk.
 - 2. Compensation: ASLAPR will not compensate anyone preparing or presenting a solicitation to this RFP.
 - 3. Cancellation of RFP: If there are no proposals which adequately meet the specifications in this document, including a plan to meet the private funding requirement, ASLAPR reserves the right to reject in whole or in part, all proposals submitted and/or cancel this RFP.

8. Evaluation: The RFP is an information solicitation and offers received are not read at a public opening. However, the RFP is a public record and may be publicly reviewed after an award.
 1. All proposals will be evaluated for professional merit and completeness by a panel convened by ASLAPR. Criteria will include:
 - i. Experience of offeror;
 - ii. Proposed approach to the evaluation;
 - iii. Ability to carry out a statewide project;
 - iv. Ability to carry out the project as demonstrated by the proposed plan and timeline for completion.
 2. The panel convened by ASLAPR will make the final decision.
9. Contract award: ASLAPR will award a contract to the responsible bidder whose RFP best meets the requirements of this RFP. Quotations do not become contract unless the ASLAPR puts the award in writing to the Offeror.
10. Persons with Americans Disabilities Act status may request equitable accommodation by contacting the Office, and they are asked to request as early as possible to allow time to arrange the facilitation.

Institute of Museum and Library Service Evaluation Guidance

Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Evaluation

RFP NO: Arizona – LSTA2011

The proposed project evaluation should:

- highlight effective past practices;
- identify processes at work in implementing the activities in the plan, including the use of performance-based measurements in planning, policy making and administration, and;
- develop key findings and recommendations from evaluating the past five years for inclusion in the next five-year planning cycle.
- The questions below are divided into three main areas: retrospective assessments, process assessments, and prospective analysis. Below each set of research questions we have identified strategies for addressing the question. These are not designed to be an exhaustive list of research or data collection strategies but rather as a point of departure to assist SLAAs in planning their evaluation work.

Key Evaluation Questions for the Five-Year Evaluations Due in 2012

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?

Strategies for addressing these questions:

1. Make use of administrative data on program performance. This information can be from state level administrative data, data that is reported to IMLS on the State Program Report (SPR), administrative data collected from sub-grantees, etc.
2. The administrative data should be supplemented with data collected from interviews, surveys, and/or focus groups with key stakeholders.
3. Information may also be provided from secondary documents, including contracted third-party program evaluations, studies from non-partisan entities, and any State Library reports submitted to IMLS, state policy makers, and/or other parties.
4. Other sources of information, such as Census data, state education data, and surveys conducted by the SLAA may be used to describe broad changes in communities or in the state. While these, for the most part, cannot be used for making direct attributions of outcomes from LSTA programming efforts, they can be effective in describing the context of activities undertaken.
5. In conducting quantitative analysis from each of the data sources, we only expect descriptive statistics including cross-tabulations as appropriate. The mixing of summary tables and/or figures summarizing the results in the narrative is customary in this type of research. More in-depth statistical output is generally reserved for appendices (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).
6. In conducting qualitative analysis from the above data sources, we expect some form of content analysis with possibly descriptive statistics. There are various types of sampling and coding strategies that will precede the analytical choices and we expect that they will be made transparent and justified when describing the evaluation methodology adopted (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).

PROCESS QUESTIONS

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

Strategies for addressing these questions:

1. Make use of administrative documents, including programmatic plans, annual budgets, memos, administrative rule changes, periodic reports to IMLS and state policymakers, correspondence with sub-entities, and media stories.

2. This data will likely need to be supplemented with data collected from interviews and/or focus groups with key stakeholders within and outside of the State Library.
3. In conducting quantitative analysis from each of the data sources, we only expect descriptive statistics including cross-tabulations as appropriate. The mixing of summary tables and/or figures summarizing the results in the narrative is customary in this type of research. More in-depth statistical output is generally reserved for appendices.
4. In conducting qualitative analysis from the above data sources, we expect some form of content analysis with possibly descriptive statistics. There are various types of sampling and coding strategies that will precede the analytical choices and we expect that they will be made transparent and justified when describing the evaluation methodology adopted (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).

PROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. How should the State Library 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 State Library learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other States could benefit from knowing? Include what worked and what should be changed.

Strategies for addressing these questions:

1. Data for answering these questions will likely need to be generated from surveys, interviews, and/or focus group.
2. It also may be advisable to use social media (e.g., wikis) to collect information.
3. In conducting quantitative analysis from each of the data sources, we only expect descriptive statistics including cross-tabulations as appropriate. The mixing of summary tables and/or figures summarizing the results in the narrative is customary in this type of research. More in-depth statistical output is generally reserved for appendices (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).
4. The evaluators should be given discretion for recommending alternative evaluation methods as long as they can provide adequate justification following the guiding principles of the American Evaluation Association.
5. In conducting qualitative analysis from the above data sources, we expect some form of content analysis with possibly descriptive statistics (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).

LOOKING AHEAD AT THE NEXT FIVE YEAR PLAN

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

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

Strategies for addressing these questions:

1. Data for answering these questions will likely need to be generated from surveys, interviews, meetings, and/or focus groups.
2. It also may be advisable to use social media (e.g., wikis) to collect information.
3. It is very important for the answers to these questions to be framed to reinforce the independence of the evaluators' judgments.
4. In conducting qualitative analysis from the above data sources for addressing the first optional question, we expect some form of content analysis. There are various types of sampling and coding strategies that will precede the analytical choices, and we expect that they will be made transparent and justified when describing the evaluation methodology adopted (see below for more details under questions in describing the evaluation methodology).
5. When recommendations are made based on the evaluators' judgments, it is expected that the evaluators will provide explicit reference to previously cited evidence in the evaluation report to support the contentions.

Questions in Describing the Evaluation Methodology

1. Identify how the SLAA implemented the selection of an independent evaluation using the criteria described in the next section of this guidance document.
2. Explain who was involved in conducting the various stages of the evaluation. What stakeholders provided and interpreted evaluation data?
3. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods used in conducting the evaluation. Include administrative information as well.
4. Document any tradeoffs made in the selection and implementation of the selected evaluation methods.
5. Discuss strategies used for disseminating and communicating the key findings and recommendations.
6. Assess the validity and reliability of the data used for conducting this evaluation study.

Strategies for addressing these questions:

1. These questions should be carefully addressed before implementing the evaluation in developing a research plan.
2. Careful documentation of project records also will be needed. Remember: professional guidelines for this type of research require protocols in place to ensure confidentiality and consent. If in doubt, we suggest you receive clearance for the type of research methods used in the evaluation with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the institution conducting the evaluation. If the institution conducting the evaluation does not have an IRB, contact the Research and Statistics Office at IMLS.

3. Addressing these questions in the formal evaluation report is customarily done towards the beginning of the document. In working with the independent evaluator, other stakeholders reviewing the document should have set aside appropriate time in the beginning of the investigation to assure that they have enough knowledge of the scientific techniques that the evaluators will be using, including tradeoffs that they are making.

4. The section should provide specific details for the reader to understand the methods used in any statistical and qualitative research conducted in the evaluation. For qualitative research, we recognize that many types of sampling and coding strategies may be appropriate; we expect that they will be made transparent and justified in this section of the report. It is acceptable to include appendices of any instruments used for data collection as well as those used in coding.

Format of Report

IMLS analyzes and makes public all LSTA five-year evaluations. In order to do this effectively, certain information needs to be included in all evaluation reports. One objective of this guidance is to better enable IMLS to tell federal policy makers what has happened at a national level by better assuring tighter conformity in the organization of each of the State Library evaluation reports. The guidelines should be given to any staff member, partner, interns, or consultant doing evaluation work for the State Library in order to ensure that all evaluation reports include the following:

1. Cover Page: (1 page)

- State Library Administrative Agency.
- Title of the evaluation.
- Evaluator(s) name and organizational affiliation.
- Date.
- Name of the team, branch, unit, or person commissioning the evaluation.

2. Evaluation Summary

- Prepare a brief 2-5 page description of the main findings.
- Summarize the major questions addressed in the evaluation.
- Briefly describe the methods used in producing the evidence to address the questions.
- Present key findings to the questions. Report findings should address each of the IMLS Congressional priorities were referenced in the State's five-year plan.
- Discuss key recommendations.

3. Body of the Evaluation Report

- Document size: The body of the evaluation report is not expected to exceed 25 pages.
- Background of the study: This should detail the intended user(s) and use(s) of the evaluation process and/or product; the specific evaluation questions or issues addressed; and the values and principles guiding the evaluation process.
- Description of the methodology employed: This should include an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the research design, tools and methods used, the process followed, data sources, and people interviewed. It should describe how the project/program stakeholders and the intended user(s) of the evaluation participated in the process. It should also comment on the validity and reliability of the evidence as well as any ethical considerations.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- Evaluation findings: This section should be formulated according to the evaluation plan and the terms of reference (TORs) of the evaluation study. The findings should be organized around each specific priority in the IMLS authorization addressed under the State's five-year plan.

4. Annexes

- List of acronyms.
- List of people interviewed (with full coordinates if appropriate and not in breach of confidentiality).
- Bibliography of all documents reviewed.
- Optional output of statistical findings.
- Optional summaries of coding used in any qualitative analyses.
- Copies of any research instruments used for surveying, interviewing, and/or use of focus groups.

All of the above items must be received by 3 p.m., Arizona Time on Sept. 16, 2011 to:

Laura Stone, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, 1700 W. Washington, Suite 200, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Questions concerning this RFP should be directed to: Laura Stone, lstone@lib.az.us.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

SAMPLE RFP SUBMITTAL LETTER
(use as page 1 of RFP)

[DATE]

Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records – Laura Stone
1700 W. Washington, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

In response to your Request for Proposals (RFP): Arizona 2008-12 LSTA
Evaluation, the following response is submitted.

In submitting this response, I hereby certify that:

1. The entire RFP has been read and understood;
2. The materials requested are enclosed and will not be returned;
3. All information provided is true, accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge;
4. This proposal is submitted by, or on behalf of, the party that will be legally responsible for service delivery should a contract be awarded.

Signature of Authorized Person

Date

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex D

List of People Interviewed

Key Stakeholder Interviews were conducted with the following group:

Laura Stone, Arizona State Library Consultant
Holly Henley, Arizona State Library, Library Development Division Director
Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library, Acting State Librarian

A Focus group was conducted with Arizona County Librarians. Participants were notified they would not be individually identified. A listing of County librarians can be found at <http://www.lib.az.us/alts/Directory.aspx>.

Eleven library stakeholders were interviewed via telephone. Participants were notified they would not be individually identified. Background information on the participants can be found in the table below.

