

[illegible]

INSTITUTE of
Museum and Library
SERVICES

The Institute of Museum and Library Services is the primary source of federal support for the nation's 123,000 libraries and 17,500 museums. The Institute's mission is to create strong libraries and museums that connect people to information and ideas.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
EVALUATION REPORT	3
Background	3
Methodology	5
Findings	7
LSTA Grants to States Priority 1	7
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	
LSTA Grants to States Priority 2	21
Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks	
LSTA Grants to States Priority 3	23
Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries	
LSTA Grants to States Priority 4	26
Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations	
LSTA Grants to States Priority 5	27
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	
LSTA Grants to States Priority 6	30
Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line	
RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS FROM THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES	31
Retrospective Questions	31
Process Questions	32
Prospective Questions	33
Optional Prospective Questions	34
COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH CONDUCTING THIS EVALUATION	35

Appendices

A: Summary of Site Visit Interviews	A - 1
B: Summary of Personal Interviews	B - 1
C: Summary of Web Survey	C - 1
D: List of Acronyms and Terms	D - 1
E: Bibliography of Documents Reviewed	E - 1
F: Summaries of Coding Used in Qualitative Analyses	F - 1
G: Research Instruments – Interview Guide, Survey	G - 1

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The crisis had a direct impact on MBLC. At the time Massachusetts' 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan was written, MBLC had 25.5 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff. As this evaluation is being written, that number has been reduced to 21; a reduction of almost eighteen percent (17.64%). In September 2009, MBLC was directed to reduce projected FY 2011 funding to mid 1990 levels. The State level cuts resulted in the consolidation of the six regional library systems into a single entity (the Massachusetts Library System [MLS]) as well as reductions in State aid to libraries and the staffing losses at MBLC. It is to the great credit of the MBLC administration and staff that so much has been accomplished and that solid program evaluation has been ongoing in spite of a loss of capacity to serve at the SLAA.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Massachusetts' 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan included six goals. They were:

Goal 1: *Massachusetts residents, no matter where they live, will find and obtain the resources they need using an improved technological infrastructure that links all types of libraries and provides and coordinates shared electronic resources. Residents will have access to digitized images of unique and valuable resources, improved access tools, and properly preserved physical and electronic materials.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1, 2, and 3)

- Goal 2:** *Library users will have access to effective library and information services provided by well-trained and supported library staff.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 1)
- Goal 3:** *All Massachusetts residents will be better prepared to meet life's challenges at school, in the workplace, and in their daily lives through access to programs and training that foster their development of information literacy skills and communication technology skills.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 1)
- Goal 4:** *Massachusetts children and young adults will have access to public and school libraries that are active partners in providing resources and learning opportunities that foster literacy from birth through the teen years.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1, 4, and 6)
- Goal 5:** *All Massachusetts residents will have equal access to library information, collections, and services regardless of their geographic location, cultural or socioeconomic background, and regardless of disability or limited functional literacy skills.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 5 and 6)
- Goal 6:** *Massachusetts residents, regardless of age, will have access to lifelong learning resources and programs through their local libraries.* (Designed to address LSTA Grants to States Priorities 1 and 4)

At the time that Massachusetts' 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan was written, the LSTA Grants to States program had six stated priorities. Components of the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' LSTA Plan address all six to some degree. A short version of the LSTA Grants to States Priorities follows:

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

In their response to a “self-assessment” survey conducted by the evaluators, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' administration indicated that they believed they had met three of their goals (Goals 3, 4 and 6) and that they were progressing toward meeting the remaining three (Goals 1, 2, and 5). The evaluators believe that the MBLC staff is being far too harsh on their outstanding LSTA program! We understand that their self-assessment of “progressing toward goal” was typically occasioned by the fact that some stated outcome targets have not been met. However, taken as a whole and, given the fact that the five-year period covered by the Commonwealth's Plan hasn't ended, the evaluators have rated MBLC's performance higher than their self assessment on four of their six state-level goals. Our assessment on the remaining goals concurs with the MBLC self-assessment.

Table 1
MBLC and Evaluator's Assessment of Progress

Goal	LSTA Priorities Addressed	MBLC Self-Assessment	Consultants' Assessment
Goal 1	1, 2, and 3	Progressing Toward Goal	Surpassed Goal
Goal 2	1	Progressing Toward Goal	Met Goal
Goal 3	1	Met Goal	Surpassed Goal
Goal 4	1, 4, and 6	Met Goal	Met Goal
Goal 5	5 and 6	Progressing Toward Goal	Met Goal
Goal 6	1 and 4	Met Goal	Met Goal

In addition to achieving a high level of accomplishment in regard to meeting the state-level goals presented in their 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan, MBLC has been highly successful in addressing all six of the LSTA Grants to States Priorities. The programs and initiatives conducted using FFY 2008 – FFY 2010 LSTA funds have been closely aligned with the Grants to State priorities. In addition, many of the programs MBLC has funded using LSTA dollars effectively address multiple LSTA Priorities. The Massachusetts program is particularly strong in its focus on LSTA Priorities 1 and 3; however, efforts in all areas are well-designed and executed.

Over the years, the evaluators have been involved in more than a score of five-year LSTA evaluations for states throughout the United States. We can honestly report that Massachusetts' 2008 – 2012 implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program is the most effective program we have seen in regard to addressing ALL six of the LSTA Grants to States Priorities in a substantive way. We believe that Massachusetts' program is an exemplary one and that a further examination of their program would yield additional insights that would be valuable for other state library agencies.

EVALUATION REPORT

Background

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

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

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

Retrospective questions include:

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

Process questions include:

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

Prospective questions include:

1. How does the MBLC plan to share performance metrics and other evaluation-related information within and outside the agency to inform policy and administrative decisions over the next five years?
2. How can the performance data collected and analyzed to-date be used to identify benchmarks in the upcoming five-year plan?
3. What key lessons has the agency learned about using outcome-based evaluation that other states could benefit from knowing? Include what worked and what should be changed.

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

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

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

Methodology

Himmel & Wilson employed a variety of different methods to assess the progress that Massachusetts has made in pursuing its goals for the LSTA Grants to States program. The evaluation began with a reading of the Commonwealth's 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan and a review of the State Program Reports (SPRs) submitted to IMLS by MBLC. An initial one-day site visit was made to the MBLC offices in Boston, Massachusetts. During that visit, the consultants reviewed the 2008 – 2012 LSTA Plan with MBLC Director Robert Maier and Head of Library Advisory and Development Cindy Roach. Interviews were also conducted with several key staff members. Included were:

- Shelly Quezada, Consultant to the Underserved
- Marlene Heroux, Reference Information Systems Specialist
- Paul Kissman, Library Information Systems Specialist
- Gregor Trinkaus-Randall, Preservation Specialist

Himmel & Wilson also used a multifaceted research protocol, including interviews with library community leaders, site visits to some libraries that had received sub-grants to discuss the success of their projects, and a web-based survey targeting the broader Massachusetts library community. Individual tools are described below.

The strengths of the evaluation methodology derive from:

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

Methodological weaknesses are associated with several factors:

- Ex post facto evaluation design, which only allowed for review of program data after the fact, resulting in inconsistent data in some areas and sometimes unrecoverable gaps in information.
- Difficulty in identifying trends, with only two full years of data available at the time of this evaluation. (A third year of data became available late in the process [December 2011]. This information was reviewed; however, most outputs and outcomes presented represent only two years of activity.)
- The online survey dissemination method did not allow collection of responses from a random sample of library staff (it was a self-selected sample); consequently, results are biased toward individuals most interested in LSTA.

Review of existing documents. The consultants conducted an extensive review of background documents, including the *LSTA Five-year Plan 2008-2012* and annual State Program Reports to IMLS for 2008 and 2009. Additional reports and websites were mined for additional information. See Appendix D (List of Acronyms and Terms) for some of the websites visited and Appendix E (Bibliography of Documents Reviewed).

Interviews with key MBLC personnel. Consultants Bill Wilson and Ethel Himmel visited MBLC on September 7, 2011 and interviewed six MBLC staff members. A list of individuals interviewed was provided above.

Web-based input on key questions from MBLC personnel. Himmel & Wilson created a web-based tool to solicit comments from the state library agency head and the LSTA Coordinator regarding the SLAA's performance in implementing their plan. The web-survey asked the key MBLC staff to provide a self-assessment of the agency's performance in pursuing each of the goals in their plan (little or no progress

toward goal, progressing toward goal, met goal, surpassed goal). Respondents were also asked to indicate why they believed that assessment was accurate.

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

Site Visits. Massachusetts originally planned to hold a series of three focus groups related to the LSTA assessment. However, due to an internal calendaring error, the sessions had to be cancelled at the last moment. To compensate for the lack of focus group input, MBLC and the evaluators agreed to increase substantially the number of personal interviews that would be conducted and to add site visits to some libraries that had received sub-grants to discuss the success of their projects. A summary of input received during the site visits is included as Appendix A.

Site visits were made in early October 2011 to five libraries and one network office. All of the individuals interviewed had administered one or more LSTA grants during the evaluation period.

Interviews with key stakeholders. Consultants Ethel Himmel and Bill Wilson conducted telephone interviews with nineteen Massachusetts library leaders. Most of the interviews were conducted during the first two weeks of November 2011. A summary of the interviews and a list of participants are attached as Appendix B; the interview guide for the interviews is included as part of Appendix G. Notes from interviews were analyzed using content analysis techniques recommended by Gibbs. Coding sheets are included in Appendix F.

Web-based survey. Himmel & Wilson hosted a web-based survey using SurveyGizmo. This software was selected because it is superior to SurveyMonkey both in its features and in its accessibility for individuals with special needs who may be using screen readers. An email containing an invitation to participate and a “hot-link” to the survey was distributed using existing library email lists and listservs. Survey results are provided in Appendix C.

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

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

Laughlin, Himmel and Wilson reviewed other documents (both print and web-based) and State Program Reports. Laughlin synthesized the data and information collected and created a draft report in the format provided by IMLS in the “Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation Report” document. Himmel and Wilson revised and added content to the draft report and shared it with MBLC Director Robert Maier and Head of Library Advisory and Development Cindy Roach to make sure that it would fully meet the expectations of the MBLC and comply with IMLS requirements. After incorporating feedback, they provided the resulting document to the MBLC in print and digital formats. Finally, the evaluators submitted the evaluation report in a format suitable for forwarding to IMLS.

Findings

In this section of the report, findings are organized around each specific priority in the IMLS Grants to States authorization addressed under Massachusetts' five-year plan. The organization by LSTA Priority is intended to offer insight into the ways in which MBLC has addressed each Priority.

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

Programs that address LSTA PRIORITY 1 are summarized below. Massachusetts' LSTA Plan places a heavy emphasis on addressing LSTA Grants to States Priority 1. Five of the Commonwealth's six state-level goals indicate that they, at least in part, address Priority 1. Furthermore, the Plan addresses Priority 1 in five different ways. The evaluators have characterized these as:

- Goal 1 – Digitization, Preservation and Resource Enhancement
- Goal 2 – Staff Development and Capacity Building
- Goal 3 – Information Literacy
- Goal 4 – Learning Opportunities for Children and Youth
- Goal 6 – Lifelong Learning through Library Programs

Goal 5 of the Massachusetts Plan does not directly address LSTA Priority 1.

The evaluators have organized descriptions of programs and initiatives carried out by the Bay State that fall into these categories. As you will find throughout the Findings section of the report, many programs *could* be placed in multiple categories. For example, a program that offers learning opportunities for children and/or youth from families with incomes below the poverty line could be categorized under LSTA Priority 6. Likewise, a program that makes digitized resources available online could be placed under Priority 1 because it "expands access to information resources" or it might be placed under Priority 2 because it provides "access to information... through electronic networks." Some programs even fit nicely under multiple state-level goals within Priority 1. For example, support for the Summer Reading program could be seen as Capacity Building (Goal 2), Information Literacy (Goal 3), Learning Opportunities for Children and Youth (Goal 4) or Lifelong Learning through Library programs (Goal 6). The reader should recognize that many of Massachusetts' LSTA-funded programs do, in fact, directly influence success in regard to multiple LSTA Grants to States priorities. We have chosen to place a large number of programs under Priority 1 to underscore the importance that the Massachusetts Plan places on Priority 1's focus on facilitating lifelong learning activity.

Digitization, Preservation and Resource Enhancement

Environmental Monitoring and Data Analysis (2008 -2010: \$325,090 or 3.09% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period: \$53,547 match in FFY 2008 and FFY 2009) The detail below does not reflect efforts that were ongoing under FFY 2010 funds.

- MBLC In 2008 MBLC contracted with the Image Permanence Institute to conduct a statistical analysis of 14 years of environmental monitoring data of more than 400 institutions, documenting the conditions in each institution, as well as in each library region. They then created a website to enable institutions to access the information specific to their organization.
- MBLC In 2008, MBLC completed five-month environmental monitoring at 15 sites and continued monitoring at 13 others. Six months later, 15 libraries reported on their progress in implementing recommendations for improvement. In 2009, MBLC reported 26 completed reports and 13 with data-loggers in place awaiting retrieval after five months; 25 progress reports were received after six months of improvement efforts.

Digitization Projects (2009: \$63,126, 0.9% of total LSTA funding; \$46,702 match) Three projects supported digitization of important documents in individual collections (see additional projects under other LSTA Priorities)

- Mapping Massachusetts (2009: \$38,379, 0.6% of total funding; \$28,301 match) The State Library of Massachusetts digitized state documents relating to the development of transportation systems during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including maps, manuscripts, photographs, annual reports, and hearings related to the development of rail lines, harbors, highways, and canals.
- Open Project: Preservation of Library and Archival Materials (2009: \$16,771, 0.2% of total funding; \$16,407 match) Massachusetts Historical Society completed conservation activities, created preservation microfilm and digital images of the 28-volume diary of Boston portrait painter Sarah G. Putnam, 1860-1912. Altogether staff scanned 1,081 diary pages.
- Open Project: Preservation of Library and Archival Materials (2009: \$7,976, 0.1% of total funding; \$1,994 match) Thomas Crane Public Library purchased negative and positive preservation microfilm masters of the Quincy Sun weekly newspaper from 1970 to the present. Negatives will be stored off-site; positives will be used for digitization in the future.

Although digitization didn't earn notice in questions 1 or 3 of the online survey about current services, it was included on the lists of ten respondents in question 5, regarding greatest potential for improving library services.

Preservation Survey (2008 - 2010: \$57,500 or 0.55% of the total LSTA funding for the three-year period: FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 match: \$10,000) Twenty libraries worked with consultants to conduct preservation surveys and prepare preservation long-range plans. Each library received \$2,500 and matched \$500.

- Amesbury Public Library (2009)
- Assumption College (2009)
- Berkshire Athenaeum (2009)
- Cary Memorial Library (2008)
- Framingham Public Library (2008)
- Framingham State College (2008)
- Lachance Library (2008)
- Lee Library Association (2009)
- Massachusetts Maritime Academy (2008)
- Massasoit Community College Library (2008)
- National Heritage Museum (2009)
- Paul Pratt Memorial Library (2008)
- Robbins Library (2008)
- Russell Public Library (2008)
- Somerville Public Library (2008)
- University of Lowell-South Campus (2008)
- Uxbridge Free Public Library (2008)
- Waltham Public Library (2008)
- Westfield Athenaeum (2008)
- Woods Hole Public Library (2008)

Preservation of Library and Archival Materials (2008: \$40,000, 0.38% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period: FFY 2008: \$11,533 match) The USS Constitution Museum preserved, microfilmed, and then digitized the contents of scrapbooks created by crew members of the ship during its National Cruise from 1931-1934. More than 200 researchers, visitors, and sailors stationed on the ship have accessed the scrapbook.