Affiliation	Title	degree	Current position	Library field
K-12 School Library	Teacher/librarian	Masters of Science	25 years	25 years
Special Library	Education Administrator	Doctorate educational administration	3 years	30 years
Academic Library	Assistant Division Director	Doctorate	6 months	11 to 12 years
County Library	Library Director	Masters of Library Science	7 years	30 years
City Library	Leisure and Library services Director	Masters of Library Science	6 months	6.5 years
County Library	Library District Development Officer	Masters of Library Science	10 years	28 years
City Library	Director of Library Services	High School Diploma	5 years	11 years
County Library	Director of Library District	Masters of Library Science	14 years	34 years
City Library	Library Director and Library Manager	Masters of Library Science Masters of Library Science	25 years 3 years	31 years 17 years
Tribal Library	Library Director	Masters of Science	27 years	27 years
Tribal Library	Librarian	Masters of Library Science	3 years	3 years

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex E

Focus Group Instrument

Focus Group Protocol -- Arizona Library Association

My name is Amy Kemp and I am with Dynamic Evaluation, LLC. I am working with the State Library, Archives, and Public Records to evaluate Arizona's LSTA plan for 2008-2012. I am very pleased to be here with you; I am very interested in your feedback on LSTA, its impact, and its importance in your work. We have the next hour to discuss some of those key issues. Any comments or responses you make today will not be printed in the final report (or other reports) with our name or institution's name attached. Does anyone have questions about the process or any concerns with me recording our conversation?

[Opening – 15 minutes maximum]

I know the topic of your conference is the future of libraries. To briefly start our conversation, what are some key trends or changes you see as the future of libraries?

Do you believe LSTA funds and priorities are important to envisioning and fulfilling those priorities?

[Do not use second question if responses are forthcoming]

The areas of need in the 2008-2012 plan were: Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences. Were these the right priorities for 2008-2012? How should focus change in the coming years? Are these areas of need general enough to allow for needed flexibility? Are there projects that you believe are needed that could not be accommodated? Are the areas of need specific enough to be measurable and produce needed impact?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on customer experience and the enhancement of the user's ability to use information and services? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on community responsiveness and the ability of library staff to provide desired information, services and programs for communities? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on enhancing of Arizona librarians ability to meet the

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

lifespan learning need of Arizonans? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on collaboration and the ability of libraries to extend services, reach new audiences, and better serve their diverse communities? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on Arizonan's view of libraries as a relevant and excellent source of information in-person, digitally, or through collaborations? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

[As time permits]

A large percentage of Arizona's LSTA allocation funds statewide projects such as databases, hardware and software as well as professional development. Do you think this is the most effective approach?

While a large percentage of the funds fund infrastructure projects in technology and professional development, a substantial portion of the resources fund varied local projects. Do you believe this is an effective use of resources and an efficient way to meet local needs?

Is the current proportion of statewide versus local about right? If not, what could be changed?

[Closing]

Are there any other items we have not covered that you would like to add about LSTA?

Thank you for your time and valuable input. I will leave my cards on XX; please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex F

Interview Instrument

Interview Protocol

My name is Amy Kemp and I am with Dynamic Evaluation, LLC. I am working with the State Library, Archives, and Public Records to evaluate the LSTA program for 2008-2012. I am very pleased to speak with you; I am very interested in your feedback on LSTA, its functioning, and its importance in your work. We have the next hour to discuss some of those key issues. Any comments or responses you make today will not be printed in the final report (or other reports) with our name or institution's name attached. Do you have questions about the process or any concerns with me recording our conversation?

[Introduction and demographics]

Confirm name, title, and library affiliation.

Will you share with me the highest degree you have attained?

How long have you been in your current position?

How long have you worked in the library field?

[If this is not a county or city library ask about the population they serve, how they collaborate with the State library and county/city libraries.]

I know your library is located in XX [town] and XX [county]. Could you tell me a bit more about the community you serve and their needs?

[Establishment of needs]

If you had to sum it up, what are the three most important or common needs of your users and community?

Of these needs, please identify the most serious challenges or impediments to meeting those needs? What would really help you to meet those needs?

Does LSTA assist with meeting those needs?

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

[Experience/feedback on grants process]

Have you or your library/organization applied for LSTA funds?

[If yes] Was the application and scoring process clear and user friendly?

[If yes] Did you understand the goals and selection criteria?

Has your organization received LSTA funds?

[If no] Did you receive feedback on why you were not selected?

[If no] Do you believe you or your organization will apply in the future?

[If yes] During implementation, were the reporting (financial and programmatic) requirements user-friendly and meaningful?

[If yes] Were LSTA funds able to assist you in developing new and innovative programming?

[LSTA priorities and impact]

The areas of need in the 2008-2012 plan were: Lifespan Learning Continuum; Virtual Access; Training, Education and Consultant Support; and Centennial Experiences. Were these the right priorities for 2008-2012? How should focus change in the coming years? Are these areas of need general enough to allow for needed flexibility? Are there projects that you believe are needed that could not be accommodated? Are the areas of need specific enough to be measurable and produce needed impact?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on customer experience and the enhancement of the user's ability to use information and services? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on community responsiveness and the ability of library staff to provide desired information, services and programs for communities? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on enhancing of Arizona librarians ability to meet the lifespan learning need of Arizonans? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on collaboration and the ability of libraries to extend services, reach new audiences, and better serve their diverse communities? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

Based on what you know in your community and the state overall, do you believe LSTA funds made a positive impact on Arizonan's view of libraries as a relevant and excellent source of information in-person, digitally, or through collaborations? What might have increased that impact? Is this still a priority area for the future?

[Granting priorities]

A large percentage of Arizona's LSTA allocation funds statewide projects such as databases, hardware and software as well as professional development. Do you think this is the most effective approach?

While a large percentage of the funds fund infrastructure projects in technology and professional development, a substantial portion of the resources fund varied local projects. Do you believe this is an effective use of resources and an efficient way to meet local needs?

Is the current proportion of statewide versus local about right? If not, what could be changed?

[Closing]

Are there any other items we have not covered that you would like to add about LSTA?

Thank you for your time and valuable input. Here is my card, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex G

Online Survey Instrument

LSTA 2008-2012 Evaluation

Created: November 24 2011, 9:52 AM

Last Modified: November 28 2011, 7:46 PM

Design Theme: Clean

Language: English

Button Options: Custom: Start Survey: "Start Survey!" Submit: "Submit"

Disable Browser "Back" Button: False

LSTA 2008-2012 Evaluation

Page 1 - Heading

Experience with LSTA

Description

Page 1 - Question 1 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Have you or your library/organization applied for LSTA funds?

- ☐ yes [\[Skip to 2\]](#)
- ☐ no [\[Skip to 5\]](#)
- ☐ don't know [\[Skip to 5\]](#)

Page 2 - Question 2 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Was the application and scoring process clear and user friendly?
--

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 2 - Question 3 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Were the goals and selection criteria clear?
--

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Page 2 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

[Mandate]

Did your organization receive LSTA funds?

- ☐ yes [Skip to 3]
- ☐ no [Skip to 4]
- ☐ don't know [Skip to 4]

Page 3 - Question 5 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Has your library received LSTA funds between 2008 and now?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 3 - Question 6 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

During implementation, were the reporting (financial) requirements user-friendly

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 3 - Question 7 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

During implementation, were the reporting (programmatic) requirements user-friendly and meaningful?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 3 - Question 8 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Did LSTA funds assist in the development of new and innovative programming?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 3 - Question 9 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

[Mandate]

Do you believe your organization will apply in the future?

- ☐ yes [Skip to 5]
- ☐ no [Skip to 5]
- ☐ don't know [Skip to 5]

Page 4 - Question 10 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Was there feedback on why the application was not funded?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 4 - Question 11 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Do you believe your organization will apply in the future?

- ☐ yes
- ☐ no
- ☐ don't know

Page 5 - Heading

Please indicate how important you believe the following priority areas are for your library and community.

Description

Page 5 - Question 12 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Supporting learning and skill development from birth throughout life.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 13 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Increasing community awareness of digital resources.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 14 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Digital resources and education for those under 30 years of age.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 15 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Digital resources and education for those 30 years of age or older.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 16 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Professional development for library staff.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 17 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Professional development for library staff related to digital resources.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 5 - Question 18 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Preservation of Arizona Centennial and historical materials.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Page 5 - Question 19 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Increasing access to Arizona Centennial and historical materials.

- ☐ very important
- ☐ important
- ☐ somewhat important
- ☐ not important

Page 6 - Heading

Perception of LSTA Impact

Description

Page 6 - Question 20 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Have you utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?

- ☐ yes [Skip to 7]
- ☐ no [Skip to 8]
- ☐ don't know [Skip to 8]

Page 7 - Question 21 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please rate the overall quality of that professional development.

- ☐ very good
- ☐ good
- ☐ poor
- ☐ very poor

Page 8 - Question 22 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Have other members of your staff utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?

- ☐ yes [Skip to 9]
- ☐ no [Skip to 10]
- ☐ don't know [Skip to 10]

Page 9 - Question 23 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please rate the overall quality of that professional development.

- ☐ very good
- ☐ good
- ☐ poor
- ☐ very poor

Page 10 - Question 24 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Access to EBSCO and other technology resources through LSTA is critical for my library.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 25 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help maintain services and resources my community needs.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 26 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help bring new services and resources to my community.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 27 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities impacted by the economic downturn.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- ☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 28 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities that are increasingly diverse.

- ☐ strongly agree
☐ agree
☐ somewhat agree
☐ disagree
☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 29 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of families and individuals with lower economic and educational attainment.

- ☐ strongly agree
☐ agree
☐ somewhat agree
☐ disagree
☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 30 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs encourage collaboration.

- ☐ strongly agree
☐ agree
☐ somewhat agree
☐ disagree
☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 31 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs improve digital resources.

- ☐ strongly agree
☐ agree
☐ somewhat agree
☐ disagree
☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 32 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs increase access to digital resources.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ don't know

Page 10 - Question 33 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

LSTA funds and programs help keep libraries relevant.

- ☐ strongly agree
- ☐ agree
- ☐ somewhat agree
- ☐ disagree
- ☐ don't know

Page 11 - Heading

Background

Description

Page 11 - Question 34 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Please indicate the county where your library is located:

- ☐ Apache
- ☐ Cochise
- ☐ Coconino
- ☐ Gila
- ☐ Graham
- ☐ Greenlee
- ☐ La Paz
- ☐ Maricopa
- ☐ Mohave
- ☐ Navajo
- ☐ Pima
- ☐ Pinal
- ☐ Santa Cruz
- ☐ Yavapai
- ☐ Yuma

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Page 11 - Question 35 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please choose the best description of the community your library serves:

- ☐ urban
- ☐ rural
- ☐ suburban
- ☐ tribal community
- ☐ other

Page 11 - Question 36 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Please choose the best description of your library type:

- ☐ state library
- ☐ county library
- ☐ city or town library
- ☐ university library
- ☐ community college library
- ☐ K-12 school library
- ☐ other library or organization

Page 11 - Question 37 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Please indicate your highest education level attained:

- ☐ high school diploma
- ☐ bachelor's degree
- ☐ Master of Library and Information Science
- ☐ other master's degree
- ☐ PhD or EDD
- ☐ other

Page 11 - Question 38 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your current position:

- ☐ Library Director
- ☐ Librarian
- ☐ Library Assistant
- ☐ other

Page 11 - Question 39 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate the number of years you have been in your current position:

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- ☐ less than 1 year
- ☐ one year to three years
- ☐ three to five years
- ☐ five to ten years
- ☐ more than ten years

Page 11 - Question 40 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate the number of years you have been in the library field:

- ☐ less than 1 year
- ☐ one year to three years
- ☐ three to five years
- ☐ five to ten years
- ☐ more than ten years

Thank You Page

Thank you for your time and valuable input.