Manuscript Arrangement and Description (2008: \$14,500, 0.14% of total funding for the three-year period: FFY 2008 match \$11,625) New England College of Optometry, the longest continually-operating school of optometry, received basic training to arrange, describe, preserve, and maintain archival collections, created a procedure manual, and processed materials. As a result of publicity, both accessions and use of the collections increased.

Note that the School and Academic Library Incentive programs could easily have been placed under this Priority because of the collection development/resource enhancement components in those programs; however, you will find these programs listed under information literacy instead.

Staff Development and Capacity Building

Administrative Costs (2008 - 2010: \$404,796 or 3.85% of total funding for the three-year period) The Commonwealth Office of Administration and Finance provided financial and administrative services related to LSTA. This “program” is placed here because it supports all of MBLC’s activities conducted using LSTA funds. Since the Massachusetts’ Plan places a heavy emphasis on Priority 1 and because that Priority is arguably the broadest of the Priorities, we have decided to place administrative costs here.

Advisory and Technical Assistance for Equal Access to Libraries (2008 -2010: \$700,540 or 6.67% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC provided advice and technical assistance in a number of areas:

- **Preservation programs** included workshops, technical assistance, an environmental monitoring program, emergency assistance, and sub-grant awards, reported under LSTA PRIORITY 2 below.
- **Library-based literacy.** In 2008, MBLC staff assisted eight libraries in implementing Mother Goose on the Loose early literacy programs and created a website for those seeking information about literacy programs in the state. In 2009, 35 MBLC supported 35 literacy programs offering adult basic education, English for Speakers of Other Languages, GED preparation, and family literacy. Local outcomes are included under LSTA PRIORITY 1.
- **Strategic planning.** MBLC staff supported 299 libraries in 2008 and 186 in 2009 in submitting strategic plans to meet state requirements.
- **Services for people having difficulty using libraries.** In 2008, MBLC staff made presentations at two library association conferences on projects relating to serving the immigrant English as a Second Language population, supporting community reading initiatives, and outreach to the homeless. In 2008, staff updated a website on accessibility for people with disabilities and answered questions on a wide range of accessibility issues; in 2009, they created a separate section for accessibility and consulted on wheelchair access, screen reading software, and a variety of related topics. A staff member met monthly with librarians serving prisoners. Reports on projects are included elsewhere in LSTA PRIORITY 1 and PRIORITY 6.
- **Other issues relating to libraries and access to library services.** In 2008 and 2009, staff consulted on services to teens. In 2009, MBLC partnered with the Massachusetts Library Trustee Association to sponsor a symposium attended by 80 trustees.

In the online survey, ratings for advisory services are divided. Advisory services for public library directors was rated important or very important at the local/state levels by 72.5%/83.2% of respondents; for trustees by 50.0%/67.8%; for digitization topics 43.5%/61.9%; for preservation or environmental monitoring 38.7%/57.6%; for advice and issues regarding Friends of the Library groups by 37.1%/51.7%; for early literacy, family literacy and English for Speakers of Other Languages topics by 31.1%/62.7%. Comments confirm that librarians depend on advice from MBLC consultants in all these areas:

"The consultants are an important part of the library success processes."

"Advisory services at all levels are crucial to helping libraries form appropriate, strong partnerships among director, trustees, and Friends. This makes for a healthy, unified library."

"Our library is in the process of planning a new building so we are working with both the grant program and advisors."

"The Millis Public Library has participated in two LSTA grants – 'Tweens and Teens and Mother Goose on the Loose. The expertise, training, and resources provided by the MBLC at every juncture in each of these grants have been irreplaceable."

Continued advisory services rated fourth in frequency among comments on question 5, which asked respondents to identify programs with greatest potential to improve library services.

"Advisory services for libraries because they educate library staff so they can provide better programs and services to the public."

Continuing Education and Training (2008 and 2009: \$672,697 or 6.40% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) Three specific projects under LSTA Priority 1 supported professional development:

- **Continuing Education and Training** (2008 – 2010 LSTA expenditure: \$431,496 or 4.11% of the total LSTA funds for the three-year period) MBLC worked with the Massachusetts Library Association, Massachusetts Library Trustee Association, and Massachusetts Friends of Libraries to provide a wide range of continuing education programs, with library technology and equal access being agency priorities. Outputs are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Continuing Education and Training, 2008-2009						
	2008 Workshops	2008 Participants	2009 Workshops	2009 Participants	Percent Change Workshops	Percent Change Participants
Preservation	21	324	10	208	(52.4%)	(35,8%)
Databases	<i>Reported under Access to Licensed Databases</i>					
Trustees/Friends	4	267	3	212	(25.0%)	(20.6%)

In end-of-session evaluations, at least 90% of participants reported that participation had increased their knowledge or skills

In the online survey, 85.5% of respondents rated workshops important or very important for their individual libraries, and 90.6% rated them important or very important for all audiences in the state.

"I am a school librarian... I love to take advantage of the workshops and professional development programs."

"... youth services professional development opportunities are the most important."

"Workshops excellent."

In their responses to open-ended question 5 in the survey which asked which programs had the greatest potential for improving library services in the state, continuing education ranked third, behind statewide database licenses and sub-grants.

“Continuing education, offered in various regions of the state, with a focus on new and emerging media and the ability to market what the library has to offer in that regard.”

- Massachusetts Library Leadership Institute (2008 - 2010: \$121,030 or 1.15% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC partnered with Regional Library Systems to hold the third and fourth leadership institutes. In 2008, 37 librarians and 10 mentors attended; in 2009 37 librarians and 10 mentors participated. Forty-eight percent of the librarians are involved in network, regional or state-level association work.

Data Coordination and Analysis (2008 and 2009: \$699,265 or 6.66% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) The MBLC contracted with Counting Opinions to develop and support an online data management tool to assist in meeting statutory and regulatory requirements for certifying 338 municipalities to receive \$9.9 million (2008) and \$6.8 million (2009) in Massachusetts State Aid to Public Libraries. The Board granted 111 Certificates of Librarianship required for public library directors as a prerequisite for municipalities to receive State Aid. Data collected for the State Aid program was used to certify 339 libraries for the reciprocal borrowing program that allows residents to borrow from all other certified libraries. Data was compiled into 15 (2008) and 13 (2009) reports covering public and academic libraries. In 2008 and 2009, 450 participants attended 27 workshops for public libraries on how to report, interpret, and use data.

In the online survey, 75.6% of respondents rated public library data – online or customized reports – as important or very important to their individual libraries, while 84.8% rated them important or very important to statewide library services. Their comments suggest they use the data regularly to support budget requests and benchmark service levels:

“Data collection and those statistics are useful in our annual budget preparations.”

“Public library data helps support information for grants and other documents and proposals.”

“Statistics across the state are imperative for positioning the success of our library against others. These comparisons resulted in increased funding for us.”

Consolidation of Regional Services (2009: \$29,839, 0.4% of total FFY 2009 funding) MBLC responded to a 17% reduction in state funding and dire economic conditions in the state with recommendations to consolidate six regional library systems to achieve administrative savings. After substantial effort among the six systems, facilitated by MBLC and with input from 1,750 library members, the Massachusetts Library System (MLS) began operation in July 2010. Core resource sharing services, including interlibrary loan and delivery, and electronic content have been preserved. Continuing education and technical assistance have been continued at reduced levels.

Readers’ Advisory (2008 and 2009: \$109,993, 1.6% of FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 funding; \$27,273 match) Eleven libraries received \$10,000 sub-grants to purchase popular reading collections in multiple formats and engage staff in year-long genre study. Reports confirm that participants gained knowledge and increased comfort; no patron outcomes were documented, but anecdotal evidence suggests that staff comfort with Novelist and other resources increased. Norwell Public Library’s program was typical:

- Norwell Public Library (2009; \$6,500 match) staff studied mysteries. They began by surveying patrons to ask about favorite sub-genres, what titles the library should add, and which authors they

would like to meet. They weeded the collection and practiced readers' advisory interviews. In addition to 11 library staff, the high school librarian and 3 others participated. Forty patrons attended a "Sisters in Crime" panel discussion.

Other participating libraries included:

- Boxford Town Library (2009)
- Gleason Public Library (2008)
- Hamilton Wenham Public Library (2008; \$4,183 match)
- Morrill Memorial Library (2009)
- Nevins Memorial Library (2009)
- Peabody Institute Library, Danvers (2009: \$2,029 match)
- Richards Memorial Library (2008; \$2,458 match)
- Scituate Town Library (2008)
- Seekonk Public Library (2008; \$9,184 match)
- West Tisbury Free Public Library (2009; \$2,919 match)

The following program was one of the most difficult to categorize because it impacts many different Priorities.

How Green is My Library (2009: \$19,600, 0.3% of total funding; \$24,571 match) Sub-grants to three libraries in 2009 helped them contribute to their communities' sustainability:

- Athol Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$1,890 match) presented 33 programs, trained staff on database use related to environmental topics, contributed a "Quick Energy Tip" on cable TV and added them to its website, created Energy Kit bags for check out, and added 100 titles which circulated 603 times. Circulation in the relevant Dewey sections (300s and 600s) nearly doubled and databases received more use. The library developed partnerships with the North Quabbin Energy Group, North Quabbin Garden Club, North Quabbin Community Co-op, Greening Greenfield, Athol Bird and Nature Club, Harvard Forest, and Athol High School Library.
- Framingham State College (2009: \$6,100, \$3,681 match) developed an environmental science collection to support a new major and become an environmental resource center for the campus. The library created a subject guide and conducted two instruction sessions, hosted three programs, and completed an environmental assessment in preparation for building improvements. While no specific output measures or outcomes were reported, the collaboration allowed the library to develop relationships on campus, on-going connections with local eco-ambassadors and conservationists and to reach out to a wider community including town high school and public library. Under this grant, science faculty requested library instruction programs for first time science students.
- Merrimack College (2009: \$6,000; \$19,000 match) enhanced its support of campus sustainability initiatives by creating RSS feeds for Gale's Environmental Studies and Policy Collection (670 sessions recorded) and EBSCO's Green File (400 sessions recorded); a blog, viewed 200 times a month; a sustainability wiki; by adding 50 books, 20 DVDs, and 3 kits; and sponsoring a program attended by more than 100 students, faculty, and others. On pre- and post-tests after instruction sessions, students able to distinguish between popular and scholarly articles rose from 38% to 92%; those who could recognize and locate a science article reporting original research climbed from 30% to 95%; those who could construct search statements with appropriate databases increased from 19% to 92% .

Information Literacy

The School and Academic Library Incentive programs could also be listed under multiple categories. They are placed here because they seem most consistent with MBLC's expectations for the programs.

School Library Incentive (2008 - 2010: \$44,000, 0.4% of total funding for the three year period; \$25,110 match for 2008 – 2009) With FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 funds, nine schools pursued local collection development and information literacy priorities:

- **Berlin-Boylston Regional School District** (2009: \$5,000; \$500 match) focused on the Middle Ages (500-1500 A.D.) and purchased multimedia resources including fiction and non-fiction books, videos, a specialized database, music, art prints, and educational games. Students visited the Higgins Armory Museum. Two nearby public libraries helped by providing additional resources for the unit that culminated in a Medieval Feast and Fair.
- **Boston Latin Academy** (2008 and 2009: \$5,000; \$2,450 match) refreshed collections in history and taught 315 ninth grade students "history literacy" and how to use the research process to complete assignments.
- **Duxbury Middle/High School** (2008: \$5,000; \$5,560 match) purchased print resources to support the social studies research assignments for eighth and ninth grade students and hosted an assembly, after which the re-enactor who portrayed Galileo visited six classrooms. A review of bibliographies confirmed that students cited new materials frequently.
- **Masconomet Regional Middle/High School** (2008: \$5,000; no match) cooperated with the public library and with teachers to select resources for curricular units to support the school-wide Global Education Initiative.
- **Millis Public Schools** (2008: \$5,000; \$8,700 match) created "Famous People Live @ Your Library" to integrate collection development, information literacy standards, and professional collaboration. The library purchased 450 new biographies for elementary and middle school and promoted their use with two historical performances and a Wax Museum created by students. Teachers involved were interested in continuing next year.
- **Randolph High School** (2008:\$5,000; \$100 match) updated its fiction collection and created an after-school student organization to encourage more independent reading by students. Circulation rose dramatically. A pre- and post-survey of students about reading habits showed changes: those who liked reading and did it often increased from 17% to 24%; those who thought the library was an interesting place to go rose from 15% to 20%; and those who thought it was a place they could go to find good books to read increased from 39% to 48%; those who could name a book read during the year rose from 36% to 44%.
- **Smith Academy** (2009: \$4,000; \$4,700 match) weeded, then added materials to support the science curriculum. Thirty-six students made a field trip to four local farms, thanks to funding from the Hatfield Education Foundation and Massachusetts Agriculture in the Classroom.
- **Triton Regional High School** (2009: \$5,000; \$3,000 match) strengthened resources for local, state, and natural history to support a museum studies class. Sixty students took a field trip to the Harvard Museum of Natural History. They developed presentation skills as they explained their projects to all students and faculty.

Academic Library Incentive (2008 -2010: \$35,000, 0.33% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period; FFY 2008 – FFY 2009 \$122,389 match) With FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 LSTA funds, six academic institutions received sub-grants, with supporting training on best practices and outcome-based evaluation (reported under "Continuing Education and Capacity Building").

- Emmanuel College (2009: \$5,000; \$15,000 match) supported the “writing across the curriculum” initiative by developing an online writing resource that addressed issues of plagiarism and evaluation of sources; hosting three programs attended by 180 students, faculty and administrators; conducting 25 workshop for 539 first-year students; and purchasing 56 books on college writing in all disciplines.
- Framingham State College (2008: \$5,000; \$12,500 match) improved support for research needs of undergraduate economics and business administration majors and MBA students. The library updated print collections and added web content, created a business research web guide, conducted three library instruction sessions, and announced the changes. With new magazines, librarians observed increased use of the business lounge; the web guide was accessed 500 times. No outcomes were reported.
- Massachusetts Maritime Academy (2008: \$5,000; \$5,529 match) attempted to increase library/information literacy/critical thinking skills with targeted instruction. Seventy-six students took a pre-test using iSkills online assessment. Half of the students participated in seven workshops covering the research process, defining research needs and developing a research strategy, conducting the search, evaluating resources, using resources, managing technology and integrating information, expressing your point of view and communicating ideas effectively. The library received strong positive feedback on the sessions, although students complained about the time commitment. Post-test results showed students lost skills.
- North Shore Community College (2008: \$5,000; \$38,750 match) collaborated with cross-college Green Curriculum Project and the President’s Green Team, added 136 up-to-date physical and 142 online resources to support new environmental curricula and promoted their use with faculty and students, and hosted two programs. The site received 963 page views and 563 unique page views. Although only two class liaison meetings occurred during the fall semester, relationships with Green Curriculum faculty were strengthened and faculty continue to request resources. No outcomes were documented.
- Northern Essex Community College (2008: \$5,000; \$6,500 match) added 121 up-to-date physical and web resources on environmental science. One hundred seventy-seven individuals attended four special lectures and Environmental Awareness month events; librarians gave 14 library instruction sessions to 135 students in seven classes, more than double the previous year’s total. After organizing an electronics recycling event, the library is viewed as a key leader in the College’s effort to become an environmental resource for the greater Haverhill community.
- University of Massachusetts, Lowell, South Campus (2008: \$5,000, \$44,110 match) identified weak freshman information literacy skills and undertook a variety of activities with 160 students in English classes to help improve them. The library developed online demonstrations on “Searching Academic Search Premier,” “Finding Books in Our Library Catalog, Virtual Catalogs, Netlibrary, and Google Books,” “Evaluating Sources,” and “Using RefWorks.” Using iSkills software, they conducted pre- and post-tests. While students did not show dramatic improvement, there was moderate improvement in ability to access, evaluate, integrate, communicate, and create information. The library reported that faculty members were more aware of challenges in teaching information literacy and more inclined to work with the library.