Please address any questions or concerns to Amy Kemp at amy@dynamicanalysisllc.com.

Screen Out Page

Standard

Over Quota Page

Standard

Survey Closed Page

Standard

Annex H

LSTA external subgrant guidelines for 2011

Centennial Experiences

Select one of these three project models as the basis for your project. Projects dealing with local collections and materials are especially encouraged. You may augment the description, outcome and evaluation, but grant reviewers will consider how carefully you are able to meet the criteria outlined here. Please consider applying to be a Centennial Legacy Project; more information is available at www.azcentennial.gov.

Centennial Programming:

Description: Libraries work with other community organizations to create educational, enriching and exciting ways to appreciate Arizona's history and explore its future via Centennial projects and plans.

Outcome: Arizonans learn about the history, culture and positioning for the future as part of the Centennial.

Evaluation: Surveys indicate that Arizonans have increased their understanding and appreciation of the state via Centennial projects and plans.

Centennial Exhibits:

Description: Libraries collaborate with staff of local organizations to mount rotating exhibits on the historic and evolving culture of the community.

Outcome: Libraries establish relationships and partner to create new community resources and outreach programs while working on Centennial projects.

Evaluation: The number of collaborative historic and cultural exhibits increases and libraries document their efforts to collaborate.

Local Centennial Projects:

Description: Libraries launch local initiatives that demonstrate their ability to astutely and capably create community partnerships and position libraries as centers of community life.

Outcome: Arizonans view libraries as vital and valuable parts of the community as a result of Centennial experiences.

Evaluation: Public opinion surveys show the public recognizes the importance of libraries to community life.

[Lifespan Learning](#)

Select one of these five project models as the basis for your project. You may augment the description, outcome and evaluation, but grant reviewers will consider how carefully you are able to meet the criteria outlined here.

Lifespan Learning Programming:

Description: Libraries develop programs and services to enhance the skills, interests and information needs of users across the lifespan, from birth through senior years.

Outcome: Arizonans find lifespan learning resources and experiences (people, programs & materials) through their libraries.

Evaluation: Community members report the library is satisfactorily meeting their lifespan learning needs.

Library-Educator Partnerships:

Description: Libraries coordinate with educators to provide complimentary resources, programs and materials through a combination of workshops, collection enhancement and technology-driven interactions.

Outcome: Arizonans find lifespan learning resources and experiences (people, programs & materials) through their libraries.

Evaluation: The number of coordinated activities involving libraries and educational institutions increase, and Arizona students benefit.

Library Services Address Non-Traditional and Underserved Populations:

Description: Libraries create and promote library services for non-traditional library users and underserved populations.

Outcome: Libraries become participants and leaders in advancing lifespan learning, and Arizona's multifaceted literacy efforts.

Evaluation: The number and percent of targeted users increases, and surveys show improvements in targeted areas for the targeted users.

Volunteer Programs:

Description: Libraries engage volunteers in programs to develop manage and sustain library services via varied and rewarding opportunities.

Outcome: Libraries provide enhanced opportunities by partnering with educational, cultural and other community organizations.

Evaluation: Libraries report an increase in successful volunteer programs, the volunteers report that their work is meaningful.

Library Programming:

Description: Libraries leverage community experts and resources to provide a portfolio of services, educational opportunities and experiences for all ages and abilities.

Outcome: Arizonans view libraries as trusted, knowledgeable and safe places for lifespan learning.

Evaluation: The number of users that learned about a topic increases as more people are attracted to the library.

Innovation:

Description: Libraries create library “test beds” to nurture innovative programs or use of resources for lifespan learning.

Outcome: Arizona librarians develop innovative programs and resources.

Evaluation: Arizonans see libraries as innovative spaces.

[Virtual Access](#)

Select one of these three project models as the basis for your project. You may augment the description, outcome and evaluation, but grant reviewers will consider how carefully you are able to meet the criteria outlined here.

Intuitive Web Presence:

Description: Libraries develop audience-appropriate web presences that intuitively guide users to the digital needs of users across the lifespan from birth through senior years.

Outcome: Arizonans find appropriate online materials, including government

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

documents, archival, historic, health and consumer information.

Evaluation: Surveys show that users are finding what they need on library websites.

Innovative Virtual Service:

Description: Libraries launch innovative virtual services, accessible by both wired and wireless devices, to serve targeted audiences.

Outcome: Community leaders and educators value virtual services and resources provided by Arizona libraries.

Evaluation: Community leaders and educators are surveyed about their awareness of new, innovative virtual services.

New Technologies:

Description: Libraries use new technologies to provide services for users. This category is limited to technologies and equipment not currently present in the applicant library, including high-speed internet and a first self-check machine.

Outcome: Arizonans have easy access to materials.

Evaluation: Librarians report having adequate technology in their facilities to meet both online and walk-in user needs.

2011 introduction letter <http://www.lib.az.us/lsta/11annletter.aspx>

Dear Library and Cultural Institution Colleagues:

I am pleased to confirm that the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records Agency will administer \$3.6 million in 2011 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). About two-thirds of the funds are committed to statewide services such as statewide databases, digital government initiatives, the repository for cultural information, network support, interlibrary loan, field travel and a number of other programs that benefit the entire state. The remaining money will be invested in field-based, competitive grants.

The State Library's five-year plan, approved by IMLS, sets funding priorities for the LSTA funds. The three funding categories – centennial experiences, lifespan learning, and virtual access – are based directly on the [five-year plan](#).

All types of libraries recognized by the State Library are eligible for funding. Libraries are encouraged to partner with museums, archives, cultural institutions, community organizations, schools or other organizations.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC**Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation**

Plan to attend one of the “LSTA Funding @ Your Library” workshops in January. During this three-hour workshop, you’ll learn about the LSTA grant application process, tips for planning your project, and how to incorporate outcome-based evaluation into your LSTA project application. Arizona State Library staff will provide you with specifics to help prepare a competitive grant application. Information about registering for the workshop is in the back of this booklet.

This year you may again submit your application online. You will find the application and guidelines at www.lib.az.us/lsta/. Applications must be submitted online and certifications postmarked by March 14, 2011.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

Annex I

Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records Mission and Goals

The Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records [the Agency]:

Serves the Arizona Legislature and Arizonans, providing public access to public information, fostering historical/cultural collaborative research, information projects and ensuring that Arizona's history is documented and preserved. It holds the following goals:

- Providing prompt, professional legislative support
- Preserving and documenting Arizona's history
- Providing access to public information
- Promoting statewide collaboration for historical and cultural institutions

Through the Library Development Division, the Agency takes a leadership role in coordinating statewide planning and development of library services. A staff of [professional library consultants](#) works closely with [public libraries](#) to help define and meet the wide variety of information needs that exist in the state (Arizona State Library, 2011).

Annex J

IMLS LSTA Purpose and Goals

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) supports libraries in Arizona through the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) program, administered by the Arizona State Library.

LSTA funds are intended to help libraries develop central roles as community builders. LSTA funds are used to promote improvements in services to all types of libraries; to facilitate access to, and sharing of, resources; and to achieve economical and effective delivery of service for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry. LSTA funds are targeted for statewide library services and support a wide array of programs from family literacy to providing broad access to sophisticated databases. This program develops the role of libraries as “information brokers,” helping to make resources and services, which are often prohibitively expensive, more readily available. LSTA also supports efforts to recruit and educate librarians.

In Arizona, LSTA funds are available as grants to individual libraries.

LSTA priorities as defined in 20 USC Chapter 72, Sec. 9141 are:

- expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats; in all type of libraries, for individuals of all ages;
- developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international electronic networks;
- providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries;
- developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;
- 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 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 lines. (Arizona State Library, 2011; IMLS 2011).

The overall purposes of the Library Services and Technology Act are to

- enhance coordination among federal programs that relate to library and information services;
- promote continuous improvement in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States;
- facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry;

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public;
- promote literacy, education, and lifelong learning and to enhance and expand the services and resources provided by libraries, including those services and resources relating to workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills;
- enhance the skills of the current library workforce and to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;
- ensure the preservation of knowledge and library collections in all formats and to enable libraries to serve their communities during disasters;
- enhance the role of libraries within the information infrastructure of the United States in order to support research, education, and innovation; and
- promote library services that provide users with access to information through national, state, local, regional, and international collaborations and networks.

The Act specifies the following priorities for the Grants to States program:

- expand 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 in order to support such individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;
- establish or enhance electronic and other linkages and improved coordination among and between libraries and entities for the purpose of improving the quality of and access to library and information services;
- provide training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services;
- enhance efforts to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;
- develop public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;
- target library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills;
- target 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 (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 9902(2) of title 42) applicable to a family of the size involved;

develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks; and carry out other activities consistent with the purposes set forth in section 9121, as described in the SLAA's plan (IMLS 2011).LSTA external subgrant programmatic outcome reporting guidelines

Annex K

Arizona LSTA plan 2008-2012

Arizona 2008-2012 LSTA Plan
Prepared by the
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records
For the Institute of Museum and Library Services
June 29, 2007
Resubmitted Aug. 30, 2007

Overview

The Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records serves the information needs of Arizonans through six divisions: Braille and Talking Books Library; History and Archives; Law and Research Library; Library Development Division; State Capitol Museum; and Records Management. As a legislative agency, an important role of the Arizona State Library is to provide professional legislative support. The Arizona State Library has historically used LSTA funds to support both a strong subgrant program, as well as a number of statewide programs carried out by State Library staff. GladysAnn Wells, Arizona State Librarian, chose to rigorously evaluate the 2003-2007 plan, and to build planning for 2008-2012 into that process. Significantly, 2012 marks Arizona's Centennial Statehood Anniversary.

Through the evaluation and planning process, the State Library staff learned that librarians across the state valued the mix of subgrant and statewide programs. The process validated a belief on the part of Ms. Wells and the staff that there is no one way or one answer to provide statewide library services. There are no cookie-cutter models. After reflecting on how to ready librarians for the near future, the Arizona State Library staff believes that the best course is to equip librarians with the skills and resources to identify, assess and address the needs of today and tomorrow, thereby expanding their capacity to be responsive leaders in shaping the future of their Arizona communities. That is the primary focus of this LSTA Plan.

As evidenced in this report, that conclusion was reached after significant research. This report begins with a discussion of a 2007 report *America's Perfect Storm*. The report outlines three forces impacting the United States: substantial disparities in skill levels; seismic economy changes; and sweeping demographic shifts. The report quickly overlays those national trends with a look at Arizona issues. Arizona will grow to 7.3 million people by 2012 according to U.S. Census Bureau projections, following a 15 percent increase in population between 2000 and 2005. In 2005, Arizona had the largest economic surge in the state's history. Aside from the challenges of digital literacy, Arizona communities face huge demands for basic literacy and English as a Second Language.

Working within a border state with explosive growth patterns, Arizona librarians face a broad range of social, educational and economic challenges. Libraries, whether urban or rural, face dramatic shifts in service areas and customer expectations, along with the challenge of developing and maintaining services that are responsive to ever-changing community needs.

The report then discusses information gathered through the needs assessment. This information is organized around four questions: How do individuals look for information?; How do individuals see the role of the public library?; What do Arizona librarians think about public libraries?; What do legislators think about their library service?. The needs assessment was also informed by a public opinion survey conducted by Northern Arizona University's Social Research Laboratory. The survey found that in general, Arizonans hold a very positive view of public libraries; 68 percent of Arizonans rate public libraries as "very good" or "good." Despite these positive findings, many of those surveyed agree that "public libraries are becoming irrelevant since people can find almost anything they need on the Internet."

Based on research, the needs assessment and the agency's mission, State Library staff identified four primary areas of need, and five goals. The goals will be achieved via a mix of targeted initiatives and competitive grants, the latter providing seed money for innovation. The goals, organized around the "Five C's of Service," are purposely broad in nature and limited in number to provide flexibility for creative community-responsive initiatives and leveraging of local funds. Matrices provide additional details on outcomes, projects and measures.

The areas of need are:

- ***Lifespan Learning Continuum*** addresses needs from birth to end-of-life to develop, improve and extend skills and interests vital to a productive and rewarding life.
- ***Virtual Access*** addresses needs for all age groups to be aware of, access and successfully use digital resources for school, work, or personal enrichment.
- ***Training, Education & Consultant Support*** addresses professional development, direction and support for librarians and library staff to maintain the knowledge and skills required to serve effectively in the 21st century.
- ***Centennial Experiences*** addresses the need for communities to view historic accomplishments in the context of current achievements, while creating collaborative community relationships for future success.

The Goals and Five C's of Service are:

- **Customer Experience**
Goal: Arizona libraries will offer virtual and physical customer experiences for traditional and alternative library audiences to enhance the user's ability, regardless of literacy level, to find and use information and services available to them.
- **Community Responsiveness**
Goal: Arizona communities will recognize library staff as having the ability to

participate in assessing community needs, identifying resources and planning collaboratively to address needs and opportunities via a portfolio of library services and programs that educate, inform, and interest community members.

▪ **Continuous Progress**

Goal: Arizona librarians will expand and enhance their ability to meet the lifespan learning needs of Arizonans.

▪ **Collaboration**

Goal: Arizona libraries will use partnerships and collaboration with various types of libraries and cultural institutions to extend services, to reach new audiences, to better serve the information needs of the rapidly growing, culturally and demographically diverse Arizona population.

▪ **Connections**

Goal: Arizonans will view libraries as trusted, knowledgeable, easy-to-access sources of information whether they connect in person, online or via another organization.

This report includes information on stakeholder involvement, which included two studies from professional consultants; a public opinion survey conducted by NAU Social Research Laboratory; a web-based survey of participants in the State Library's continuing education programs; focus groups and presentations to various organizations. Communications procedures describe a variety of methods: via web, publications and presentations to the library community, political leaders, US congressional delegates, and State Library staff. A final section describes monitoring of both statewide programs managed by State Library staff, and sub-grants, both to make sure project directors have the tools they need to be successful, and that they report on their projects in helpful and timely ways.

Agency Mission

The agency serves the Arizona Legislature and Arizonans, providing public access to public information, fostering historical/cultural collaborative research and information projects and ensuring that Arizona's history is documented and preserved.

Agency Goals:

- Providing prompt, professional legislative support
- Preserving and documenting Arizona's history
- Providing access to public information
- Promoting statewide collaboration for historical and cultural institutions.

Through its divisions, the Agency provides access to unique historical and contemporary resources:

- Archives of historical records in Arizona
- Library consulting assistance to libraries
- Library for the visually and physically disabled
- Museums on state government history and people of the state

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- Public records management program
- Research and law library (includes Federal Regional Depository and State Depository).

Needs Assessment

The Landscape: America's Perfect Storm

America's Perfect Storm: Three Forces Changing Our Nation's Future, (Educational Testing Service (ETS) Policy Information Center, January 2007) paints a grim picture of our nation's future. Education and literacy levels underpin sobering shifts in economic opportunity and portend a decline in our nation's position on key indicators relative to other countries ranked by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

According to the ETS report, three forces impacting our country are:

- >Substantial disparities in skill levels (reading and math) ;
- >Seismic economic changes (widening wage gaps);
- >Sweeping demographic shifts (less education, lower skills).

In addition huge differences exist across groups as defined by race/ethnicity, country of birth and socioeconomic status. These differences influence social, educational and economic opportunities. Following is a series of findings from ETS about the "Perfect Storm" forming in the U.S.:

A recent OECD report ranks the United States as 16th out of 21 OECD countries in high school graduation rates. Technology and globalization have combined to restructure the U.S. workplace. Manufacturing continues to decline and contributed only 10.7 percent of total employment in 2003. Two-thirds of U.S. job growth between 1984 and 2000 was in positions associated with a college-level education. The expected lifetime earnings of males with a bachelor's degree in 2004 were 96 percent higher than peers with a high school diploma.

Bottom line in the U.S. and in Arizona: The growth of human capital and its distribution is shifting in the wrong direction creating significant gaps. Job growth, requiring increased educational and skill levels, is being matched against declining literacy and numeracy levels in the working-age population.

The Arizona Landscape

From a 2006 population of 6,239,482, Arizona will grow to 7,370,993 people by 2012 according to U.S. Census Bureau projections. This projected increase of 18 percent will add the equivalent of the entire population of the state of Rhode Island and then some. This growth follows a 15 percent increase in population between 2000 and 2005.

Growth, by any measure, is the word most often heard from people when asked about Arizona, its communities, or its challenges. Rapid growth is affecting every aspect and every area of the state. The impact touches everything from infrastructure services like roads and utilities, to zoning and quality of life issues like clean air. Libraries, whether urban or rural, are facing dramatic shifts in service areas and customer expectations, along with the challenge of developing and maintaining services that are responsive to ever-changing community needs.

Nationwide, Arizona ranks in the top ten by both percentage of growth (the fastest growing state in the U.S.) and numeric population (6-plus million people). The State of Arizona had four counties on the list of fastest-growing U.S. counties (*Population Estimates for the Fastest-Growing U. S. Counties by Percentage Growth from July 1, 2004 to July 1, 2005*). Pinal was the highest ranked Arizona County coming in 7th with a 6.9 percent growth from 2004 to 2005. Arizona had five counties on the list of U.S. counties with the largest numeric increase from 2000 to 2005 (Maricopa, Pima, Pinal, Yavapai, and Mohave). Maricopa County, which includes the Phoenix metropolitan area, ranked number one on this list with an increase of 563,191 people bringing its population to over 3.6 million in 2005 and making it the fourth largest county in the United States. By year-end 2006, Maricopa County had grown to 3.8 million residents according to the Census Bureau.

Surprising to some, Arizona's fast growing population is younger than the national average. The median age in Arizona is 34.2; the median age for the nation is 35.3 years. The proportion of those younger than 25, as well as those over 65, is roughly the same as the U.S. overall. Nevertheless, by 2020, one in four Arizonans will be over age 60.

Of the six million residents of Arizona, approximately four million live in the Phoenix metropolitan area, and nearly one million more in the Tucson metro area. This uneven population distribution creates a rural / urban imbalance in resource allocation, services and infrastructure.

Not included in the population figures is the additional demand created by a huge influx of "snowbirds" – winter visitors flocking to Arizona's mild climate. The state's seasonal population adds an estimated 300,000 individuals who spend an estimated \$1 billion while they're in Arizona, according to an annual winter resident study conducted by the Center for Business Research at Arizona State University. Additionally, research by Northern Arizona University shows more than three-quarters of Arizona's winter visitors are over 60 years old.

Populations double or triple in many small rural communities during winter months, and demand for library services increases exponentially. Arizona libraries face every dimension of growth in meeting the needs of children, teens and adults of all ages. Rapid community growth and seasonal population swings make planning for everything from library services to the library's physical and virtual space a challenge for Arizona's libraries.

Diversity in background, education and ethnicity come with the rapidly changing population. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, Arizona population composition by race was: White 88.72 percent, Black 3.67 percent, American Indian 5.47 percent, Asian 2.15 percent (persons of Hispanic Origin may be of any race – Hispanic Origin was 22.00 percent). Between 2000 and 2005, Arizona's Hispanic population grew by 32 percent.

While "American Indian" accounts for only 5.47 percent of the Arizona population, the state has the third highest number (and sixth highest percentage) of Native Americans in the U.S. (2003 Census Bureau estimates). Arizona is home to 21 federally recognized tribes and over 250,000 Native Americans (2000 Census). Reservations and tribal communities make up more than a quarter of the state's land.

Domestic migration in and out of Arizona continues at a strong pace, whether it is snowbirds deciding to become residents or families retreating from higher-priced, densely-populated communities in California or southern Nevada.

Migration from outside the U.S. accounts for four percent of the state's population based on 2000 Census data for movers who had a different residence outside the U.S. five years prior.

According to the Brookings Institution, recent foreign immigration patterns show more immigrants in suburbs than cities. Those who do move to urban areas are choosing cities with relatively little history of immigration like Phoenix. Brookings cites schools, hospitals, the workplace and libraries as the factors that determine how people assimilate – or not.

This constant immigration churn has created a diverse population, not only by race, but also by education, income and birthplace. Working within a border state with explosive growth patterns, Arizona librarians face a broad range of social, educational and economic challenges.

Economy

Arizona's economy, and its history, can be traced through the Five C's: copper, cattle, cotton, citrus, and climate. The state seal embodies these historic economic engines. While the "Five C's" continue to play an important role, Arizona's economy has expanded to include aerospace, electronics, semiconductor, software, biomedical and other high-technology sectors.

Based on size, real estate and rental industries, tourism, government and construction are the largest economic sectors in Arizona. Service jobs outnumber manufacturing jobs. The Arizona economy has diversified, and high-tech employers like Google and Intel have chosen Arizona for their businesses.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

More recently, Arizona ranked second in the nation in non-farm job growth, based on percentage of change January 2007 over January 2006 (+4.64 percent). The national average was 1.67 percent change. Among states in the West, Arizona is expected to generate the second highest rate of job growth, 3.6 percent, according to the *Western Blue Chip Economic Forecast*.

In 2005 Arizona had the largest economic surge in the state's history. Arizona's five metro areas – Flagstaff, Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, Prescott, Tucson and Yuma – produced 92 percent of the state's Gross State Product according to the 2005 *State of the State Report: Arizona*.

Climate, one of the five C's, accounts for a healthy tourism industry with more than 13.3 million people visiting the Phoenix metropolitan area, the Valley of the Sun, each year. Visitors to Arizona spend \$6 billion annually. Cultural, historic, sports and entertainment opportunities abound drawing visitors and providing rich opportunities for collaboration with libraries and other community organizations.