Learning Opportunities for Children and Youth

Serving ‘Tweens and Teens (2008 – 2010; \$455,381 or 4.33% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period: FFY 2008 and 2009 match \$217,363) With FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 LSTA dollars, 30 libraries received 37 grants to develop a Teen Advisory Board, update spaces, conduct outreach, develop

partnerships, and expand collections to reflect the expressed interests of 'tweens and teens. Highlights and some outcomes were reported:

- Bellingham Public Library (2008: \$10,000; \$13,000 match) Librarians looked for ways for teens to share ideas and skills through classes or contests. Circulation has tripled and program attendance increased 45%.
- Brewster Ladies' Library (2008: \$5,500; \$17,324 match) In the second year of its project, attendance at teen programs increased 380%, Summer Reading Program attendance grew 46.3%, and circulation of YA materials increased 159%. In a survey, 80% of teens reported they feel "very welcome" at the library and 100% reported they feel safe at the library and are given a voice about services; 72% volunteered at the library event in the past two years.
- Charlton Public Library (2009: \$11,250; \$375 match) End-of-session surveys showed 67% learned something new; 100% said sessions were a good experience, the instructors were knowledgeable and they would be interesting in attending more.
- Dover Town Library (2009: \$10,000; \$4,329 match) During the year, the Town funded a Young Adult position.
- Flint Memorial Library (2008 and 2009: \$15,000; \$4,220 match) The library now shares program information with middle and high schools (see also the library's report under Equal Access for outcomes).
- Gloucester Lyceum and Sawyer Free Library (2009: \$13,558; no match)
- Hamilton Wenham Public Library (2008: \$7,573; \$18,989 match) During the project, circulation of non-fiction increased 29%, graphic novels 13%, and fiction 58%. A survey of middle and high school students showed only 30% has received instruction on how to use the library online catalog to request items, while 62% had learned how to use the Internet for homework.
- Hazen Memorial Library (2008: \$7,850; \$1,385 match)
- Ipswich Public Library (2008 and 2009: \$20,000; \$7,526 match) Circulation of teen materials increased 38%.
- Lucius Beebe Memorial Library (2009: \$10,000; no match) Circulation of teen materials increased 7.4%.
- Manchester-by-the-Sea Public Library (2008: \$8,440; \$10,800 match) A number of teens now volunteer. The library's proposal to a foundation to fund the young adult librarian position was funded, guaranteeing continuation for two years.
- Marlborough Public Library (2008 and 2009: \$20,000; \$13,000 match) Circulation increased by 26%. When the Young Adult Librarian left, the Town decided to fill the position.
- Meekins Public Library (2008 and 2009: \$20,000; \$5,918 match) Trustees committed to funding a part-time teen services position.
- Middleborough Public Library (2008: \$8,900; \$18,373 match)
- Nantucket Athenaeum (2008: \$7,350; \$23,000 match) In the second year of the grant, the Teen Advisory Board added members, circulation of YA materials increased 30%.
- New Bedford Free Public Library (2009: \$15,460; \$5,560 match)
- Palmer Public Library (2008 and 2009: \$20,000; \$582 match) Results from a survey at the end of the "Power of Positive" series show 100% felt it was valuable increase their sense of well-being; 86% agreed their self-confidence was increased.
- Parlin Memorial Library (2008 and 2009: \$20,000; \$9,191 match)
- Peabody Institute Library, Danvers (2008: \$10,000; no match)
- Pollard Memorial Library (2008: \$10,600; \$6,700 match) The library hosted 35 programs attended by 672 young people; ten targeted at young people no longer enrolled in school attracted 272. The

library strengthened its partnership with the Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association/Young Parents Program, Catholic Charities/American Training, Inc. Young Parents Program, Lowell Housing Authority, and Lowell Boys and Girls Club to offer after-school and summer programs. Outcomes included a more welcoming environment in the library for young people, better staff relationships with young people, and increased interest in reading and using the library by young parents.

- Reading Public Library (2008: \$9,200; \$2,600 match) Circulation increased 23.5%.
- Shrewsbury Public Library (2008: \$9,500; no match)
- Springfield Library, Forest Park and Sixteen Acres Branch (2008: \$6,040; \$300 match). Teen Advisory Board members learned to contribute ideas, take turns, and be respectful.
- Stoughton Public Library (2008: \$10,000; \$8,500 match) The Monday night Homework Center attracted a range of 15 to 60 students each week; 166 unique individuals used it during the year. On a survey, one participant wrote: "It's a good place to do your homework with other kids and get help when you need it."
- Thayer Public Library (2008: \$20,000; \$24,000 match) Programming increased from 2 programs with 14 attendees in January to 13 programs with 70 attendees in September. Teen attendance at the library after school hours has increased and the library now has a part-time Teen Librarian.
- Wellfleet Public Library (2008: \$5,000; \$700 match) Circulation increased 27% and the youth services librarian reported the "(surprising) joy that has come from working with these young people."
- Wendell Free Library (2009: \$10,000; \$4,214 match) Wendell teens attend 11 different secondary schools; the Sunday hours and welcoming atmosphere allowed them to reconnect.
- West Springfield Public Library (2009: \$10,000; \$10,000 match) Baseline survey data showed that 46% of sixth graders, but only 26% of eighth graders, make weekly or monthly visits to the library.
- Wilbraham Public Library (2008: \$13,250; \$2,527 match) added 247 books, 39 music CDs, and 16 movies and finalized plans for teen space. The Teen Advisory Board hosted a music night event for 75 that raised \$200 for teen programs and a teen art exhibit with 9 exhibitors; anime club met weekly; and 100 teens signed Summer Reading contracts. A technology survey about teens' use of phone, computer, music, and gaming yielded 410 responses. YA circulation increased 6.1%.
- Wilmington Memorial Library (2008: \$10,850; \$4,248 match)

In the online survey, 71.1% of respondents rated grants for service to children/youth/teens as important or very important for their libraries and 86.0% felt they were important or very important to the state as a whole. In question 5, 18 of the 32 who felt grants would have the greatest impact on improving service mentioned grants for children/youth/teens specifically.

"An LSTA grant for teens and 'tweens allowed us to... have some great programs for that age group."

Massachusetts Summer Reading Program (2008 - 2010: \$325,666 or 3.10% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period; FFY 2008 and 2009 match: \$114,060) MBLC coordinated summer reading programs for children, teens, and adults. In 2008, 397 libraries ordered materials; 94,491 people registered online. In 2009, 400 libraries and 85,000 children, teens and adults participated, perhaps due in part to the reduction in regional library systems children's consultants to assist with promotion. Librarians rated promotional channels: 31% felt online ads most effective, 29% chose the state website, 20% voted for radio ads, and 20% selected the collaboration with Boston Bruins hockey team. No outcomes for participants were documented.

In the online survey, 78.9% of respondents rated the summer reading program as important or very important to their libraries and 83.0% as important to statewide services.

"As a children's librarian, I know that the support for summer programs makes a big difference to the level of programming we can offer our public."

"... advertising the summer reading program more widely has brought focus to the importance to children of reading over the summer."

It rated sixth as a program with potential for improving library services in the future.

"... the importance of reading needs to be instilled when they are young."

Equal Access-Youth (2008: \$20,000 or 0.19% of the LSTA funding for the three-year period: 0.6% of total LSTA funding for FFY 2008; \$12,020 match) This program was a partnership between MBLC and Libraries for the Future to conduct community assets and needs assessments, update collections and spaces, and present programs for 'tweens and teens. MBLC support for four sub-grant libraries included four days of professional development on community-responsive librarianship.

- **Flint Memorial Library** (\$5,000; \$2,500 match) added 30 new anime DVDs, 206 graphic novels, 7 CDs, and 145 fiction books, with advice from the Youth Advisory Board; and held 10 programs and events with 124 participants. In end-of-session surveys at two programs, 100% of participants reported their knowledge on the subject had increased; 78% of drawing workshop attendees increased confidence in their drawing and 68% of photography workshop attendees increased confidence in their photography skills.
- **Lucius Beebe Memorial Library** (\$5,000; \$3,020 match) initiated an advisory board with 16 members; purchased materials to support gaming, game design, and general technology interests; developed a "Things for Teens to Do" section on its web site, which received 496 hits; and presented five programs with 141 attendees. No formal outcomes were available.
- **Morse Institute Library** (\$5,000; \$6,000 match) formed a Teen Advisory Group, began a Youth Recognition Program, held an employment workshop and took a field trip in which 34 young people participated; 71 attended six "Game Days;" 20 attended a "Sock Hop;" two contributed to the library's teen blog. No outcomes were documented.
- **Watertown Free Public Library** (\$5,000; \$500 match) added materials to its teen collection and held 12 programs. No outputs or outcomes were reported.

Mother Goose on the Loose (\$2008 and 2009: \$82,500, 1.2% of total funding; \$30,961 match) Eleven libraries participated in this 30-minute, structured early literacy program based on the learning theories of educator Barbara Cass-Beggs. Each library purchased materials and supplies and offered programs. Results at Tewksbury were typical:

- **Tewksbury Public Library** (2008: \$7,500; \$13,000 match) attracted 1,051 participants to 65 programs. Circulation rose dramatically – 33% of the board book collection was checked out at any given time; circulation of developmental kits rose 700% and CDs 800%. On end-of-session surveys, 25% of respondents reported they had never attended a public library program before; 100% learned new rhymes and songs; 87% repeated rhymes and songs at home with their child; 42% checked out more materials; 38% checked out materials modeled, played or offered during the program.

Libraries also reported organizational outcomes. At Boyden Public Library, for example, a "surprising and notable outcome" was the rising profile of the library as a result of Mother Goose on the Loose, leading to new requests to partner. Lunenburg Public Library reported very positive outcomes for parents and children, but also noted that, in the end-of-series survey, more than half of parents did not have an informal support network; the library is working to address that.

Other libraries participating included:

- Amesbury Public Library (2008: \$7,500; no match)
- Boyden Public Library (2008: \$7,500; \$3,240 match)
- Hamilton Wenham Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$2,826 match)
- Lilly Library (2009: \$7,500; \$3,790 match)
- Lucius Beebe Memorial Library (\$2008: \$7,500; \$2,006 match)
- Lunenburg Public Library (2008: \$7,500; no match)
- Millis Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$2,000 match)
- Waltham Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$1,200 match)
- West Tisbury Public Library (2008: \$7,500; \$2,899 match)
- Worcester Public Library (2009: \$7,500; no match)

Open Project: Library STEM (Growing Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) (2008 and 2009: \$18,500, 0.3% of total funding; \$15,794 match) Nevins Memorial Library offered fun, high interest activities related to STEM topics for children in 4th-6th grade, including three field trips each year. In 2008, 130 individual children participated in a team-based, professional, multi-disciplinary environment, with total program attendance totaling 201; in 2009, total participation was 450. Sixty-eight percent of children completing the survey reported reading up to 10 books on science, technology, engineering, or math and 69% asked to sign up to attend another science program. Among parents, 56% responded that their children loved the program, 94% said their children talked about it at home, 75% of children can explain how to do an experiment, and 81% express interest in repeating it with family or friends.

Open Project: Discovery Kits (2009: \$7,500, 0.1% of total funding; \$1,394 match) Agawam Public Library created ten large and six small discovery kits on themes suggested by a survey of local elementary teachers. Teachers have become more frequent library users and many charged out kits during the summer to plan lessons for the coming year. Neither topics nor outcomes were described in the state report.

Open Project: Discovery Kits (2008: \$3,500, less than 0.1% of total funding; \$2,630 match) In the second project year, Bourne Middle School supplemented curriculum support kits on adaptation, heredity, and slavery/reconstruction and created new kits on cyber-bullying and fairytales, folktales and legends; and created pathfinders with online resources. No outcomes were documented.

Lifelong Learning Through Library Programs

On the Same Page (2008 – 2010 LSTA funding: \$192,750 or 1.83% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period. FFY 2008 – FFY 2009 match: \$35,160) Nineteen public libraries and one school district participated in this project that created programming around a book or theme. Libraries worked with community partners to plan community-centered events that stimulated new partnerships and attracted new audiences to the library and sustained attention in the community. A few examples illustrate the creativity brought to the projects and typical outcomes:

- Ames Free Library of Easton, Inc. (2009: \$7,500; \$6,125 match) partnered with the Easton Department of Public Works, Recreation Department, Easton Cultural Commission, YMCA, Garden Club, Friends of the Library, community access cable, *Easton Journal*, School, and Historical Commission, using *Last Child in the Woods*, by Richard Louv, and *A Walk in the Woods*, by Bill Bryson. Six hundred ninety-four people participated in 57 related programs. In end-of-session surveys, 97.2% agreed that the programs had alerted them to the importance of Easton's natural resources.

- Bellingham Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$4,687 match) selected *The Soloist* by Steve Lopez and held six programs with attendance of 199, eight book discussions for 48 people, and coat, food and diaper drives to benefit the local food pantry. In end-of-session surveys, 19% intended to increase the hours they read for pleasure, 68% were likely to read another book by Steve Lopez, 69% were likely to read more on this topic, 69% had not participated in a library program before, and 77% said they were likely to participate in future.
- Beverly Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$6,909 match) selected *Three Cups of Tea* by Greg Mortenson and hosted 19 programs with 510 people in attendance. The library entered a float in the Thanksgiving parade to promote the book, created a webpage, and broadcast programs on the local cable channel. In end-of-session surveys, 100% of participants agreed they were likely to participate again and that they had a sense of satisfaction about community involvement; 85% agreed they welcomed the chance to interact with others.
- Russell Memorial Library (2008: \$7,500; \$525 match) chose the theme of baseball rather than a single book title and offered nine events for 189 people of all ages, in partnership with Council on Aging, Friends of the Library and Acushnet Cable Access. More than 70 new library cards were issued; circulation increased 7%. In end-of-session surveys, 70% of those new to the library said they would be likely to participate in future and 85% agreed that the program gave them a chance to meet or interact with people they didn't know.