Initiatives from government and industry focus on innovation; yet much more is needed to provide an infrastructure that supports today's global knowledge-based economy. Arizona's "new economy" ranks 20th in the nation based on factors like IT professionals, workforce education, fast-growing firms, and managerial, professional, technical jobs along with other new economy indicators, according to *The 2007 State New Economy Index* from the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) www.innovationpolicy.org). The ITIF study used 26 indicators to assess how state economies are structured and operating as new economies.

A 2007 study by the Urban Institute found that public libraries build a community's capacity for economic activity and resiliency. Libraries provide economic stability directly through positive use of public space, and indirectly through the services and resources they provide to local businesses, workers and entrepreneurs. Given their potential contribution to community resiliency, librarians should be active participants in assessing and meeting the needs of the communities they serve.

Education and Lifespan Learning

Because the new economy is digitally-based, education and related literacy levels face significant challenges. Computer literacy, financial literacy, and analytical skills are the "reading, writing and arithmetic" of the 21st century. In the new economy, business and government transactions are increasingly conducted only via digital (virtual) access. Everything from entry-level job applications to applying for government services and benefits requires computer skills.

The number of people online is a basic indicator of progress toward a new economy. By 2006 in the U.S., almost 75 percent of U.S. adults were online, and Arizona was number 17 of the 50 states with 63.6 percent of its population online. In the 2007 ITIF study, Arizona was 37th in integration of technology in schools. The state cannot continue

educating tomorrow's workforce with yesterday's tools and has made it a priority to develop a highly skilled, well-educated workforce.

Aside from the challenges of digital literacy, Arizona communities face huge demands for basic literacy and English as a Second Language. In Arizona, 20 percent of people aged 16 and older (819,500 based on 2000 U.S. Census) do not have a high school diploma or GED and are not enrolled in school. Of adults aged 18 and older, 6.5 percent (246,170) cannot communicate effectively in the English language. There is a direct relationship between low literacy levels and unemployment and poverty. Almost 90 percent of adults enrolled in Arizona Adult Education read below the 9th grade level. Both of these factors severely limit participation in the "new economy."

The greatest predictor of a child's success in school is the education level of the parent. Unfortunately, many parents lack the skills necessary to help their children succeed in school. Approximately 38 percent of people enrolled in Arizona Adult Education programs are unemployed and a high percentage of those people are receiving public assistance. Of the families enrolled in Arizona Family Literacy, 90 percent have annual incomes below \$25,000. Studies have shown that median weekly earnings increase with each level of literacy (National Center for Education Statistics, *Literacy in Everyday Life*, April 2007).

Lifespan learning, from birth to end-of-life, is another dimension of the educational focus. An interest in learning, along with skills to find, analyze and use information, is a key to economic and physical well-being in the 21st century. Libraries play a pivotal role in this area.

Needs Assessment: Building on a Solid Foundation

This Five-Year Plan addresses needs identified from stakeholders, public opinion surveys, consultant reports and other data gathering conducted over a six month period in Arizona. National studies about trends in library services, customer perception, and the changing role of the library, added to the context for assessment. From this information, the following ideas consistently arose as needs, perceptions or issues to be addressed by this plan. [The representative comments below are taken verbatim from survey responses.]

How do individuals look for information?

- Use online access in general and the Internet in particular
- Choose online access as the first, and sometimes only choice
- Ask a colleague, friend or other source (sometimes online)
- Check print sources
- Use multiple sources.

How do individuals see the role of the public library?

- A place to find books and a source for "out of print" materials
- A place for popular reading material whether print or audio

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- An important source of Internet access, even if users can access it at home or work
- A place “snowbirds” and travelers use for email and meeting new people
- A key source of more current technology and learning how to use it
- A place to learn how to do research and use resources such as databases
- A place that serves all ages and interests by focusing on customer needs
- A place that provides equal access for those on the wrong side of the digital divide
- A community center, especially in small rural towns
- A place to bring people together or a resource to go out to them
- A portal to community groups, resources and activities
- A place that provides choices and “human touch” in finding information
- A place in cyberspace for 24/7 use
- A facility where upkeep, use of space, lighting and atmosphere are important
- A place where convenience is expected: *“My view of the library is to have what I want, when I want it, and how I want it.”*

What do Arizona librarians think about public libraries?

[Feedback from a cross-section of Arizona librarians including those from urban and rural, academic and school settings]

- Libraries are struggling to keep up electronic resources and equipment
- Libraries need to be positioned as relevant and central to the community
- Library staff need training on how to respond to the needs of the communities they serve
- Current Arizona LSTA broad-based priorities work well and support a variety of projects
- Statewide purchasing, e.g., databases, is a valued service
- The State Library fosters collaboration as “a neutral arbitrator among players”
- School librarians wanted to participate more in state library initiatives
- Academic libraries want to be more involved with public libraries
- We are a leading state because of the state library. Their customer service is amazing.

What do legislators think about their library service?

The Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records serves the information needs of Arizona citizens as authorized by Arizona Revised Statutes §41-1331 through §41-1352. Organizationally, the agency is aligned with the Legislature. The Board of Library, Archives and Public Records exercises general supervision over the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, and appoints the Director of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. The Director serves at the pleasure of the Board. When asked about the role of the State Library, current and former Arizona state legislators provided the following feedback:

- The State Library has networked with legislators, sparked interest and raised awareness of the library and archives
- Progress is being made with a link between education and libraries
- The legislative newsletter is useful – need to continue to create awareness

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

- Customer service was rated as excellent by participating legislators
- Useful services included a list of current issues, intern orientation, database training for legislative staff, and helpful information on records retention and records management
- The State Library is described as a “leader going into the 21st Century”
- “A true resource for these [small town] libraries” – sending consultants out to help library staff and providing access to materials from interlibrary loan to databases – a big job due to growing urbanization in rural areas
- The archival role is important to local libraries – providing public libraries with support to “keep the history of Arizona.”

Public Opinion Survey Findings

Northern Arizona University conducted a statewide telephone survey for the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records in fall 2006. A random sample of 1,202 adult residents of the state participated in the survey. Consistent with national public opinion surveys about libraries, the Arizona public opinion poll found: “There is nearly unanimous understanding of the importance of public libraries” and very positive attitudes about public library services. Other information from the survey revealed:

- 98 percent agree that “public libraries are needed because they provide free information”
- 93 percent agree that “public libraries are essential for maintaining a productive community”
- 66 percent have a library card for an Arizona Public Library
- Respondents averaged 10 in-person library visits per year
- Respondents averaged 3 on-line visits to library services per year.

In general, Arizonans hold a very positive view of public libraries; 68 percent of Arizonans rate public libraries as “very good” or “good.” Despite these positive findings, 46 percent of those surveyed agree that “public libraries are becoming irrelevant since people can find almost anything they need on the Internet.” These perceptions are a key consideration for the Five-Year LSTA Plan.

Despite these positive findings, 46 percent of those surveyed agree that “public libraries are becoming irrelevant since people can find almost anything they need on the Internet.” This belief is strongest among those in rural areas (52 percent); among those 18-34 years old (55 percent); among those with no college education (52 percent); among those with income less than \$50,000 (51 percent); and among non-whites (62 percent). Yet, libraries have worked hard to provide relevant programs and services to these audiences. Clearly, more work needs to be done serving these populations.

Capturing and Distilling the Needs

While the data gathering described above provided a multitude of viewpoints, the data analysis was relatively clear-cut. Several needs dominated regardless of audience. When

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

considered together these needs, along with the opportunity presented by the 2012 State Centennial, provide a conceptual framework for the goals of this plan. The plan addresses the following areas of need:

Lifespan Learning Continuum addresses needs from birth to end-of-life to develop, improve and extend skills and interests vital to a productive and rewarding life.

Virtual Access addresses needs for all age groups to be aware of, access and successfully use digital resources for school, work, or personal enrichment.

Training, Education & Consultant Support addresses professional development, direction and support for librarians and library staff to maintain the knowledge and skills required to serve effectively in the 21st century.

Centennial Experiences addresses the need for communities to view historic accomplishments in the context of current achievements, while creating collaborative community relationships for future success.

Goals, Programs and Evaluation

Goals: The “Five C’s of Service” for Arizona’s Libraries

This Five-Year Plan will conclude in 2012, Arizona’s Centennial year. This historic year, along with the plans leading up to it, presents a unique opportunity to position librarians as stewards and leaders in strengthening community relationships.

The goals that follow align around Five C’s, not the Five C’s on Arizona State Seal, but Five C’s that will prepare Arizona librarians (and through collaboration their colleagues in other cultural institutions) to contribute successfully in shaping the state’s future.

Each goal focuses on meeting the needs identified above and creating the linkages between libraries, communities and other cultural organizations to address those needs. The “Five C’s of Service” encompass community and customers as well as library services.

The plan addresses challenges and realities based on surveys, focus groups, and stakeholder interviews gathered over the past six months (see the Stakeholder Involvement section for background). This plan begins to position libraries and the communities they serve for the next 100 years in Arizona.

Evaluation of the 2003-2007 Five-Year LSTA Plan provided positive feedback on its goals and outcomes. The overarching goals in that plan created a flexible umbrella for action. Those goals were: Public Satisfaction, Access to Information, Information Technology, Cultural Diversity, Community Focal Point, Strategic Partnerships, Recruiting and Retraining, and Administration.

Under the 2003-2007 Plan the Arizona State Library applied LSTA funds to create a mix of competitive grants, targeted initiatives and statewide programs. The 2003-2007 Arizona LSTA Plan identified the following most prevalent external forces:

- Need for greater educational attainment
- Changing demographics
- Rapid urban growth and sprawl
- Stresses on children and families
- Need for greater access to health care
- Increased need for access to new technologies

These external forces still exist and have only accelerated in pace or increased in importance.

The 2008-2012 LSTA Plan provides direction and focus, not cookie-cutter models. It is streamlined to five goals that will be achieved via a mix of targeted initiatives and competitive grants, the latter providing seed money for innovation. Its goals are purposely broad in nature and limited in number to provide flexibility for creative community-responsive initiatives and leveraging of local funds.

Predicting the next five years, let alone the next 100 years is impossible. There will be unimaginable technological, societal and environmental changes. Change is the only given. The ability to astutely assess and nimbly respond to community change is critical to success. The broad goals defined by this plan through the “Five C’s of Service” provide a direction to guide librarians and their community partners. More importantly, they provide a context and construct for working with change – for monitoring it, addressing it and using it to extend the library into community planning processes.

There is no one way and no one answer. The best course is to equip librarians with the skills and resources to identify, assess and address the needs of today and tomorrow – to expand their capacity to be responsive leaders in shaping the future of their Arizona communities. That is the primary focus of this LSTA Plan.

These goals apply to libraries and through collaboration and partnerships other cultural and historic organizations. They set the direction for meeting Arizona’s needs by “raising the bar” for community responsive services and delivering on the State Library’s commitment to “Providing Access and Preserving Arizona.”

The Five C’s of Service:

1. Customer Experience

Goal Statement: Arizona libraries will offer virtual and physical customer experiences for traditional and alternative library audiences to enhance the user’s ability, regardless of literacy level, to find and use information and services available to them.