Other libraries receiving sub-grants and the books they chose:

- Dighton Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$143 match) read *Shoeless Joe* by W. P. Kinsella.
- Framingham Public Library (2008: \$7,500; \$15,600 match) selected *Three Cups of Tea* by Greg Mortenson.
- Haston Free Public Library (\$7,500; \$885 match) chose *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle* by Barbara Kingsolver.
- Norfolk Public Library (2009: \$7,255; \$1985 match) chose *In the Heart of the Sea* by Nathaniel Philbrick for adults and high school students and *Revenge of the Whale* also by Philbrick, for elementary readers.
- Norwell Public Library (2008: \$7,500; \$250 match) selected the theme of baseball.
- Pelham Public Library (\$7,500; no match) chose *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle* by Barbara Kingsolver.
- Pembroke Public Library (2009: \$5,495; \$2,700 match) read *Three Cups of Tea* by Greg Mortenson.
- Sandwich Public Library (\$7,500; \$5,900 match) selected *People of the Book* by Geraldine Brooks.
- Sharon Public Library (\$7,500; \$6,825 match) chose *The Devil in the White City* by Erik Larson.
- Silver Lake Regional School District (2008: \$7,500; \$5,500 match) selected *In the Heart of the Sea* and *Revenge of the Whale* by Nathaniel Philbrick, and *Young Man and the Sea* by Rodman Philbrick.
- Somerville Public Library (2009: \$7,500; \$6,700 match) read *The Things They Carried* by Tim O'Brien.
- Stoughton Public Library (2008: \$7,500; no match) chose *Dark Tide, the Great Boston Molasses Flood of 1919* by Stephen Puleo.
- Topsfield Town Library (2009: \$7,500; \$3,000 match) chose *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle* by Barbara Kingsolver.
- Wayland Free Public Library (\$7,500; no match) chose *Breakfast with Buddha* by Roland Merullo.
- Yarmouth Town Libraries (2009: \$7,500; \$500 match) chose *War Dances, The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-time Indian* by Sherman Alexie, and *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* by Dee Brown.

Responses to question 2 in the online survey confirm that local libraries used grant funding to strengthen partnerships and call attention to their services:

“The LSTA grant awarded to our library was critical in leveraging cooperative links with town agencies and organizations.”

“Grants help us show credibility in our community...”

Equal Access-Lifelong Learning (2008: \$70,000, 0.67% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period; 2.09% of the FFY 2008 LSTA funds: \$49,453 match) was a partnership between MBLC and Libraries for the Future to conduct community assets and needs assessments, identify target audiences, update collections and spaces, and present programs for active older adults. MBLC support for 16 sub-grant libraries included four days of professional development on community-responsive librarianship. The New Bedford Free Public Library included a comment by one participant that suggests local residents noticed the change occurring because of the grant: “It’s wonderful that the library has become more community-oriented.” The activities and outcomes reported by the Wayland Free Public Library are representative:

- Wayland Free Public Library (\$5,000; \$2,000 match) developed five strands of programming based on its needs assessment: a “Great Presenters” series where community members learned about something, a series of arts and crafts programs where people could learn how to do something, live music programs, and informal discussions on wellness issues and book groups where people could meet and share experiences. In end-of-session evaluations, 90% said they acquired new knowledge, 75% had a chance to meet new people, and 100% reported the program increased their sense of community.

Other libraries participating in the sub-grant included:

- Amesbury Public Library (\$5,000; \$6,512 match)
- Blackstone Public Library (\$5,000; \$4,594 match)
- Hamilton Wenham Public Library (\$5,000; \$5,901 match)
- Joseph H. Plumb Memorial Library (\$3,000; \$100 match)
- New Bedford Free Public Library-Lawler (\$3,000; \$179 match)
- Northborough Free Public Library (\$5,000; \$5,568 match)
- Oak Bluffs Public Library (\$5,000; \$10,100 match)
- Peabody Institute Library-South Branch (\$3,000; \$1,090 match)
- Peabody Institute Library-West Branch (\$3,000; \$300 match)
- Pelham Public Library (\$3,000; \$300 match)
- Sharon Public Library (\$5,000; no match)
- Vineyard Haven Public Library (\$5,000; \$2,800 match)
- Waltham Public Library (\$5,000; \$2,219 match)
- West Tisbury Free Public Library (\$5,000; \$5,630 match)
- Woburn Public Library (\$5,000; \$2,860 match)

Equal Access – Health (2008: \$23,000, 0.22% of LSTA funds for the three-year period: 0.69% of FFY 2008 LSTA funding; \$6,649 match) This program was a partnership between MBLC and Libraries for the Future to conduct community asset and needs assessments, identify target audiences, update collections and spaces, and present programs related to health. MBLC support for five sub-grantees included four days of professional development on community-responsive librarianship.

- Forbes Library (2008: \$5,000; \$1,000 match) added 51 new books on health/fitness/nutrition, 14 new reference titles, 41 pamphlets; and two health newsletters, and displayed them in a new Consumer Health Information Center. One-hundred and eighty-three people participated in 14 programs. More than three-quarters (76.3%) of participants agreed that the program increased

their knowledge of how to stay healthy. The library collaborated with the Senior Center, Health Department, ServiceNet, and the local hospital and received a foundation grant to continue its efforts.

- Manchester-by-the-Sea Public Library (2008: \$5,000; \$1,000 match) added 68 books, seven DVDs, and Consumer Health Reference database – all less technical and more easily understood – as well as standard authoritative basic health education texts, and strengthened partnerships with the Council on Aging and the Town Nurse. The library offered nine programs in response to high-interest topics; attendance was low; no outcomes were reported.
- Meekins Public Library (2008: \$3,000; \$1,500 match) worked with the Williamsburg Council on Aging to provide company, mental stimulation, and health information for elders who lived alone and could not easily leave their homes. The library purchased 14 books, six books on CD, and 13 DVDs, eight games and 10 puzzles; presented seven programs for 88 participants; and completed 18 home visits. Workshop participants said they learned something new and wished to continue to attend classes.
- Oxford Free Public Library (2008: \$5,000; \$949 match) held 25 fun, interactive programs for 245 unique ‘tweens and teens and created a teen health corner with 38 books, 26 DVDs, 10 video games, and other equipment. In interviews after programs, participants indicated they increased their knowledge of healthy eating.
- Whitman Public Library (2008: \$5,000; \$2,200 match) created a Teen Advisory Board and teen space, purchased resources, and held 10 programs attended by 200 teens. Ninety-five percent of teens surveyed gained leadership ability and were more likely to return to the library and attend future programs. Awareness of seventh graders about library programming for teens rose from 20% to 60% and those able to list benefits of going to the library rose from 42% to 70%. Among eighth graders, 25% before and 66% after programs said they would consider leading a program at the library. The library partnered with South Shore Lyme Support Group for eight health-related programs attended by 180 people; purchased seven books; and created a health corner. In a survey, 75% said they would research health topics at the library.

Massachusetts Center for the Book (2008 and 2009, 0.8% of total funding: \$57,974; \$163,367 match) is the Commonwealth affiliate of the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress and worked with partners Boston Public Library, Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities, Hampshire College, Simmons College, and the Boston Athenaeum to sponsor Letters About Literature; over both years, more than 7,400 letters were submitted by students in grades 4-12 and 600 students and families attended the award ceremony. The Center also participated in the Massachusetts Book Awards, the MassBook Census and Mother Goose Asks “Why?” family literacy program. No outcomes were reported.

MBLC’s LSTA program is highly effective in addressing LSTA Grants to States Priority 1. The program has many diverse components; however each component is carefully focused to achieve results that serve to achieve desired results.

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

Programs funded under LSTA that address LSTA Grants to States PRIORITY 2 are summarized below.

The evaluators have placed a number of programs under Priority 2 that use technology to deliver content directly to end-users in keeping with Priority 2’s wording (library services that provide... access

to information through networks. We have chosen to place projects that are more oriented to providing the infrastructure needed to deliver content under Priority 3.

Access to Licensed Databases (2008 - 2010: \$2,065,619 or 19.66% of the total LSTA funding for the three-year period) In what is the largest single LSTA project funded under Massachusetts' program, MBLC licensed suites of databases from three vendors, available in 1,776 libraries of all types through six regional library systems (now consolidated into a single entity), as well as in schools and on college/university campuses, and from homes and businesses anywhere in the state. Staff supported in-person and online training, technical support, promotional activities, and ongoing administration and program and technical development. In June 2009, the contract with EBSCO ended since funding was not available to continue the program. MBLC renewed the agreement with Gale to provide database access. The Statewide Database Team improved authentication for remote users by using "geolocation." FY 2010 funds were awarded to three "How Green Was My Library" applicants and a new grant program "Libraries for Job Seekers" was developed for the FY 2011 funding round. In 2009, the vendor added 50 e-book reference titles. The Database Project Manager presented five webinars for 107 participants and eight in-person workshops.

Outputs for Access to Licensed Databases are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Licensed Database Usage, 2008-2009				
	2008	2009	Change 2007-08	Change 2008-09
Gale sessions	5,100,000	5,700,000	16%	11.8%
Gale articles retrieved	8,400,000	9,200,000	25%	9.5%
EBSCO sessions	505,636	424,935	140%	(16.0%)
EBSCO articles retrieved	1,000,000	1,271,618	77%	27.2%
ProQuest searches	1,000,000	900,000		(10%)
ProQuest articles retrieved	315,101	300,000		(4.8%)

In the online survey, statewide databases ranked third in importance to the respondents' libraries (behind the library directory and MBLC website), with 88.7% of respondents rating it important or very important, and first in statewide importance. When respondents were asked to identify services with greatest potential for improving services, licensed databases again ranked number one.

"We use the databases daily for student research."

"Our library cannot afford the statewide licensed databases and our patrons rely on them."

One reference librarian quoted in the 2009 state report supported the change to geolocation:

"... It is so wonderful to be able to use the databases so easily now without remembering the passwords, etc. Great change!"

In addition, MBLC covered a portion of the cost of MassAnswers, the 24/7 reference service. No outputs or outcomes were reported.

The program below could easily have been placed under Priority 1. We have selected to locate it here because of the component of delivering content rather than the digitization process.

Digitizing Historical Resources (2008 and 2009: \$50,000, 0.7% of total funding; \$11,696 match) Two libraries received sub-grants for digitization projects (three additional projects were funded under LSTA PRIORITY 1):

- George C. Gordon Library (2008 and 2009: \$30,000; \$6,267 match) digitized the Fellman Collection of Charles Dickens' original novels. Ten titles were completed – *Bleak House*, *Dombey & Son*, *Great Expectations*, *Hard Times*, *Little Dorrit*, *Mystery of Edwin Drood*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, *Oliver Twist*, *Our Mutual Friend*, *Tales of Two Cities*- plus 45 of 88 parts of *Master Humphrey's Clock*. A Project Boz web site included an essay by Worcester Polytechnic Institute scholar Joel Brattin. The Charles Dickens Museum in London has expressed interest in collaborating to digitize the remaining three serialized novels: *Martin Chuzzlewit*, *Pickwick Papers*, and *David Copperfield*.

Northeastern University Libraries (2009: \$20,000; \$5,429 match) In the first year of a two-year project, the archives digitized 3,963 photographs and 6,452 documents from two social service agencies serving Boston's Latino community: La Alianza Hispana and Inquilinos Boricuas en Accion.

MBLC's efforts to address LSTA Grants to States Priority 2 are dominated by the statewide database program. However, other efforts to deliver content through electronic networks have been both innovative and targeted. This includes interfaces to improve access to digitized resources as well as other efforts, such as geolocation, to make access to resources easier for the public.

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

Programs supported with LSTA funds that directly address LSTA PRIORITY 3 are summarized below. We have placed projects that are primarily related to providing electronic resource sharing infrastructure rather than on actually delivering the content under this Priority.

Open Project: Massachusetts Libraries Open Source (2008 – 2010 LSTA funding: \$321,408 or 3.06% of total funding for the three-year period) Central/Western Massachusetts Automated Resource Sharing, Inc. (C/W MARS), partnered with Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (MVLC) and North of Boston Library Exchange (NOBLE) to work on the implementation of the Evergreen open source integrated library system. The consortia facilitated member demonstrations and installed a test system on their servers. They developed "use cases," which highlighted areas where further development was needed before launch. Some libraries have now "gone-live" on the system and more are scheduled to join the system.

In the online survey, 42.6% of respondents rated the open source project important or very important for their own libraries and 51.7% felt the project was important or very important for the state as a whole.

In question 5, which asked what had the greatest potential for improving library service, 15 respondents included open source.

"... the Massachusetts open source project has the potential of the greatest impact in improving library services as it controls system costs and tailors a system to meet the specific needs of Massachusetts libraries, thereby improving service."

"Areas that affect all libraries where the MBLC can serve as leader and catalyst – legislative agenda, Evergreen open source project, and libraries as digital resource centers – are also crucial for the growth and success of libraries in Massachusetts."

MBLC Website Support (2008 – 2010 LSTA funding: \$428,737 or 4.08% of the total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC supported two websites: the mass.gov/libraries portal for the public and mass.gov/mblc directed at libraries.

In 2008, MBLC made progress on creating a federated search interface to the URSA catalog and licensed databases and implemented remote access geolocation.

Promotional efforts reported elsewhere may be responsible for the doubling in traffic between 2008 and 2009 (Table 3).

Table 3	MBLC Website Usage, 2008-2009			
	2008	Change 2007-08	2009	Change 2008-09
Page views	17,400,000	13%	34,900,000	100.5%
Portal site visits	120,080	(0.9%)	131,543	9.5%

In the online survey, 89.5% of respondents felt the mass.gov/mblc website was important or very important to their individual libraries, and 85.5% rated it important or very important to statewide services. In open ended comments in question 2, one individual wrote:

“Geolocation finally makes statewide databases user friendly.”

Virtual Catalog (2008 – 2010 LSTA expenditure: \$286,579 or 2.73% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC supported a help desk, administered by Fenway Libraries Online, which held two Virtual Catalog Users Group meetings, managed the massvc.org website, kept contacts up to date, and maintained the virtual catalog server. The help desk responded to 541 questions, approximately 100 of which required involvement of vendor Sirsi/Dynix for resolution. The virtual catalog facilitated 178,132 inter-system loans. Fenway Libraries Online was also involved in planning future directions for the Virtual Catalog.

In the online survey, 88.7% of respondents rated the virtual catalog important or very important to their own libraries; 99.3% rated it important or very important to the services to the entire state. This was the third highest rating for both personal and statewide services.

“I use the virtual catalog every day...”

“Virtual catalog, database access, and delivery make it possible for our small library to give our patrons the access to materials and information on a par with the largest libraries. Our mission of equal access for all is fulfilled because of this!”

Asked to name programs with the greatest potential to improve library services in Massachusetts, no one included the Virtual Catalog, but 15 suggested an open source catalog.

Online Publications (2009: \$45,548, 0.43% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC built a new online communications platform that gives a unified identity to various programs, reduced costs, and increased the reach of publications. Working with consultant Buyer, MBLC examined the target audience and purpose of each publication, and created the Newsroom. No outputs or outcomes were reported.

In the online survey, 50.9% of respondents felt MBLC Notes was important or very important to their individual libraries, and 53.0% felt is important or very important to all in the state.

In the same survey, 57.0% felt Library Update news from around the state was important or very important; 56.3% rated it at those levels for statewide importance.

Network Connections and Servers (2008 -2010: \$348,390 or 3.32% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) Four sub-grants supported infrastructure upgrades in Regional Libraries using FFY 2008

and FFY 2009 LSTA funds. Six additional projects that are not detailed below were funded with FFY 2010 LSTA funds.