2. Community Responsiveness

Goal Statement: Arizona communities will recognize library staff as having the ability to participate in assessing community needs, identifying resources and planning collaboratively to address needs and opportunities via a portfolio of library services and programs that educate, inform, and interest community members.

3. Continuous Progress

Goal Statement: Arizona librarians will expand and enhance their ability to meet the lifespan learning needs of Arizonans.

4. Collaboration

Goal Statement: Arizona libraries will use partnerships and collaboration with various types of libraries and cultural institutions to extend services, to reach new audiences, to better serve the information needs of the rapidly growing, culturally and demographically diverse Arizona population.

5. Connections

Goal Statement: Arizonans will view libraries as trusted, knowledgeable, easy-to-access sources of information whether they connect in person, online or via another organization.

The following matrices define the 2008-2012 Five Year Plan and describe the relationship between NEEDS, GOALS, PROGRAMS, and OUTCOMES. **Matrix 1** aligns the Goals with desired Outcomes. **Matrix 2** identifies the Programs for each Goal and shows how both the Goals and Programs address the Needs. Programs described in Matrix 2 are the vehicles to achieving the inter-related and potentially synergistic outcomes for each Goal as shown in Matrix 1.

MATRIX 1: ARIZONA LSTA GOAL – OUTCOME MATRIX 2008-2012

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>
Goal 1: CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE	Arizonans find lifespan learning resources and experiences (people, programs, & materials) through their libraries.	Arizonans find appropriate online materials, including government documents, archival, historic, health and consumer information.	Arizonans find helpful and useful library staff support via virtual or physical access.	Arizonans learn about the history, culture and the state's future direction as part of the Centennial ² projects and programs.
Goal 2: COMMUNITY RESPONSIVENESS	Librarians become participants and leaders in advancing lifespan learning and Arizona's multifaceted literacy ¹ efforts.	Community leaders and educators value virtual services and resources provided by Arizona libraries.	Community leaders value librarians' expertise and community contributions.	Librarians identify and share local resources to enhance the state's historical knowledge and to position for the future.
Goal 3: CONTINUOUS PROGRESS	Librarians continue to assess and evaluate literacy efforts at all levels, and continue to update the knowledge and skills needed to do so.	Librarians have the technical skills to better evaluate online resources, new technologies and the virtual user experience.	Library consultants continuously scan the environment to identify and offer training, technologies and tools to improve the productivity and effectiveness of Arizona libraries.	Librarians develop new skills that expand and enhance their expertise while working on Centennial projects.
Goal 4: COLLABORATION	Librarians partner with educational, cultural and other community	Librarians partner with access and content providers, and other	State library staff extends continuing education and reach new	Librarians establish relationships and partner to create new

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

	organizations to enhance literacy efforts, early childhood education and lifespan learning.	organizations, to better meet the information needs of all Arizonans.	training audiences via university and college library internships, certification and training programs.	community resources and outreach programs while working on Centennial projects.
Goal 5: CONNECTIONS	Arizonans view libraries as trusted, knowledgeable and safe places for lifespan learning.	Arizonans know about and have the skills to use virtual library resources including e-government services ³ .	The Arizona library community shares ideas and resources to extend its expertise and effectiveness.	Arizonans view libraries as a vital and valuable part of the community as a result of Centennial experiences.

¹**Literacy:** The [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization \(UNESCO\)](#) has drafted the following definition: "Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society." The standards for what constitutes "literacy" vary, depending on social, cultural and political context. For example, a basic literacy standard in many societies is the ability to read the newspaper. Increasingly, many societies require literacy with computers and other digital technologies (see: [Literacy in the Information Age: Final Report of the International Adult Literacy Survey, OECD 2000. PDF](#)).

²**Centennial:** Arizona commemorates 100 years of Statehood on February 14, 2012. As the last of the contiguous 48 states admitted to the Union, Arizona and its citizens have a wonderful opportunity to showcase the state's beauty, history and future. Through locally-initiated and grassroots activities in communities throughout the state, people of all ages will be participating in events in every area of the state that inform, document, present and commemorate Arizona's Centennial. The Centennial activities will include major projects that involve community-wide collaboration, to demonstrate the vitality, quality and diversity of Arizona and will contribute to establishing a lasting legacy into the next century. The projects will enhance the teaching, learning, and writing of Arizona's history with new content.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

³**E-Government:** E-Government refers to the government's use of information technologies (such as Wide Area Networks, the Internet, and mobile computing) to exchange information and services with citizens, businesses, and other arms of government. www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2004/glossary.html . Findings from the *Public Libraries and the Internet 2006: Survey Results and Findings* and other studies point out that:

“...as federal, state and local government agencies migrate their services and resources to e-government applications; they do so without offering any community-based access point to these services. Increasingly, government agencies refer individuals to their public libraries for assistance and technology to complete their interactions and meet their government services needs.”

*All activities will address the services and programs listed in the six LSTA priorities.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

MATRIX 2: ARIZONA LSTA GOAL – PROGRAM MATRIX 2008-2012

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS
<p><u>Goal 1: Customer Experience</u> <i>Arizona libraries will offer virtual and physical customer experiences for traditional and alternative library audiences to enhance the user's ability, regardless of literacy level, to find and use information and services available to them.</i></p> <p>Federal LSTA Purpose: 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. 5. Targeting library</p>	<p>Program 1 Librarians develop programs and services to enhance the skills, interests and information needs of users across the lifespan from birth to end-of-life. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Community members report the library is satisfactorily meeting their lifespan learning needs.</p> <p>Program 2 Librarians coordinate with educators to provide complementary resources, programs and materials through a combination of workshops, collection</p>	<p>Program 1 Librarians develop audience-appropriate web presences that intuitively guide users to the digital information and services they seek. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Periodic surveys show that users are finding what they need on library websites.</p> <p>Program 2 Library staff provide enhancements to increase high-speed, public access to the information needed for productive work and family life. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Librarians report having</p>	<p>Program 1 Library managers leverage continuing education, online training and model programs to instill a customer service focus in library staff. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Periodic user feedback rates library customer experience as "good or very good."</p> <p>Program 2 Library staff develops tailored information services, in a variety of formats, to enhance ease-of-use and ease-of-access to information for the State Legislature. Timeframe: FY 2008-</p>	<p>Program 1 Librarians work with other community organizations to create educational, enriching and exciting ways to appreciate Arizona's history and explore its future via Centennial projects and plans. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Surveys indicate that Arizonans have increased their understanding and appreciation of the state via Centennial projects and plans.</p> <p>Program 2 State library staff provides virtual access to images and historic documents to preserve</p>

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills.	<p>enhancements and technology-driven interactions. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Number of coordinated activities involving libraries and schools will increase.</p> <p>Program 3 Librarians integrate services for alternative or special needs users into their service portfolio. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: User surveys show awareness of special needs services.</p>	<p>adequate high-speed public access in their facilities to meet online user needs.</p> <p>Program 3 Libraries will promote use of e-government services via library websites. Timeframe: FY 2008-2011. Measure: When surveyed, a majority of Arizonans are aware of e-government services available via library websites.</p>	<p>2012. Measure: Legislators report the State Library is satisfying their need for legislative-related information.</p> <p>Program 3 State Library staff receives training to support digital collection development and management. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The agency increases staff competency and expertise to develop and manage digital collections.</p>	<p>and record the living history of Arizona. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number of digital collections within the Arizona Memory Project increases by 20 percent each year from 2008 to 2012.</p> <p>Program 3 State library staff equip a mobile digitization lab to train rural community library staff on digital collection basics. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: At least ten digital collections are created each year between 2008 and 2012 with a focus on rural communities.</p>
<u>Goal 2: Community Responsiveness</u>	Program 1 Library staff become	Program 1 Librarians work to	Program 1 State Library staff offers	Program 1 State Library staff offer

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS
<p><i>Arizona communities will recognize library staff as having the ability to participate in assessing community needs, identifying resources, and planning collaboratively to address local needs and opportunities via a portfolio of library services and programs that educate, inform, and interest community members.</i></p> <p>Federal LSTA Purpose: 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. 5. Targeting library services to individuals of</p>	<p>members of community planning teams and regular participants in local government meetings. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Librarians report improvement in their knowledge about community needs.</p> <p>Program 2 Librarians create and promote library services for non-traditional and underserved populations. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number and percent of specified users increases.</p> <p>Program 3 Library staff participates in creating physical or virtual content for the community.</p>	<p>increase their communities' awareness of virtual services. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: At least 70percent of visitors to Arizona public library websites will indicate awareness of virtual services.</p> <p>Program 2 Librarians launch innovative virtual services, accessible by both wired and wireless devices, to serve targeted audiences. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Introduction of one innovative virtual service per year that serves as a model program for libraries statewide.</p>	<p>“access skills” training in needs assessment, outreach, collaboration and evaluation to expand the capacity for library service planning, thereby improving equal access to information. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Librarians report an increased ability to assess community needs after completing annual workshops on access skills offered by the State Library.</p> <p>Program 2 State Library staff offers professional development programs that prepare library personnel to deliver services in the six LSTA priorities. Timeframe: FY 2008-</p>	<p>workshops on creating and managing oral histories via a basic “how to” program, e.g., “oral histories in a box.” Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Workshop participants learn to create and manage oral histories.</p> <p>Program 2 State Library staff develop a vital records and emergency preparedness workshop program to assist local communities in identifying and safeguarding their valuable community resources. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Workshop participants learn to</p>

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS
diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills.	Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Libraries report participation in local content creation.	Program 3 Library staff uses library websites to connect with other local, state and national resources to enhance community use of available services. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Arizona leaders, educators and other community members will report that library websites are valuable to them.	2012. Measure: Participating librarians report enhanced abilities in meeting the six LSTA priorities.	identify and safeguard valuable community resources.
<u>Goal 3: Continuous Progress</u> <i>Arizona librarians will expand and enhance their ability to meet the lifespan learning needs of Arizonans.</i> Federal LSTA Purpose: 1. Expanding services for learning and access	Program 1 Librarians create library “test beds” to nurture innovative programs or use of resources for lifespan learning. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: At least one “test bed” grant will be offered each year. Program 2	Program 1 Librarians develop a series of user guides (virtual and print) to improve community awareness of available resources. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number of people who use the services of a community or agency	Program 1 LDD staff develops virtual and in-person technical support to enhance librarians’ effective use of technology. Timeframe: FY 2008-2010. Measure: Librarians report that technical support resources available to	Program 1 State library staff expand a statewide cultural inventory will be expanded with enhanced database technology with linkages to the Arizona Memory Project to create seamless integration between these two rich Arizona information sources.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.	<p>Librarians support the expanded definition of literacy (see footnote to Goals – Outcomes Matrix) by providing the public with tools to find, evaluate and use information in multiple formats.</p> <p>Timeframe: FY 2008-2012.</p> <p>Measure: Library users indicate by survey that they use the library to learn how to find and evaluate information.</p>	<p>new to them during the five-year plan increases.</p> <p>Program 2 Librarians use virtual services including social networking to enable user-driven and user-created library programs. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: User-driven and user-created library programs increase during the five-year plan.</p>	<p>they are enhancing their use of technology.</p> <p>Program 2 LDD staff facilitates support professional and para-professional development via certification programs in cooperation with Arizona community colleges and the Western Council of State Libraries to address all six LSTA priorities. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number of participants completing the certification program increases each year during the five-year plan.</p> <p>Program 3 State Library staff utilizes web-based and</p>	<p>Timeframe: FY 2008-2010. Measure: The number of Arizonans using the databases will increase.</p> <p>Program 2 State Library staff develops best practices for libraries and other cultural organizations to capture local history-in-the-making. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Best practices are documented and made available via the State Library website.</p>

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
 Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
			<p>blended training to allow rural libraries to enhance their skills and ability to deliver 21st century services, addressing all six LSTA priorities. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Session participants rate the sessions as good or excellent in enhancing the specified skills.</p> <p>Program 4 State library staff enhances and promotes the use of a professional collection for library, archives, records management and museum staff. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Use of the professional collection increases by 15 percent.</p>	

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
			Program 5 State Library staff provides ongoing evaluation of the Arizona LSTA five-year plan. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: State Library staff addresses library needs based on evaluation.	
<u>Goal 4: Collaboration</u> <i>Arizona libraries will use partnerships and collaboration with various types of libraries and cultural institutions to extend services, to reach new audiences, to better serve the information needs of the rapidly growing, culturally and demographically diverse Arizona population.</i>	Program 1 Librarians engage other community organizations in collaborative planning to identify unmet needs or opportunities for lifespan learning. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Libraries report that they are updating their plans via periodic collaborative community	Program 1 Librarians assess opportunities to leverage local infrastructure investments or high-volume vendor pricing to obtain new or expanded technologies. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Libraries report benefiting from local infrastructure advances or high-volume vendor	Program 1 State Library staff convenes statewide library leader professional development exchanges to promote innovative ideas and develop cooperative activities among libraries and cultural institutions, fostering public and private partnerships, and providing linkages	Program 1 Librarians collaborate with staff of local organizations to mount rotating exhibits (virtual and physical) on the historic and evolving culture of the community. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number of collaborative historic and cultural exhibits will

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
Federal LSTA Purpose: 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. 4. Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations.	assessments. Program 2 Librarians engage active older adults in volunteer programs to develop, manage and sustain library services via varied and rewarding opportunities. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Libraries report an increase in active older adult participation in successful volunteer programs. Program 3 Librarians and school educators create connections between resources and curriculum to enhance educational experiences. Timeframe: FY 2008-	pricing for new technologies. Program 2 State Library staff effectively uses technology investments made through federal e-rate, LSTA programs, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, WebJunction and others. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Funds available for investment in Arizona library technology are used. Program 3 State Library staff develops a digital initiative that supports local and state government ability to manage and find digital content.	among and between all types of libraries to expand services for learning and access to educational resources. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Participants report benefiting from exchanges. Program 2 The State Library staff will be leaders in sharing Arizona's innovative practices in developing public and private partnerships, developing library services through electronic networks, and providing other linkages among and between all types of libraries. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The State Library will be recognized as innovative	increase. Program 2 State library staff provide annual convocations to connect library, cultural, and historic organizations with each other to stimulate creative discussion, collaboration and joint Centennial projects. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: When surveyed, participants in Arizona's annual Convocation report plans for or participation in a cooperative activity based on connections made via Convocations. Program 3 State Library staff collaborates to develop a Centennial project that

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS	PROGRAMS
	2012. Measure: Expanded curriculum-related resources are available to Arizona students.	Timeframe: FY 2008-2010. Measure: State Library staff takes a leadership role in one major digital initiative.	in developing partnerships and collaborative relationships.	reflects the goals of “Providing Access and Preserving Arizona.” Timeframe: 2009-2010. Measure: One Centennial project is completed to enhance Arizona’s history.
<u>Goal 5: Connections</u> <i>Arizonans will view libraries as trusted, knowledgeable, easy-to-access sources of information whether they connect in person, online or via another organization.</i> Federal LSTA Purpose: 2. Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national and	Program 1 Librarians leverage community experts and resources to provide a portfolio of services, educational opportunities and experiences for all ages and abilities. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Number of users that learned about a topic of interest increases. Program 2 Tribal librarians connect	Program 1 Librarians promote linkages between virtual and physical resources to increase public awareness and use. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Number of users that broaden their information network increases. Program 2 Librarians provide community members with introductory opportunities to	Program 1 State Library staff partners with the School of Information, Research and Library Science (SIRLS) at the University of Arizona and other colleges and universities to provide training for librarians and library staff to ensure user access to information through new and innovative methods and technologies. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Library school faculty	Program 1 State Library Staff digitizes and makes available local collections of cultural or historic significance. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: The number of Arizona Memory Project collections increase during the five-year plan. Program 2 Staff from community organizations

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
international electronic networks. 3. Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries.	with each other, county or state libraries to enhance and expand their services. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Tribal community libraries expand their virtual and physical services during the five-year plan.	participate in the digital world. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Number of users that expand use of digital resources increases.	participate in programs meeting the needs of Arizona's librarians. Program 2 State Library staff supports library interns, and has access to reimbursement for library related classes and workshops to better allow staff members to inform Arizona librarians about best practices, to expand services, networks, linkages, partnerships, and to reach diverse and underserved audiences. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Interns and State Library staff increase skills and knowledge in the six priority areas.	collaborates with librarians to create public discussions of community history, development and issues shaping the future. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Number of users who participate in or attend public community discussions increases. Program 3 Librarians launch local initiatives that demonstrate their ability to astutely and capably create community partnerships and position libraries as centers of community life by applying for subgrants to provide services meeting the six LSTA priorities. Timeframe: FY 2008-2012. Measure: Public

Dynamic Analysis, LLC
Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

NEEDS>>>>>>> >>>	LIFESPAN LEARNING CONTINUUM	VIRTUAL ACCESS	TRAINING, EDUCATION & CONSULTANT SUPPORT*	CENTENNIAL EXPERIENCES
	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>	<i>PROGRAMS</i>
				opinion survey shows the public recognizes the importance of libraries to community life.
Administration	Expenses in this category are limited to 4percent of the federal allotment.			

*All activities will address the services and programs listed in the six LSTA priorities.

Stakeholder Involvement

This five-year plan is based on a broad spectrum of ideas, suggestions and evaluations as summarized below. Stakeholders span the gamut from community leaders, to resource allocators, to museum and cultural organization directors, and to educators. While feedback from librarians and library directors was important, direct feedback from the public was instrumental in assessing perception of and need for library services in Arizona.

From Library Professionals and a Diverse Group of Arizona Stakeholders:

The Arizona State Library contracted with two firms: the Brecon Group and Library Planning Associates to evaluate the 2003-2007 LSTA Plan and to make recommendations for the future. Much of the research generated through these reports was used in developing the next five-year LSTA plan.

Brecon Group contracted to evaluate the State Library's LSTA-funded early literacy work. They were briefed by State Library staff and then reviewed planning and evaluation documents from almost twenty early literacy projects. They contacted project directors as needed. In addition to providing a thoughtful and thorough evaluation, they provided a number of recommendations reflected in this five year plan.

Library Planning Associates completed an in-depth evaluation of lifelong learning activities related to the 2003-2007 LSTA Plan. Their work included library visits, focus groups with various stakeholder groups, and recommendations on "lessons learned." Focus groups, each averaging 15 participants, were held with: Arizona Library Advisory Board, Arizona Legislative Staff, Tempe Public Library - Social Service Leaders, Parker Public Library - Local Government, School and Civic Leaders, Glendale Public Library - Local Business Leaders, and Arizona Library Association - Library Leaders

From Arizona residents: Northern Arizona University Social Research Laboratory conducted a "Survey of Arizonans' Attitudes About Public Libraries" in Fall 2006. A random sample of 1202 adult Arizona residents participated in the study.

From past participants in programs sponsored by the Arizona State Library:

An online survey of more than 400 library staff members who participate in continuing education activities was completed in fall 2006.

From State Library Professionals: GladysAnn Wells and Jane Kolbe each provided oversight for the project, and participated in planning and evaluation meetings, reviewed documents and considered the data. Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records Agency Directors and Project Leaders provided input on goals and objectives.

Planning for stakeholder input, evaluation and data gathering began in spring 2006. Consultants were hired in the fall and data gathering began in late fall 2006. Ongoing review, analysis and additional stakeholder interviews continued into spring 2007 leading to an outline for the 2008-2012 Plan in March 2007.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

In the plan development phase, from March through May 2007, the planning team continued to solicit input and feedback on the goals and related programs. As the plan was finalized, it was reviewed by the following groups:

- Arizona Library Advisory Council
- Arizona County Librarians
- Key “non-librarian” stakeholders
- Arizona State Library, Archives and Records Management Senior Leadership Team
- Library Development Division team members

The LSTA plan focuses on the goals and programs that are appropriate for federal funding and best relate to LSTA purposes.

Communication Procedures

This five-year plan was developed with input obtained from a variety of stakeholders and audiences via both formal and informal channels. The section above on Stakeholder Involvement describes communication procedures used in the development and finalization phases. The following outline summarizes communication plans for 2008-2012 during the implementation phase.

Once the new five-year LSTA plan is accepted by IMLS, the plan will be placed on the Arizona State Library website, www.lib.az.us with a feedback mechanism for public comment. The Board of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records (legislators) will receive the LSTA Plan. Throughout the year, the Board will receive regular updates from the State Library Director or a staff member at each of their meetings. Members have the opportunity to ask questions or provide feedback during these meetings.

Library and political leaders will also be informed of the new plan along with county librarians and librarians throughout the state. The Arizona Library Association, the Arizona State Library Advisory Council (comprised of library, museum and public representatives) and the State Library Senior Management team will be kept abreast of progress toward key initiatives.

The State Librarian also informs U.S. Congressional delegates about the success of LSTA programs and the benefit of LSTA programs to their individual congressional districts. Arizona’s LSTA success stories are also posted on national websites highlighting library and community organization progress.

The State Library professionals who are most involved with LSTA programs and the LSTA Grants Administrator are featured speakers at library, museum and archives, and other professional conferences, meetings and workshops. LSTA Plan achievements, and the planning process itself, are often noted in these sessions.

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Arizona 2008-2012 Library Services and Technology Act Plan Evaluation

The Arizona State Library has been and will continue to be a convener, advocate, collaborator, and disseminator of all types of library and cultural information. Through these roles, the State Library will foster communication with a variety of audiences about ongoing implementation and achievements of the 2008-2012 LSTA Plan.

Monitoring Procedures

The Arizona State Library monitors statewide programs and sub-grants differently. For statewide programs that are funded via LSTA, the individual program manager submits an annual report to the LSTA Grants Administrator in November of each year. This information is included in the IMLS final report. Some of the larger statewide initiatives such as the Summer Library Institute for rural librarians, the annual Convocation of cultural, historic and library leaders, and Continuing Education programs are monitored when they occur.