- Fenway Libraries Online (2009: \$18,136; \$5,000 match) replaced an aging server, added the New England College of Optometry as a member, and migrated to Voyager integrated library system. The server experienced no unplanned downtime, responsiveness improved, and new data management processes resulted in higher quality records.
- Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (2009: \$14,250; \$13,771 match) installed a new packet shaper and resolved issues of slow response time. The network had 100% uptime after installation and libraries are able to keep up with increasing bandwidth demands.
- Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (2009: \$23,391; \$14,314 match) replaced an aging server, moved to the Linux operating system, and prepared for transition from its Dynix Horizon integrated library system to Evergreen. After some troubleshooting, libraries reported substantial reduction in time to run pull lists.
- Minuteman Library Network (2008: \$38,743; no match) replaced obsolete routers in 27 libraries and trained 28 library employees to maintain VLAN implementations. In a follow-up survey, 57% of libraries were very satisfied overall, 64% were very satisfied with speed of Internet access and 71% very satisfied with access to Minuteman resources.

Small Libraries in Networks (2008 - 2010: \$365,020 or 3.47% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) These sub-grants partially offset new member charges, costs of telecommunications equipment, annual network service fees and telecommunications circuits to connect 139 public libraries serving fewer than 10,000 people to an automated resource sharing network. The project continued with FFY 2010 LSTA funding; however the detail shown below reflects only FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 activity.

- Central/Western Massachusetts Automated Resource Sharing, Inc. (C/W MARS) (2008 and 2009: \$214,076) Grants provided full membership offsets to 37 libraries, seven “online affiliate” libraries and in 2008, two “Internet only” libraries, which decreased to one in 2009. In 2008, network transfers between libraries increased 8.2%, to 1.35 million items loaned; in 2009, transfers increased 1.2%, to 1.37 million items loaned. During 2009, circuits changed from frame relay to cable or DSL. Patron comments confirm that the library’s participation in lending and borrowing is valued.
- Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (2008 and 2009: \$25,000) supported participation by Dunstable Public Library, Peabody Public Library-Georgetown, Langley-Adams Library-Groveland, Flint Public Library-Middleton, and Tyngsborough Public Library. In 2008, total library card registrations increased 9%, total borrowing by 7%, and total lending from the five libraries 37% over the previous year. In 2009, borrowing increased by 24% and lending by 5% (Tyngsborough) to 85% (Middleton). Borrowing on the statewide catalog increased 18% and lending by 4%.

In the online survey, 45.9% of respondents felt the Small Libraries in Networks program was important or very important for their own libraries; 64.7% felt it was important or very important on the state level.

“We are able to participate in the C/W MARS consortium due to the Small Libraries in Networks LSTA grants. This has made our small library a portal to a much larger library collection and the Hopedale community truly appreciates and uses this service.”

In question 5 where respondents wrote in programs with the greatest potential for improving library services in Massachusetts, 15 included Small Libraries in Networks.

Western Massachusetts Regional Library System (WMRLS) Open Project: Together We Thrive – Small Libraries Work as One (2008 and 2009: \$87,650, 1.3% of total funding) assembled a team of circuit riders who traveled to small libraries to help with weeding and retrospective conversion. In this second year, they focused on space planning and website design. Four libraries received space design recommendations. WMRLS created three website templates using Joomla and purchased materials related to customer service, and other topics. According to local librarians, having circuit riders in the building to provide expertise and help with weeding was key. Low-cost recommendations in space planning reports provided incentives for progress.

Open Project: World of Alphabets (2008: \$28,080, 0.4% of total funding; \$18,020 match). Minuteman Library Network provided native language access to Chinese-Japanese-Korean and Russian (Cyrillic) collections in its catalog by adding indexes and search functions. Each of the four participating libraries designated at least one public catalog to Chinese or Cyrillic searching. At the network level, circulation of Cyrillic materials increased 6%; at Acton Public Library, circulation of Chinese materials increased 4%. Holds on Cyrillic materials increased 12% and on Chinese materials 12%.

Open Project: SAILS Next Generation Customer Interface (2008 and 2009: \$94,000, 1.4% of total funding; \$134,237 match). SAILS, Inc., evaluated user discovery products, then elected to develop a SoPac (The Social OPAC) interface through a contract with CraftySpace. An online end-user survey received 5,600 responses. In 2009, CraftySpace developed wireframes for easy access to the catalog, information sources unique to each library, and access to network-wide resources, and demonstrated the site at the SAILS May 2010 meeting. By the end of the project period, more than half of the content had been created and all search facets were functional, but essential aspects of integration with the consortial back-end were not complete and SAILS was unable to release the work to users. Work on the project was suspended.

Open Project: Director Essentials (2008: \$5,500, less than 0.1% of total funding; \$6,300 match) In the second project year, Central Massachusetts Regional Library System (CMRLS) was the lead in a cooperative project of six regional systems to produce a web-based comprehensive resource for Massachusetts library directors. In a survey of library directors, 75% said the site would be useful to them in their work.

Open Project: Home on the Web (2008: \$10,700, 0.2% of total funding; \$7,625 match) Central Massachusetts Regional Library System (CMRLS) provided pre-designed web template with a simple content management system for 15 small public libraries; 13 were in use by the end of the grant. Eighty percent of libraries were maintaining content. Among end users responding to an online survey, 48% found the website easier to use; 55% found it easier to find databases; and 86% said were more aware of library events.

The evaluators believe that MBLC's efforts to address LSTA Priority 3 are extraordinary. In a state characterized by extremes (urban and rural, diverse and homogeneous, etc.), MBLC has done a remarkable job of balancing its efforts to meet the needs of all Bay State residents. Rather than trying to apply one-size fits all solutions, MBLC has chosen to work through the regional networks when appropriate to forge effective solutions to link library resources with the people. MBLC has very effectively addressed LSTA Priority 3.

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

One notable LSTA supported program that **directly** addresses LSTA PRIORITY 4 is provided below. While this program comes closest to reflecting the spirit of LSTA Priority 4, it is simply one example of many

projects that include significant partnership components. The other programs range from digitization efforts to the Summer Reading Program and from staff development initiatives to programs targeting populations covered in LSTA Priorities 5 and 6.

Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Assistance (2008 - 2010: \$260,971 or 2.48% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC is a partner in the Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness (COSTEP) framework, with Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Northeast Document Conservation Center, Massachusetts State Archives, and others. COSTEP brings together cultural resource institutions with emergency management agencies and first responders to develop plans for dealing with disasters. In FY 2008, MEMA and FEMA endorsed MBLC's plan for public libraries to serve as Disaster Recovery Centers and added an annex for cultural resources to the Massachusetts Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan developed by COSTEP MA. A GIS initiative added data layers showing location and basic attributes of cultural resource institutions. MBLC developed training modules on cultural resources for local first responders. During FY 2009, Massachusetts was hit with the most expensive and widespread disaster in its history – flooding. Thirty-six cultural institutions reported water issues, including 12 with collection damage; five libraries served as Disaster Recovery Centers. The Preservation Specialist visited two libraries hit by flooding and responded to calls requesting advice or assistance.

On the online survey, 55.7% of respondents felt disaster preparedness was important or very important to their libraries, and 69.5% rated it important or very important for all libraries in the state. Emergency assistance was rated important or very important by 47.6% for their own libraries and 68.9% for all libraries. For one respondent, emergency assistance was very important:

“Emergency assistance was wonderful when our library burned.”

Partnerships are prevalent in many of the MBLC programs that are funded with LSTA dollars. While the program above is perhaps the most unusual of these collaborations and, while no single program has been designed primarily as an effort to create partnerships, it is clear that the collaborative spirit of LSTA has been internalized at MBLC and the decisions that are made and the rules that are in place for sub-grants encourage collaboration. Although MBLC's efforts to address LSTA Priority 4 are somewhat indirect, they are, nevertheless, effective.

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

A number of programs that directly address targeted populations covered under LSTA PRIORITY 5 are summarized below. While other programs that have been categorized under different LSTA priorities also serve targeted populations, those detailed below have been chosen to illustrate the breadth of Massachusetts' LSTA effort related to this Priority. Populations for which English is a second language and a variety of groups who have difficulty using traditional library services due to disabling conditions are included in the highlighted programs.

Outreach to the Underserved (Two projects, totaling \$536,012 or 5.10% of total funding for the three-year period) Efforts supported development of a portal on the mass.gov/libraries website as well as sub-grant projects.

- **Outreach to the Underserved** (2008 and 2009: \$440,047 or 4.19% of total LSTA funding for the three-year period) In 2008, MBLC conducted a survey of public library directors about library usage by immigrants. MBLC developed a website for Spanish speakers that highlighted free Internet

computers and the fact that services are free and libraries are welcoming and do not share patron information; and included video of Spanish speakers talking about using the library. The site included a directory of refugee and immigrant resources, including organizations that provide assistance with employment, computer training, and literacy, and help for the elderly and those with disabilities. In 2009, MBLC staff worked with Massachusetts Department of Education/Adult and Community Learning, Family Literacy Consortium, Department of Deaf and Hearing Impaired, Blind and Physically Handicapped, and Department of Corrections; supported 45 libraries in early and family literacy projects, and two special projects on Spanish speakers; supported Family Literacy Month by linking activities at 90 local libraries on the mass.gov/libraries site and made presentations to three groups. More than 100 libraries created or updated records on accessibility services on mass.gov/libraries. No usage or end user outcomes were reported.

In 2009, the portal serviced 254,049 page views, an increase of 108% from 2008, and directed 125,513 views to geolocation links.

In the online survey, 43.9% of respondents felt the mass.gov/libraries consumer web portal was important or very important to their own libraries, and 50.4% felt it was important to statewide services.

Conversation Circles (2008 – 2010 LSTA funding: \$106,467 or 1.01% of the total LSTA funding for the three-year period) Eight libraries developed a curriculum and volunteer training for Conversation Circles, recruited and trained volunteer facilitators, promoted the services, presented Talk Time programs for English language learners and expanded the libraries' language and citizenship collections.

- **Jones Library** (2008 and 2009: \$12,500; \$3,750 match) in partnership with University of Massachusetts Family Housing Office and International Programs Office, Round the World Women, and Center for New Americans, in 2008 hosted four ongoing Talk Time groups, with six volunteer facilitators, 88 individual events, attended by 10 students on average, for a total of 150 students. In 2009, 175 students participated in 203 conversation circle sessions, with attendance averaging 12 at each session. In an online survey, 90% of students advanced vocabulary, 67% had greater confidence in speaking, and 90% had better understanding of American culture.
- **Lawrence Public Library** (2008: \$5,000; no match) held three eight-week conversation circles supported by language learning books and online resources. Approximately 40 people participated in sessions for Spanish speakers and for Asian immigrants. In this second grant year, the library increased radio advertising and added more structure and focused vocabulary during the sessions. No outcomes were reported.
- **Milford Town Library** (2008 and 2009: \$12,500; \$2,400 match) worked with partner St. Mary of the Assumption Church. Over both years, 21 experienced volunteers from ten countries were recruited; nine groups met for 10-week series, and 42 participants from 14 countries enrolled. More than one-hundred and fifty (154) individuals registered and completed 980 sessions with Mango Languages web-based language software. In a post-conversation group survey, most participants said they speak English more often, but only 24% started conversations.
- **Morse Institute Library** (2008 and 2009: \$12,500; \$12,760 match) added a weekly evening group to three ongoing conversation groups; 14 people participated. A book group had 5-8 participants weekly. Fifty-four children and 22 adults attended four bilingual story times. Tutors trained by the library developed new programs in two neighboring towns; the Literacy Coordinator earned state certification as a test administrator and trained 30 tutors in Natick, which eliminated the waiting list for tutors. Language acquisition materials in the library were among the top 20% of items circulated. A wiki created by the library in partnership with Natick and Framingham libraries supported communication among tutors and trainers. No outcomes were reported.

- New Bedford Free Public Library (2008 and 2009: \$12,500; no match) offered Talk Time programs in Spanish and Portuguese neighborhoods in 2008 and expanded to Bristol Community College and a local senior center in 2009. The library ordered materials, hired a coordinator, worked with local churches and Workforce Investment Board and Interchurch Council and recruited six volunteer discussion group leaders. In 2009, nine eight-week sessions served 154 registrants. Seventy-five percent of individuals participating wished to keep on meeting to practice English and improve speaking skills. The library director requested that the City hire a literacy coordinator. The library discovered French and Chinese speakers who also need help.
- Robbins Library (2008: \$5,000; no match) worked with English at Large, a non-profit literacy organization, to recruit and train conversation group leaders, publicize the service, and hold ten conversation groups. This year, the library held an open house with 36 participants and three conversation groups. On post-surveys, 100% have heard Americans speaking English, have more English-speaking friends, improved grammar, and participated more in their community, 75% have started more conversations, 66% supported their children in school, 58% improved pronunciation, and 50% started conversations more often.
- Stoughton Public Library (2009: \$6,250; \$3,000 match) supplemented its one-on-one volunteer tutoring, which had a wait list of 100, with six conversation circles – three in Stoughton and three in Sharon libraries and at the Sharon Community Center, in partnership with Sharon Adult Center and Sharon Interfaith Group. A potluck dinner had 70 attendees, game night had 30, and an event at Sharon Historical Society brought ten. Altogether, 170 learners were involved. In a survey, 100% of respondents agreed their conversation leaders encouraged everyone to participate, were well prepared, patient, and did not interrupt, and 90% agreed they were interested in hearing the learner's ideas, chose interesting topics and activities, showed an interest in other cultures and ways of thinking, and respected individual and cultural differences.
- Thomas Crane Public Library (2008: \$5,000; \$9,905 match) In its second year, the library held 19 Talk Time series, with 181 sessions and 66 unique participants. Six volunteer facilitators were added to nine trained the previous year. Seventy percent of participants stayed with their group for the ten-week series; 66% continued for a second series. Based on post-tests, 46% of participants speak English more often in a week, 53% improved understanding and being understood on the phone, and 51% were more confident in speaking English. Partner Quincy Housing Authority continues to host a morning Talk Time. Quincy Asian Resources, Inc., refers potential participants and provides an advanced conversation group for graduates of the library's Talk Time.

In the online survey, 61.0% of respondents rated outreach grants important or very important for their libraries and 76.4% felt they were important or very important to statewide services. On question 5, where they were asked to identify services that had the greatest potential for improving library service, seven of the 32 who suggested grants specifically mentioned outreach grants.

Community Languages (2008: \$20,000, 0.3% of total funding; \$3,040 match) Greenfield Public Library purchased more than 500 books and audio-visual materials for Russian, Romanian, and Spanish speakers; introduced the materials to staff; and reached out to the new immigrants through community partners. One hundred thirteen people attended three family programs for Spanish speakers.

Spanish Language Outreach (2009: \$10,000, 0.1% of total funding for FFY 2009; \$3,200 match) Two public libraries received sub-grants to improve programs for Spanish speakers:

- Springfield Public Library (\$5,000; \$2,000 match) added the 12-volume set *Ingles Sin Barreras* for the Central Library and Brightwood Branch, as well as DVDs, children's books, and fiction and non-fiction for adults. The library offered 16 story times infused with early literacy lessons for adults for 335

participants. Seventy-five attended the masks exhibit and workshop; 10 participated in the focus group. The library's outreach efforts resulted in grant funding for another family literacy program.

- Jones Library (2009: \$5,000: \$1,200 match) offered a wide variety of programs, after surveying Spanish speakers for preferences; nine programs attracted 154 participants. Those who attended indicate they are more aware of the library's services and better understand how to get a library card. Participants in computer classes increased skills. The library established excellent partnerships.

Open Project: Children with Autism (2009: \$12,000, 0.2% of total funding; \$5,562 match) Northeast Massachusetts Regional Library System hosted four workshops on autism, attended by 47; created six circulating kits of materials and resources to be used in conjunction with library programming, developed an online database; and maintained a blog, which received 484 hits. Participating libraries are not identified nor are outcomes.

Open Project: Seize the Web (2008: \$8,202, 0.1% of total funding; no match) In a summer internship, the Institute for Human Centered Design worked with students who are deaf from the Horace Mann School in Allston to create a new accessible archival website for the school, which is the oldest public school for the deaf in the U.S.

MBLC's efforts to address LSTA Priority 5 have been both innovative and diverse. Given that many other programs that have been listed under separate priorities also manage to reach populations targeted under LSTA Priority 5, the evaluators believe that MBLC has successfully addressed Priority 5.

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

A few programs that directly address populations covered by LSTA PRIORITY 6 are summarized below. As was the case with Priority 5, many other programs and initiatives that we have categorized under Priorities 1 – 3 could easily be placed under Priority 6 as well. The programs detailed below are simply a representative sample.

Consumer Web Portal (2009 – 2010 LSTA funding: \$328,974 or 3.13% of the total LSTA funding for the three-year period) MBLC maintained a web portal designed for a number of target end user audiences.

- Consumer Web Portal (2009: \$122,596, 1.8% of total funding; no match) MBLC maintained a web portal at mass.gov/libraries specifically for those who might have difficulty finding or using a library, including a Spanish language portal (for details, see Outreach to the Underserved in LSTA PRIORITY 1). This site also receives authentication requests, performs geolocation checks, and redirects users to chosen databases if allowed.
- Job Seekers (2009: \$61,497, 0.9% of total funding; no match) MBLC promoted libraries as a resource for job seekers through mass.gov/libraries, its publications, and through local and national media. From November 2009 through November 2010, the job seeker support page was the fourth most frequently visited by customers. Staff created a template through which individual libraries could add local job seeker success stories and resources and announced a "Libraries for Job Seekers" FY 2011 LSTA sub-grants program. Good Morning America and ABC News in Springfield featured Massachusetts libraries. Five newspapers and NPR also covered Massachusetts libraries' support for job seekers.

- Outreach to Immigrants (2009: \$53,522, 1.4% of total funding; no match) MBLC worked with the Massachusetts Office of Refugees and Immigrants to launch a Spanish language section of mass.gov/libraries. See Outreach to the Underserved in LSTA PRIORITY 1 for description.

In the online survey, 43.9% of respondents felt the consumer web portal was important or very important to their own libraries, and 50.4% felt it was important to statewide services.

A wide variety of sub-grants that were listed under other Priorities (in particular many listed under Priority 1) target populations included in LSTA Priority 6 by virtue of the fact that the sub-grants have been given to communities with populations that are located in underserved urban and rural locations and/or can be characterized as having large percentages of families with incomes below the poverty line. MBLC manages to address LSTA Priority 6 primarily through its provision of sub-grants.

Summation

Over the years, the evaluators have been involved in more than a score of five-year LSTA evaluations for states throughout the United States. We can honestly report that Massachusetts' 2008 – 2012 implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program is the most effective program we have seen in regard to addressing ALL six of the LSTA Grants to States Priorities in a substantive way. We believe that Massachusetts' program is an exemplary one and that a further examination of their program would yield additional insights that would be valuable for other state library agencies.

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

IMLS Retrospective Questions

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

MBLC's activities undertaken with LSTA Grants to State funds have been highly effective in achieving results related to the priorities identified in the Library Services and Technology Act.

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

Massachusetts employed several strategies to accomplish the progress it has made. Included are:

Statewide projects accounted for well over half of the LSTA expenditures during the three-year period. Access to Licensed Databases accounted for the largest share of this funding – 19.66%. Other projects requiring substantial investment included Advisory and Technical Assistance (6.67%), Data Coordination and Analysis (6.66%), Outreach to the Underserved (4.19%), MBLC Website Support (4.08%), Continuing Education and Training (4.11%), Environmental Monitoring (3.09%), the Summer Reading Program (3.10%), and the Virtual Catalog (2.73%).

Sub-grants to individual libraries accounted for nearly twenty percent of total expenditures. Most were targeted to specific state objectives, with state-level training and support, including Serving 'Tweens and Teens (4.33%), On the Same Page (1.83%), Readers' Advisory (1.22%), Mother Goose on the Loose (1.00%), Conversation Circles (1.01%), School Library Incentive (0.42%), and Academic Library Incentives (0.33%). Adding "Open Grants" to this total makes the sub-grant strategy one that uses a significant portion of the Bay State's LSTA dollars.

Professional development/Capacity Building was an important strategy for MBLC. LSTA funding in support of this is spread among statewide projects, including Advisory and Technical Assistance, Continuing Education, and Training for Direct Grants; regional projects, e.g., Open Project-Director Essentials at Central Massachusetts Regional Library System; and sub-grants to individual libraries that consisted primarily of professional development, such as Readers Advisory.

Improving technology: LSTA funding supported the statewide virtual catalog, sub-grants to regional systems for support of small libraries in networks, the development of user discovery tools, network connections infrastructure and website template development.

Each of these strategies has been effective in achieving different kinds of results. For example, the sub-grant strategy has been a primary tool in addressing LSTA Priority 6 effectively. The “Improving Technology” strategy has been most effective in addressing LSTA Priority 3. The strategies chosen have been well selected and effectively used.

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

The alignment of MBLC’s state-level goals with LSTA priorities was excellent. This enabled MBLC to develop programs and initiatives that impacted both state-level goals and LSTA Priorities simultaneously. Program implementation was well-monitored and performance appraisal was particularly good in regard to some of the sub-grants due to extensive training provided to sub-grantees.

MBLC developed strong training and support for sub-grant recipients, as evidenced in the best-practice design of programs, including initial needs assessment and planning with target audiences, thoughtful and creative program design, strong implementation reflected in outputs, and credible outcomes reported for most projects.

Perhaps because of the fact that most statewide programs facilitate the delivery of service rather than providing it directly to the end-user (generally meaning that quality outcome measures are harder to develop), less attention seems to have been paid to outcome-based assessment in regard to these initiatives.

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

Relatively small sub-grants stimulated energy and creativity among individual libraries that resulted in substantive improvements in their communities. Patrons attended programs and events in large numbers and were enthusiastic in their evaluations. Some visited the library for the first time or attended a program for the first time. Evaluations confirm that they learned new things, met new people, and perhaps most importantly, changed their attitude toward the library and its role in the community. Libraries reported increased staff engagement and new partnerships, as well as new positions funded or additional grants received to continue programs.

IMLS Process Questions

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

No modifications were made to the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners’ LSTA Plan.

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

Because MBLC's LSTA Plan was not modified, this question does not apply.

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

Performance metrics have played a significant part in monitoring and modifying specific programs. While more than half of the LSTA funding is expended on ongoing programs, Massachusetts has demonstrated a willingness to discontinue unproductive programs and to exercise creativity in finding new solutions to long-standing problems. A major example of using performance metrics to make managerial decisions can be seen in the Access to Licensed Databases program.

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

MBLC reports that about 14% of the sub-grants they provide generate outcome-based data. While IMLS would certainly prefer that this figure was higher, nevertheless Massachusetts has made more progress than most states in adopting outcome-based assessment principles.

One large challenge has been staff shortages. MBLC has the desire to do more outcome-based assessment but lacks the staff capacity to do so. MBLC had a highly productive partnership with Libraries for the Future (LFF) to train sub-grantees in needs assessment and in the preparation of logic models for project evaluation. The demise of LFF was truly unfortunate because the training effort was highly productive and led to some excellent assessment efforts on sub-grant programs.

Although partnering with LFF is no longer a possibility, to their great credit, MBLC has incorporated the practices and tools shared in the LFF training into their own processes for supporting sub-grantees.

IMLS Prospective Questions

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

MBLC will provide access to this report and other information related to its performance to a variety of organizations including the Library Commissioners, the State Advisory Council on Libraries, the Massachusetts Library System, the automation networks and local libraries. In addition, the evaluators believe that Massachusetts has information that would be useful to other SLAAs. MBLC should fully participate in IMLS' Measuring Success initiative. This initiative appears to be highly compatible with the assessment work that was done with LFF and the application of these principles to statewide programs could improve MBLC's overall assessment effort.

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

Although the development of outcome measures is important, output measures and qualitative data certainly have value as well. Statistics reported in this evaluation as well as data gathered through the web survey, interviews and site visits can be mined for potential baseline measures that can be used in

the development of benchmarks as we move into the next LSTA Plan. The evaluators believe that staffing cuts have had a negative impact on MBLC's efforts to track the success of some of its programs. Massachusetts should use the opportunity of the 2013 – 2017 LSTA Plan to identify a limited number of quality output and outcome measures. Less may, in fact, be more in regard to having performance data that can be used for decision-making purposes.

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

One of the primary lessons learned is that some programs lend themselves more to outcome-based assessment than other programs. A second lesson is that OBE is time-consuming. Staffing cuts have negatively impacted MBLC's ability to continue and expand its OBE efforts.

A potential answer to this conundrum (a desire to implement OBE but a lack of staff resources to do so) may be found in the work being carried out by IMLS to identify similar programs (online databases, etc.) and to create logic maps and results chains (the "Measuring Success" initiative). Shared efforts are more likely to produce outcome-based evidence of the significance of LSTA funding on the lives of real people. As was mentioned above, MBLC should be an active participant in these efforts.

IMLS Optional Prospective Questions

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

Apply best practices in program evaluation to statewide and regional initiatives. MBLC can leverage its experience with best practice program design with sub-grant recipients to tackle larger, more complicated and ongoing initiatives.

Design some shared evaluation protocols and instruments for sub-grant sites, so that comparable data can be collected at each site and event every year. It is difficult for these evaluators – and for stakeholders – to assess the effectiveness of programs occurring in many individual communities, such as the Summer Reading or Serving 'Tweens and Teens programs, when each one gathers and reports differently.

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

Focus on deeper outcomes resulting from learning. Learning designs were traditional – limited primarily to workshops, assessed through end-of-session evaluations rather than through follow-on reports of implementation or other changes in attitude, behavior, or condition for librarians, libraries, or patrons.

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.*

The evaluators believe that MBLC's program has been highly effective at meeting state-level needs and in addressing the LSTA Priorities. We are confident that ongoing monitoring of program results will result in efforts to explore new solutions to old problems under the next LSTA 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.

MBLC has been quite flexible in its practice of discontinuing unproductive programs and introducing new ones. The evaluators do not have any recommendations for the discontinuation of existing programs because MBLC staff and administration, who know their programs well, have taken these steps independently in a very effective manner.

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS EVALUATION

Cost of contract with evaluator	\$ 19,200
Internal (SLAA) cost estimate	<u>\$ 4,500</u>
Estimated Total	\$ 23,700

Appendix A: Site Visit Interview Summary

Massachusetts originally planned to hold a series of three focus groups related to the LSTA assessment. However, due to an internal calendaring error, the sessions had to be cancelled at the last moment. To compensate for the lack of focus group input, MBLC and the evaluators agreed to substantially increase the number of personal interviews that would be conducted and to add site visits to some libraries that had received sub-grants to discuss the success of their projects. Following is a summary of input received during the site visits.

Site visits to five libraries and one network office were made by the consultants in October 2011. All of the individuals interviewed had administered one or more LSTA grants during the evaluation period.

Chicopee Public Library - Ann Gancarz, Community Services Librarian

We had a community/world languages grant. We have a large Polish population. We also have a sizeable Hispanic population and several other significant immigrant groups. The grant we got allowed us to get books and DVDs of materials in Polish, Spanish, Arabic, and Russian.

From standpoint of service: we are trying to engage everybody. There are folks in the community who don't feel "entitled" to use the library and we're trying to change that. LSTA gives us an extra boost, a chance to go out into the community to say, "We have something just for you."

Partnerships?

The grant gives us something tangible to take with us when we seek to establish partnerships with other organizations.

We've been awarded another LSTA grant. With the new grant we're going to purchase materials and equipment for individuals with visual impairment. People in our meeting room were known to utter, "I can't hear a goddamn thing!" This grant will help us make the meeting room more accessible to people with impaired hearing.

We've also benefitted from other grants. Shelly (from MBLC) was here and we had a music and movement program—the kids were backed up—that started with "Mother Goose on the Loose," but it has continued as a component of our ongoing program. We wouldn't have been able to start many of these things without the seed money provided by the LSTA grants.

Innovation? Where do you look for new ideas?

We look for ways to engage our communities. If it doesn't work, we change it. Summer reading was tied into the summer concert series. There probably aren't too many summer reading programs that had a polka band involved!

I grew up in Chicopee and came back after being in New York City for a while. People in Chicopee really need us; there are lots of people without computers at home.

Shelly (from MBLC) makes a tremendous difference to us. She was a teacher; now she's a mentor. She's amazing. She always knows people that we can talk to. She's a cheerleader for us, always thinking of us.

Where do you go for continuing education/staff development?

There was a conference at Simmons (not sure that it was LSTA funded). Our director encourages us to seek out classes, etc.

Databases/licensing, electronic: Amber Clooney is electronic resources librarian. She can provide you with additional information regarding our use of electronic resources. (Amber later sent statistics showing Chicopee's use of various resources).

Summer reading is so well received; had over 1,100 kids participating. The teen librarian had over 100. We had over 100 adults participating as well—people like the adult summer reading. They write reviews we share with the public.

The kids got Bruins tickets through their involvement in the summer reading program.

We love LSTA—I'm so happy that we can apply for these funds; they enable us to do the most that we can do for our community.

Springfield City Library - Jean Canosa Albano, Public Services Manager

How has the LSTA program had an impact in Springfield?

We have had the most experience with specific grants. I think that most people (in the library community) identify LSTA with the sub-grants. Some of the grants have been "professional game changers." Things like the teen health grant alters the way you think about information services. It also brings recognition of the fact that there is a larger community of people who need the information/resources who aren't generally part of our traditional audience.

We always recommended to other libraries to get involved.

The teen health grant started with an institute. I think that the sub-grant program is missing something not having the institutes. They provided a solid theoretical base for grant implementation.

We have probably done seven grants in recent years.

Have the Statewide databases had an impact?

I struggle with this one; no one knows what you mean by "databases"—it's an ongoing conversation.

Some folks are very excited about Learning Express. Changing databases can be problematic. We have a lot of Gale databases; we could never pay for all of them; the book budget has been greatly diminished. We're down to spending 12% on materials.

Innovation in Massachusetts? Where do new ideas come in?

Necessity is the mother of invention these days. I was recently appointed to SACL (The State Advisory Council on Libraries). I was excited at SACL meeting to hear about the new projects. The Nevins Library in Methuen did a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) program for upper elementary kids — MBLC is now doing LSTA mini-grants in that area.

In regard to innovation, we are paying more attention to Urban Libraries Council to find things that meet our needs although there are lots of educational institutions doing innovative things. We don't have many peers in Massachusetts...Worcester and Springfield are kind of in a class by themselves.

I have attended only one meeting of SACL, but I did get an orientation on LSTA. There is some discussion that grants will be more competitive. MBLC is requiring that you submit a draft of the grant application. This is a bit of a hassle, but I'm positive that it will result in better grant applications.

We also applied for a grant directly to IMLS recently.