Sub-grants are monitored from grant approval through to implementation. Library Development Consultants review and recommend measurable outcomes for each grant. The annual application process begins in March with grant awards announced in May and funds made available in June. At that time, each grantee is required to attend a Grant Recipient Workshop to ensure understanding of the grant procedures including required documentation and evaluation. In addition, Continuing Education programs occur throughout the year to increase librarians' knowledge of outcome-based evaluation.

The focus is on incorporating evaluation into the process from initial grant application through implementation. Each sub-grant recipient is required to complete a final report in September. These reports provide detailed input for the more comprehensive annual report to IMLS.

Monitoring of LSTA funds is the combined responsibility of the Arizona State Library's fiscal office and the Library Development Division's Grants Administrator. In December of each year, they prepare the requisite annual report for IMLS. That report details the financial expenditures and describes many of the project programs in narrative form.

As summarized above, LSTA plan activities are monitored throughout the year. The State Library continuously strives to improve the entire process from an administrative and an operational perspective to ensure that LSTA funds will be allocated and used to the best advantage of Arizona libraries statewide. Throughout the process the public, librarians, government leaders, museum professionals and other stakeholders, along with State Library staff, have opportunities to support and verify that LSTA funds are being used to meet LSTA purposes and the goals of the Arizona Five-Year LSTA Plan.

Assurances Follow

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Annex L

Descriptive Statistics of Survey Responses

Zoomerang Survey Results

LSTA 2008-2012 Evaluation
Response Status: Completes
Filter: No filter applied
Jan 16, 2012 8:45 AM PST

Experience with LSTA

1. Have you or your library/organization applied for LSTA funds?

yes	113	71%
no	24	15%
don't know	22	14%
Total	159	100%

2. Was the application and scoring process clear and user friendly?

yes	78	70%
no	1	1%
don't know	33	29%
Total	112	100%

3. Were the goals and selection criteria clear?

yes	80	71%
-----	----	-----

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

no	2	2%
don't know	30	27%
Total	112	100%

4. Did your organization receive LSTA funds?

yes	108	96%
no	0	0%
don't know	5	4%
Total	113	100%

5. Has your library received LSTA funds between 2008 and now?

yes	98	92%
no	3	3%
don't know	6	6%
Total	107	100%

6. During implementation, were the reporting (financial) requirements user-friendly

yes	67	63%
no	4	4%
don't know	36	34%
Total	107	100%

7. During implementation, were the reporting (programmatic) requirements user-friendly and meaningful?

yes	66	62%
no	4	4%
don't know	36	34%
Total	106	100%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

8. Did LSTA funds assist in the development of new and innovative programming?

yes	96	90%
no	5	5%
don't know	6	6%
Total	107	100%

9. Do you believe your organization will apply in the future?

yes	97	90%
no	3	3%
don't know	8	7%
Total	108	100%

10. Was there feedback on why the application was not funded?

yes	0	0%
no	0	0%
don't know	5	100%
Total	5	100%

11. Do you believe your organization will apply in the future?

yes	4	80%
no	0	0%
don't know	1	20%
Total	5	100%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Please indicate how important you believe the following priority areas are for your library and community.

12. Supporting learning and skill development from birth throughout life.

very important	133	85%
important	14	9%
somewhat important	7	4%
not important	2	1%
Total	156	100%

13. Increasing community awareness of digital resources.

very important	105	67%
important	39	25%
somewhat important	10	6%
not important	2	1%
Total	156	100%

14. Digital resources and education for those under 30 years of age.

very important	85	54%
important	51	32%
somewhat important	18	11%
not important	3	2%
Total	157	100%

15. Digital resources and education for those 30 years of age or older.

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

very important	97	62%
important	53	34%
somewhat important	5	3%
not important	2	1%
Total	157	100%

16. Professional development for library staff.

very important	101	66%
important	39	26%
somewhat important	12	8%
not important	0	0%
Total	152	100%

17. Professional development for library staff related to digital resources.

very important	114	73%
important	33	21%
somewhat important	9	6%
not important	0	0%
Total	156	100%

18. Preservation of Arizona Centennial and historical materials.

very important	77	49%
important	53	34%
somewhat important	23	15%
not important	3	2%
Total	156	100%

19. Increasing access to Arizona Centennial and historical materials.

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

very important	62	39%
important	65	41%
somewhat important	29	18%
not important	2	1%
Total	158	100%

Perception of LSTA Impact

20. Have you utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?

yes	76	48%
no	40	25%
don't know	43	27%
Total	159	100%

21. Please rate the overall quality of that professional development.

very good	61	80%
good	15	20%
poor	0	0%
very poor	0	0%
Total	76	100%

22. Have other members of your staff utilized professional development resources funded through LSTA (such as Library Institute)?

yes	68	43%
no	33	21%
don't know	58	36%
Total	159	100%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

23. Please rate the overall quality of that professional development.

very good	51	77%
good	15	23%
poor	0	0%
very poor	0	0%
Total	66	100%

24. Access to EBSCO and other technology resources through LSTA is critical for my library.

strongly agree	85	54%
agree	42	27%
somewhat agree	12	8%
disagree	8	5%
don't know	11	7%
Total	158	100%

25. LSTA funds and programs help maintain services and resources my community needs.

strongly agree	94	60%
agree	42	27%
somewhat agree	8	5%
disagree	2	1%
don't know	10	6%
Total	156	100%

26. LSTA funds and programs help bring new services and resources to my community.

strongly agree	107	68%
agree	30	19%
somewhat agree	7	4%
disagree	0	0%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

don't know	13	8%
Total	157	100%

27. LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities impacted by the economic downturn.

strongly agree	101	64%
agree	32	20%
somewhat agree	8	5%
disagree	4	3%
don't know	12	8%
Total	157	100%

28. LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of communities that are increasingly diverse.

strongly agree	82	52%
agree	48	30%
somewhat agree	11	7%
disagree	1	1%
don't know	16	10%
Total	158	100%

29. LSTA funds and programs help meet the needs of families and individuals with lower economic and educational attainment.

strongly agree	82	53%
agree	49	31%
somewhat agree	7	4%
disagree	1	1%
don't know	17	11%
Total	156	100%

30. LSTA funds and programs encourage collaboration.

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

strongly agree	78	50%
agree	48	31%
somewhat agree	14	9%
disagree	1	1%
don't know	15	10%
Total	156	100%

31. LSTA funds and programs improve digital resources.

strongly agree	83	54%
agree	48	31%
somewhat agree	11	7%
disagree	0	0%
don't know	13	8%
Total	155	100%

32. LSTA funds and programs increase access to digital resources.

strongly agree	92	59%
agree	39	25%
somewhat agree	10	6%
disagree	1	1%
don't know	14	9%
Total	156	100%

33. LSTA funds and programs help keep libraries relevant.

strongly agree	113	72%
agree	29	18%
somewhat agree	7	4%
disagree	1	1%
don't know	8	5%
Total	158	100%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Background

34. Please indicate the county where your library is located:

Apache	7	4%
Cochise	4	3%
Coconino	3	2%
Gila	1	1%
Graham	5	3%
Greenlee	1	1%
La Paz	3	2%
Maricopa	69	44%
Mohave	1	1%
Navajo	7	4%
Pima	33	21%
Pinal	6	4%
Santa Cruz	2	1%
Yavapai	11	7%
Yuma	4	3%
Total	157	100%

35. Please choose the best description of the community your library serves:

urban	60	38%
rural	56	36%
suburban	24	15%
tribal community	6	4%
other	11	7%
Total	157	100%

36. Please choose the best description of your library type:

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

state library	3	2%
county library	43	27%
city or town library	68	43%
university library	13	8%
community college library	4	3%
K-12 school library	6	4%
other library or organization	20	13%
Total	157	100%

37. Please indicate your highest education level attained:

high school diploma	15	10%
bachelor's degree	21	13%
Master of Library and Information Science	93	59%
other master's degree	13	8%
PhD or EDD	4	3%
other	11	7%
Total	157	100%

38. Please indicate your current position:

Library Director	32	21%
Librarian	61	39%
Library Assistant	8	5%
other	54	35%
Total	155	100%

39. Please indicate the number of years you have been in your current position:

less than 1 year	17	11%
one year to three years	37	24%
three to five years	22	14%
five to ten years	39	25%
more than ten years	42	27%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Total	157	100%
-------	-----	------

40. Please indicate the number of years you have been in the library field:

less than 1 year	10	6%
one year to three years	9	6%
three to five years	11	7%
five to ten years	17	11%
more than ten years	109	70%
Total	156	100%

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Annex M

Reporting Guidelines LSTA subgrants

Project Purpose: What did you do, for whom, and for what expected outcome or benefit? (50-250 words)

Project Activities/Methods: Describe how the project was carried out. For example: How many workshops were conducted? How was the service promoted? How were digital images from a historical collection captured, cataloged and made accessible? Include a sentence that begins: “LSTA grant funds were used to pay for . . . “ (50-250 words)

Project Outputs: List all the measures of services or products provided. For example: the number of participants who completed a workshop or the number of items digitized. (50-250 words)

Project Outcomes: Refer to the outcomes listed in the grant proposals, and list outcomes measured during the evaluation for this project. Please include a description of the ways outcome information was gathered, such as through a survey, pre- and post-tests given in training, or other systematic measures of intended outcomes. (50-250 words)

Project Importance: Briefly explain why LSTA funding was important to this project and to your community (50-100 words)

Optional:

Other Information: Include any results not described in project outputs or outcomes above. These might include unintended outcomes. (100-250 words)

Optional:

Anecdotal Info: Stories, reports of comments, feedback, and observations about how people used the products or services, especially how they benefited from them. (100-250 words)

Optional:

Exemplary Reason: Describe why this project is exemplary, such as innovation and vision, impact on target audience or serving new population groups. (100-250 words)

Arizona LSTA Evaluation 2008-2012

Dynamic Analysis, LLC

Annex N

Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

- American Evaluation Association. 2004. Guiding Principles for Evaluators.
<http://www.eval.org/publications/guidingprinciples.asp>, accessed 12/29/12.
- Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. 2011. LSTA Program.
<http://www.lib.az.us/about/mission.aspx>, accessed 11/25/11.
- Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records. 2011. Mission.
<http://www.lib.az.us/about/mission.aspx>, accessed 11/25/11.
- First Things First. 2011. Building Bright Futures.
http://www.azftf.gov/WhoWeAre/Board/Documents/FTF_Building_Bright_Futures_2011.pdf, accessed 12/29/11.
- Institute for Museum and Library Science. 2011. <http://www.lib.az.us/lsta/>, accessed 12/29/11.
- Institute for Museum and Library Science. 2011.
<http://www.imls.gov/programs/default.aspx>, accessed 12/29/11.
- National Center for Children in Poverty. 2011.
http://www.nccp.org/profiles/state_profile.php?state=AZ&id=6, accessed 12/29/11.
- Patten, Quinn Michael. 2008. Utilization-Focused Evaluation
4th edition.
- Patten, Quinn Michael. 2000. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* in
D.L. Stufflebeam, G.F. Madaus and T. Kellaghan (eds.). Evaluation Models.
Kluwer Academic Publishers. Boston.
- U. S. Census. 2011. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/04000.html>. accessed 12/29/11.