Where do you go for continuing education/staff development?

The MBLC consultants have always been very accessible. However, we just finished a grant and there was lots of miscommunication on that one. The grant was approved as submitted and then the consultant came back and altered the way it was going to be implemented. Nevertheless, the consultant who deals with services to the underserved has been very responsive. It's hard for me to think about who is offering what especially since consolidation of the regional systems. Who does what? Who is responsible for what? I do miss the person who retired who acted as a legislative liaison. We're in the process of sorting things out in Massachusetts now that we're dealing with some new realities.

What wouldn't have happened if not for LSTA?

Read-Write now wouldn't have happened, but that one became a regular program of the library. Community Languages, Teen Health, the collaborative version of Summer Reading were all the results of LSTA grants.

The EVANCE online version doesn't do anything for me; it's not right for my community, but it may be helpful to some.

I do wish that the slogans/themes/graphics for summer reading were a little more customizable.

At SACL we talked about the virtual catalog; replacing the nearly defunct existing catalog will be a valuable expenditure. Maybe there is just too much in the way of databases...might focus on a few that have the highest impact.

Massachusetts Library Network Cooperative, Kathy Lussier, Project Manager (Evergreen Project)

How has LSTA had an impact?

I've been involved in LSTA before I became the project manager for the Evergreen Project. One project that I was involved in was the Teen project on social networking. We just knew that

libraries didn't have a good teen web presence. With LSTA funds we created a more dynamic web site; did focus groups with teens to help us understand what they needed and wanted.

One of the great things about LSTA is that it supports things that are different. It was really successful the first few years; we have mixed results in terms of continuing. When the collaboration died, the web site died. It was something that could be done regionally, but it's hard for an individual librarian to manage it. It transformed teens; one spoke before the legislators. Some lasting benefits: teen services are on the radar site.

Evergreen project: all three Massachusetts networks are exploring open source; we probably wouldn't be able to do so without LSTA; it is encouragement to work together. Joan (C/W-MARS) led the charge. C/W-MARS (with an Innovative system) already has money going in that direction. There was a desire to keep the money in the State and to be able to control it more. The organic nature of open source was appealing; we liked being able to react to the need of libraries more quickly than big vendors could handle. Funding for the project has been a combination of LSTA and funds from the networks. Money has been going to 75% of development costs; 25% from the networks (now 25%+) We're moving out of the basic development and into the launch mode now.

What bumps in the road have you had?

One of the challenges is that there's not a strong developer community yet. It's a problem moneywise and time wise. But, there's a feeling that things have gone well. The Horizon users weren't using acquisitions/serials. What was nice about them going first is that the Horizon network has a coder on staff.

Three years from now: grant required a business plan. The various networks have different business models—what will the combined structure look like long-term?

We hope that others will jump on board. Cost effectiveness will come from having a bigger group.

Other networks are standing back and waiting; some are showing some interest.

Two of the other networks are Innovative and one is Horizon. We'll have experience transitioning from these systems if they want to participate. The other two are SIRSI Unicorn; that will present some new challenges.

Where will it go? What's in the future for the project?

Eventually, the plan is to develop a system that has all of the bells and whistles. We intend to develop something that starts to integrate lots of what libraries do using standalone solutions now.

We've been concentrating on basic work flow issues, but we are trying to build in more innovative features as well.

The timing was good for moving to a newer catalog. We have the base product, but it's still early enough to influence things. For example, somebody is also looking at auto-suggest.

LSTA in the future?

The networks are seeing savings from support contracts, but they need to put that money into development. Open source doesn't necessarily save money, you just spend the money

differently and, hopefully, get something that's better and more responsive to end-user needs. LSTA will probably have to help with bringing on the other networks.

There will always be places for larger projects. I think that this is where LSTA needs to concentrate... not use LSTA for little enhancements.

The one thing that has been a concern is changing hardware needs. Innovative libraries were based on big servers while Horizon was a more distributed model. We wonder if there is going to be support for replacement of the distributed servers. It doesn't seem as sexy as replacing the big servers, but it's essential going forward. The Evergreen project has helped the participating networks become more interactive.

Marlborough Public Library - Margaret Cardello, Director

The Library was in a waiver situation with the State because we hadn't met State minimum requirements, but we are back on track now. This is a diverse community—large Brazilian population in the community. The building is a Carnegie with a 1960 addition. The building is in need of replacement; we need more space. We completed a strategic plan just one year ago today.

The previous director got teens & 'tweens grants; collection/furniture. One result has been that the teen position is the one staff position that has been upgraded to full time.

Continuing education is also important to us. We can't afford much on our own. I did a director essentials session; it's an attempt to provide directors with essentials.

Our region had a real grass-roots approach; we knew our libraries and we were able to anticipate needs. The new combined entity is so large that it's hard for them to have knowledge of local priorities. In my mind, the merger wasn't done well; it was very fast and shoved square pegs into round holes just to get something up and running.

Where does innovation live in Massachusetts? Where do new ideas come in?

MBLC had little grants for "innovation." Innovation was always what was new to the individual library. It might have been old hat to somebody else. Libraries will need to communicate their needs to MBLC. At this point, the primary influence is who applies for what grant. There needs to be a communication vehicle that can collect more information from libraries. This is especially critical now that the regions are gone.

What impact have the statewide databases had?

They're very important, but there's not enough ongoing education of what works and how much they are used. I haven't seen a lot of information on their impact. Every entity is struggling with that one. We need them, but we're not using them to their potential.

Downloadable content is coming through the networks. Networks are pooling the money. We went from 100 downloads to 1,000 download titles.

MBLC should have the same role as with the databases. Our network has canceled some databases in favor of downloadable content. We're getting more use of the downloadable content than of the databases.

Geo-location—I really don't know how well it's working; but giving those who access databases a uniform experience is helpful. Concept is a good one.

Summer Reading Program?

Collaborative Summer Reading saves money—having similar/common theme helps.

Digitization?

There's a strong historical society here in Marlborough. It's a rare library in Massachusetts that has a big need for historical collections. That's not saying that digitization doesn't deserve support. It's just that the impact won't be felt directly by public libraries.

People's memories are long. For a long time there was alienation between Boston and the State, but that's breaking down and the digitization efforts have been a big part of that. Boston Public Library (BPL) sees a statewide scope on this one and it breaks down parochial concerns. Digitization is one, but the e-card is even better at creating good will and their (BPL's) e-content is terrific. Those walls are breaking down. This is very good.

Where do you go for continuing education/staff development?

Directors are navigating a sticky situation. Where do you turn?

Communication on the merger wasn't great.

Regions were responsible for planning. Librarians are now calling their friends rather than calling the unified region or MBLC because the responsibilities haven't been sorted out very well.

Cooperation/Collaboration?

Some of the best school/public cooperation has come from LSTA sub-grants. Those are the easiest partnerships, but there have been examples of public library and colleges as well.

An issue is the role of MBLC staff in managing the process. They play an important role because for many libraries their LSTA application may be their first effort at writing a grant. If the library learns what it takes to develop a good grant and gains confidence, it can have a positive impact down the line in applying for grants from other sources.

I think MBLC does a good job with hand-holding. The idea of having the libraries submit a draft application first is good. **IF** they (MBLC) have the staff to review and respond.

Westborough Public Library - Maureen Ambrosino, Director

My experience with LSTA is unique; I worked as a youth consultant; received an open grant for Teen programs. I was also involved in LSTA in Texas.

We weren't doing much here with teens; training librarians on teens; teens & 'tweens grants were going on at the same time. The grants made an impact on teen services; the number of teen participants in summer reading programs went from 28 to around 60.

Environmental Study:

The library has local history collections--paper journals, photos, etc. Historical society has artifacts, domestic artifacts. Historical commission has artifacts, pottery, arrowheads. I think they (MBLC using LSTA) did the environmental assessment once but didn't feel that they got good data. We may need to do this again.

Regional Impact?

C/W-MARS—small libraries and networks projects helped a lot participate that couldn't before. The project opens the doors to the greater world of other libraries; it's a game changer for small libraries.

We're wrestling with implementing technology; e-books and downloadables in particular. Last year we circulated about 1,200 e-books. That's just a drop in the bucket but demand is growing. Should we have e-readers to loan?

Getting content is an issue—just Gutenberg now... we're not licensing as part of the larger group.

C/W MARS does have OverDrive.

C/W MARS has optional assessment 5% of membership fee for e-books. For FY 13 it will probably be required.

Online Databases?

Having the State license the databases is huge for our budget. If we didn't have the State access, we couldn't afford to do all of that.

I report usage every month to my board; I am always underwhelmed by the figures.

We started focusing on one database each month—press release; training; stuff on the website.

We saw increases in the use of those databases. We need a larger scale effort along those lines; definitely don't want to see them go away.

Innovation?

LSTA plays a big role in innovation. When people hear about successful programs in other towns it makes them consider the program in their town. For example, services to older adults. Just hearing about it gets the ideas going; generally Massachusetts libraries are forward looking.

Summer Reading?

Collaborative—I'm a huge supporter of joining the collaborative. We were very proud that we did our own, but I became a big supporter of the collaborative. There are lots of success stories online.

EVANCE—lots of letters

We did adult and teens online this summer; had about 40 participants in each of the two programs.

LSTA funds materials to distribute in the community. This summer was the first summer (for us) in the collaborative. Some of the skeptics were won over. It saves time and money and the quality is very good.

BPL project for digitization is a good use of LSTA funds.

We are now part of C/W MARS' "digital treasures", but are looking into Digital Commonwealth. They have the expertise and the knowledge and equipment and we have some of the resources.

Joshua Hyde Public Library, Sturbridge - Becky Plimpton, Director

(She had worked at East Hampton and at the Region before and some of her LSTA experience is from those places.)

I was involved in the "Together We Thrive" project; circuit riders.

Because the region had financial problems, my duties gradually changed.

The project would send people (circuit riders) out to the libraries to help them cover staff crises. It was hands on work and something was accomplished.

The model we used was a great model and MLS is incorporating the circuit rider idea.

I'm very proud of the grant; some of the very small libraries joined networks. They really understood the need for it.

Sturbridge did apply for a grant, but we ended up pulling our application.

When I was at East Hampton, we had grants: On the Same Page; Business-Career grant; Discovery Kits.

On the Same Page was \$7,500 and it got people excited about the one-book program. It continued for five years.

For the Business – Career grant we worked with Chamber of Commerce. We bought a laptop and projector that Chamber members could borrow. This forged new connections with the business community. The grant served to strengthen connections and collaboration.

The Discovery Kits grant was particularly effective in forging connections with the home school community.

Where do new ideas come in? Where does innovation live in Massachusetts libraries?

Innovation lives in the individual libraries, actually the librarians, people who are working with the libraries every day. When I was working on the "Together We Thrive" project, the librarians in the small libraries knew what needed to be done, but they needed an extra push. LSTA provided that extra push.

The regions provided a local connection; you knew who you could call. Now most of those people still exist, but there is also a push to try to get rid of that regionalism—that's doing a disservice. We need to consider the idea of virtual regions to build local connections.

Libraries are still looking for a local connection, looking to others nearby. There are things like roundtables, small library discussion groups.

Business and Career grant— the business community in Sturbridge is small and fractured. It's hard to figure out how to make inroads.

Readers' advisory grant: They (MBLC) envisioned a much larger program. We have 14 staff, but only three are full-time. In the program, the staff had to read X # of books. The grant I wrote was a smaller scale one (dealt only with the full-time staff) and that wasn't what MBLC wanted. In my mind, it would have been better to have three reading rather than none.

I like knowing that the open category is there. I sometimes look at the list even though we don't apply because it gets me thinking about possibilities.

Collaborative Summer Reading Program: I like the common theme, art work, manuals. It's very helpful and saves us time and money, the two things that are in shortest supply.

Online databases: I don't think use of the online databases is very high; we need more in-house training—setting up short cuts, passwords, etc. I'm the entire IT staff for our library too!

Appendix B: Personal Interview Summary

Massachusetts originally planned to hold a series of three focus groups related to the LSTA assessment. However, due to an internal calendaring error, the sessions had to be cancelled at the last moment. To compensate for the lack of focus group input, the number of personal interviews was increased substantially. The consultants also added site visits to some libraries that had received sub-grants.

Nineteen individuals identified by the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) staff were interviewed via telephone. The purpose of the interviews was to provide background information for the consultants and to gain the perspectives of Massachusetts librarians and supporters regarding the impact of LSTA funding in Massachusetts. A list of those interviewed follows the compilation of the comments made in those interviews.

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

Tremendous impact! LSTA grants helped automate resource sharing across the state; allows little bitty libraries access—small libraries and networks grants. I really like the reading programs (community reads); they are community building. Statewide access to the databases: all libraries couldn't do those on their own. There's an enormous selection of databases and it doesn't matter how big or how small your community is, you have access.

Summer Reading—a huge number of kids participate. Staff is very creative in making the funds go a long way; they got the Bruins to collaborate. It's very successful.

There have been lots of other grants too---twens and teens grants, for example. Some libraries didn't have services for those age groups before...they're just very creative programs! Another thing...academic libraries use the funds to digitize collections. They wouldn't have the funds to do that without LSTA. The Boston Public Library is doing the Digital Commonwealth....they plan to let other libraries add their collections.

Some of the things have local impact; some have statewide impact. Virtual catalog: there are lots of diverse systems, but this allows them to communicate. Colleges and universities belong to it so it expands the access people have to academic materials/holdings. Three networks are experimenting with open source...so, we use LSTA funds in many diverse ways.

Not at my school library, but others in the region and area have taken advantage of the continuing education. The databases are important and our public library does the Summer Read.

We've decided to develop and maintain a partnership with the Digital Commonwealth. It's a small scale organization we're partnering with to develop the Library for the Commonwealth. We got \$100,000 LSTA funds to provide additional digital services to community organizations, historical groups, and libraries. We'll do the actual digitization. Library for the Commonwealth will develop and maintain a statewide framework, a federated portal, for libraries to put in their materials.

Definitely—databases are huge. We couldn't afford those without state/LSTA dollars. When budgets are reduced materials get cut.

We usually apply for a grant...Job Seekers grant gave us \$12,000. It was a targeted grant that let us focus on job seeker needs..resumes. Let us buy materials, Gale Career Transitions

databases. Let people use Internet to find jobs. We also did workshops—people from various fields talked about how to get into their fields. We did outreach, put collections into 10 branches, etc. We are continuing it this year...still focusing on careers and jobs. The city veterans department is our partner.

This year we have a Conversation Circles grant...have many non English speaking people in our area.

We did a 'tweens & teens grant a few years ago. Staff worked with kids in specific neighborhoods. The grant let us hire a person, buy furniture, computers, etc. The grants are usually \$10,000-\$12,000 and let us leverage funds to do things.

We started in 1986 with an adult literacy grant. That program is still flourishing. Department of Education gave us about \$200,000/year to continue it. The program has gotten national awards. There are always 150 people on the waiting list. We couldn't have started it without LSTA. LSTA lets us leverage money.

We have done every targeted program MBLC has offered!

We did a project like Baltimore County---trained volunteers, STAR program to read to kids in the community. We still have volunteers doing that.

Several...the competitive grant program is excellent. It energizes libraries and continues after the grant period.—'tweens, Mother Goose, etc.... they serve as models. The preservation program has been a tremendous success, raising awareness of necessity of preservation.

Yes—we've benefited. When we renovated the consultant from MBLC helped us.

Also participated in disaster planning... recently got LSTA grants—huge impact with the preservation grant, conserved our scrapbooks and made them available online. It has increased scholarship around topics in the scrapbooks and has led to ore donations in those areas. Also allowed us to do education programs in schools about the scrapbooks and preservation. That couldn't have happened without LSTA funding. Collections have been transformed; they aren't hiding in the dark any more.

We're a partner with libraries to create Discovery Kits and activity books. Make those available to families across the state through public libraries, seeking a family audience around the War of 1813—the bicentennial of the USS Constitution. Great opportunity and lets us do free programs in libraries (free passes through the libraries)

Yes, our network has received LSTA funds that allowed us to establish new programs, extend services, and change our structure. The Network Connections program has meant our libraries have been able to participate without huge costs—purchase servers, redo the telecommunication network. Also had a grant to catalog Portuguese language materials.

Access to databases; consulting at many levels dealing with stakeholders and Friends. CE, yes...all of them. We got a construction grant 12 years ago. Small grant last year and again this year—leadership development for me and my staff—mentoring service through MBLC. Site visits on LSTA grants, group that reads grant applications, help and monitor grants.

Disaster preparedness has had a statewide impact. We needed a set of tools and annual training on disaster preparedness. It's frustrating that it was only \$5,000 for an academic library. Public libraries can get lots more. But the amount of work that goes into the grant application...it's many hours of work for a tiny amount. For academic libraries, \$5,000 is a tiny amount. I would hesitate to apply again. Timing was also difficult. Our year starts in September, but the money came in November-December so you lose a couple of months, the

first semester. Then the final has to be done by September 1st with the report due October 15th. The timing is just off.

The Sustainable Energy Grant was a tremendous success. It had two parts...native plants and green energy summit. It was a tremendous success!

Use of the databases and catalog; we also use pieces from the Summer Reading program. The school hasn't applied for grants. My staff and I attend continuing education workshops.

We received LSTA grants in several areas. Recently we had a Mother Goose On the Loose; also did a Customer Service one. Long ago had a children's one. We take advantage of funding for the databases and others that help us keep costs down. Minigrants helped us start collections: Mother Goose puppets, CDs, etc. Our service population is about 8,400 and we have no extra money to begin new things.

Network support--four networks replaced the telecommunications routers for public libraries, switched to Comcast lines. Our old equipment didn't do things we needed. We reduced the line costs for public libraries from \$500 to \$100/month. Also did academic upgrades --Cisco clients encrypted software to send data securely. Uptime is much better now. The new network has a five-hour average downtime versus 25 before.

Other projects with MBLC and CW/MARS...are moving to Open Source. \$412,000 collectively for that. Haven't seen the results yet because it's still in development.

Other help we've gotten: State money from MBLC to supplement telecommunications and resource sharing. Tech guy at MBLC coordinates meetings and is the ongoing glue that holds us together. Think LSTA pays his salary.

The Digital Commonwealth started with an LSTA grant about six years ago. It helped springboard a single site for digital resources. We are working on an agreement with Boston Public Library on the project to create a stable portal.

Databases are important--access is critical. Statewide purchasing is much more efficient than individually. Small libraries and networks grants have helped get libraries into a network. Network upgrades--big ticket items...really important support.

We have done many grant projects over the years: Mother Goose, collection development, preservation audit, construction; we had planned for participating in One Book. Our first bookmobile was purchased with LSCA funds. We benefit from the consultants--over 1,800 readers in the Summer Reading program. We have done projects in all areas. Mother Goose was the most recent grant we've used. In the last census 13.6% of our service population is Asian. So, I'm thinking about some literacy projects to reach some of the many grandparents here. ESL--conversation circles...intergenerational stuff.

Yes! We just got an LSTA, open category grant. There are citizenship issues here in the city. We have many partners in the grant. Two years ago the library did a YA ('tweens and teens grant). Previous to that this library hadn't applied for grants.

All of us receive statewide databases. As individuals we've applied for grants. In 2009 I developed an environmental science program. With LSTA grant we bought materials and did programs to interest students. A colleague in business and administration did one a year before

as well. Our archivist got a grant for beginning to digitize. The consortium is currently working to apply for a grant to digitize and share archival resources. The ability to apply for grants is important to academics. We haven't had a problem with timing.

We've received several small grants. Also value the statistics gathering MBLC does. We just finished a \$7,500 grant that increased awareness of the library in the role it could play in environmental issues. We had several organizations (public works, walking groups, etc. in the city) involved. Gave a part time librarian extra hours to put together programs. Measures at end of grant showed: 90-100% increase in the awareness of library resources on the topic. We had an electric cars professor from MIT as speaker; librarian demonstrated online resources to supply the program; librarian created a webpage. Measurement showed big increase in the usage of related InfoTrac and Gale databases related to topics.

Our most successful grant was Live Wires, an Equal Access grant targeting people 55. We had a \$5,000 grant, but we're still running two programs each month. Groups have donated money to keep it going.

The regional system even donated money to keep it going.

In what ways do the activities of the Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) make a difference to your library? What is the impact of consulting services offered by MBLC on your library? What about continuing education (CE) services?

CE is through the Massachusetts Library System (used to be 6 regionals doing CE and database contracts..now just the one) If the service population is less than X, the director doesn't have to have an MLS, but must take CE courses...it's important!

The Board gathers statistics, are now putting together a worksheet—value of services that a library can take to town board, etc. to use the statistics to convince local elected officials to support libraries.

Also—natural disasters. Gregor Trinkaus-Randall can warn libraries when a disaster is imminent. He also goes into libraries to help them with disasters, mold for example.

We just couldn't do without LSTA!

CE—the Massachusetts School Library Association offers professional development for its members, but there isn't much money, so they work with the library system to bring in speakers, etc. We wouldn't be able to do that without LSTA.

We haven't used continuing education much. Most of that is focused through the Massachusetts Library System. Consulting—yes, we worked with the building consultant to build a new branch.

We work with a consultant whenever we're planning a grant application.

Consulting has a great impact. The statistics collection is what we base certification on. Without the statistics, we couldn't do state aid. It's also the basis for reciprocal borrowing. A consultant who helped trustees and libraries recently retired. We heard how valuable he had been. The agency staff have a tremendous impact. Special needs—we have many immigrants who need language learning, who are helped.

CE doesn't apply to us, but yes, it does to our member libraries. Statistics are channeled through us for libraries to the MBLC. Members turn to us for background data—for grant applications, etc.

I refer directors to the consultants at MBLC if they need help with trustees, assistive devices, digitization, etc. MBLC directs us.

They help with political climate—advocacy. MBLC is essential in helping us share resources better. They are working toward a statewide model on lots of things.

The funds are well used. MBLC is not terribly visible; people don't know what they do. It's absolutely a great value for those who use their services...databases, etc. There's just not a great awareness.

The school did use the consulting service for our long range planning process.

Consulting services for us tend to be through the regions. Now there's just the one large region. We use MBLC for bigger things—grants and statistics help. Use the region for day to day things.

CE: same as consulting.

Preservation is the first step in making resources available online.

Collection of statistics is important. Consulting is useful to many that don't have the access we do.

CE—lots of things are changing in that area. The change to one system has been very helpful, but the biggest disadvantage to my library is that it's hard to get to training. But web courses are more realistic than the old way. But you don't get as much personal interaction with the web courses.

Certification is huge...people can go to other libraries (if a library is decertified).

Delivery is important too!! Libraries or networks don't pay for that.

We have used the public library building consultant, reference, Trustee and Friends, marketing legislative consultant. The statistics are crucial in budgeting and doing peer comparisons.

CE: We just sent trustees to their Massachusetts convention.

All are very important services; I use the MBLC website often.

I encourage continuing education classes for my staff. The statistics are invaluable—I use them for benchmarking, gaining financial support from funders. CE service—when there were 6 regions, that was where CE was. Now there's only one, but staff do attend programs.

CE and consulting are of interest to academics, but we haven't used those services here at Framingham.

CE is huge!! Things change fast. I've seen data on how many attend libraries and the value provided. CE is worth thousands and thousands of dollars. We're doing more now with webinars. My library has no professional development money so training is huge. The trustee training, the handbook and consultant working with them, is the only source of training for trustees. Statistics—we're very competitive and want to know who's doing what, how many employees do they have...I was able to get money for Sunday hours because I had the data. The statistics give us benchmarks and information for levels of support.

Where does innovation “live” in Massachusetts libraries? How do new efforts or initiatives get started?

In the small grants...when the economy collapsed people put together grants on job search help, etc. This year its grants on science for school age kids. STEM project...haven't offered that before. It came up because of the bad press on how American kids lagged others in science.

Years ago we used LSTA to try to encourage libraries to get LEED certification. I thought that was innovative. Three networks are setting up Open Source to run their automation systems. Without LSTA this wouldn't happen. One of the networks is up; they no longer have to pay automation vendors.

We're in the e-reader revolution...we're at a turning point, but what's forward is not clear. So someone has to put in the effort into determining our future direction. I would like libraries to take the lead rather than being told.

At Boston Public Library we have a very innovative staff, extroverted librarians who understand partners. Others approach us to partner. Cengage—career transitions, training, etc. In terms of construction I think BPL buildings are more innovative than MBLC.

Each year MBLC looks at what to do with LSTA; they look at national programs and try to import those to Massachusetts.

I'm not sure whether the ideas come from the agency or whether they just support new ideas. The network program (automation networks) has received LSTA funds. Recently they saved money by changing the way Internet access is provided. We heard about this at a board meeting. Networks are saving libraries money; LSTA has provided other things to networks too.

Again, special libraries are a bit different, we're in both the library and museum communities. The Museum has gotten National Leadership grants and a 21st century Museum grant (also IMLS) on how families learn.

We innovate at every level. Many variations, print and beyond...broadband initiative (was a Western Mass idea—would this work?) –Job and Career project. LSTA helps focus innovation; we have to focus our energy. Big initiatives—Open Source in three of the nine networks. That will be interesting as it develops. We also look to NELA; state, education association, etc. All share innovative things. It is part of staying connected.

People look to the Massachusetts Library System, to MBLC, and to the nine shared ILS, and to a few leading libraries in Massachusetts.

I would like a forum on innovation. Go back to that as use for LSTA. The different library communities look to their professional associations for innovation.

Since joining the State Advisory Council on Libraries (SACL) I've gotten a bigger statewide perspective. It has been great to be able to share new ideas with my staff from being on SACL. For me personally—ideas/directives come from the education department.

MBLC has a strategic planning committee that comes up with ideas for LSTA programs. It also comes from the bigger libraries in the state...word gets around when interesting things are happening. Ideas also come from outside the state, such as the community read program (On the Same Page), Humanities—Big Read.

We try to go to conferences and stay up with what's developing. Our mission is to be the technology partners for our libraries. So people ask us to do new things they've heard of. We provide them an opportunity to exchange ideas. We have committees and working groups.

Michael at Boston Public Library was looking for a way to bring information and historical materials from all over the Commonwealth. He wanted to provide access through a single portal and to provide additional training for handling the collections they had.

I look to the larger network, Minuteman, etc. to see what they are doing with upgrades for example. And, we look at what's happening in other states. MBLC has good ideas, but I'm not sure that's the #1 source for innovation.

If the Board hadn't had such cuts...last year it was level funded; they had to consolidate the regions. Innovation is in the regions and networks and in the MBLC and their strategic planning. I just looked at the MBLC website; these things are innovative: greening of libraries, digitization, weekly job seekers programs, and aging seniors programs. They keep us current. They change initiatives to keep us in front of things.

We look to one another; also look at national publications, websites.

That depends on what's going on on campus. The Vision project filters down to individual campuses.

I imagine innovation comes from professional sharing and examining best practices. We look to colleagues.

Have specific improvements or advances in library services taken place in the last five years that you believe are largely attributable to the availability of LSTA funding?

Money has gone to the automation resource sharing networks. They help us keep our membership fees low. Networks can do things for us—e-books (shared collection), resource sharing...it helps everybody.

Competitive grants have made libraries do new things; the emphasis on YA, for example, wasn't true before. The READ initiative... We take advantage of current ideas and fit them to Massachusetts.

Networks make reciprocal borrowing happen. When we decertified a library, their communities really let people know that it's the lack of resource sharing that hurts. Databases—libraries wouldn't have as many without LSTA funds.

Access to the statewide databases is a huge service to all Massachusetts residents. We have geo-location for authentication. Has had a major impact on the largest number of libraries and residents.

It's hard to know...because MBLC is so dependent on LSTA funds to do things. There are three huge building projects in my area; it's amazing. And our usage of libraries is high. The public is insatiable. So we have to be efficient. LSTA helps with that. We couldn't do without LSTA assistance.

Some systems have been possible, disaster preparedness—these things have benefited the entire state.

Some of the Jobs/Careers things have had a great impact locally, especially in partnership things.

Targeted programs at the public libraries, i.e., Job seeker programs, outreach to non English speakers.

Telecommunications and database funding—access for residents wouldn't have happened without LSTA. With the shared catalog we see what others own; people are borrowing from everywhere in the state and beyond. A small library couldn't hold it all, and delivery is fast! That has opened people to all sorts of things.

The Open Source project is an example of that. A lot of money has gone to programming and it provided a full time coordinator for several years to keep the networks together and to be a face to the world. LSTA paid for the software and the coordinator.

LSTA grant funds have enabled libraries to promote literacy, information literacy in libraries. Libraries use grants to provide new services.

Networks are going to the next version of ILS; probably wouldn't have as many libraries in networks if there weren't LSTA. We'd be treading water in terms of what we can offer.

Help for job seekers wouldn't have happened without LSTA funds, nor would the school incentive grants (multitype). Within the network we have to have telecommunications, servers, and maintenance costs. LSTA helps us with the technology infrastructure...it's critical. It's the small library grants. Networks wouldn't have been possible without LSTA.

The categories of grants, especially the open category, get new ideas in and let them be funded. We did a grant in Framingham that wouldn't have happened without LSTA. When I was in Palmer we did cutting edge electronic things connecting libraries, schools, parents. The real key is that the grant projects are often continued because libraries build partnerships during the grants. Funders see the value and support continuations.

We might have been able to do some of it. The grant had an emphasis on programming that we might not have done if we hadn't had the grant. We would have bought the materials...it wouldn't have been as wonderful.

We'd be duller without LSTA! We had a 'tweens and teens grant in 2008/09 that allowed us to revamp services to them. Now we have 24 teens on the advisory board. Before the revamping it wasn't as inviting. The PTO now lets us come in to talk about things for this age group. LSTA funds allow us to deepen our connections to the community and to raise awareness.

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

We do all of them!! We have two libraries for the blind.

Resource sharing –virtual catalog—is THE big thing in Massachusetts. We used to have crude methods, but now we have statewide delivery of materials. Lots of materials are moving about--it’s alive and well.

Access: new grants involving senior citizens; getting them to use libraries, classes on why they should use Facebook. Small libraries and networks grants do these—provide access...grant to pay membership in network. (3-4 libraries are still without Internet access, especially in Western Mass)

Partnerships: Can’t remember the name...had to do with Internet; Gates Foundation was involved; getting access across the state.

Other one—with academic libraries across the state....set up regions and allowed private academic libraries to join. Now they can apply for grants.

LOVE the partnership with the Bruins!!

There are benefits from resource sharing; we do ILL, I have a zero budget so the public library supplements my school needs. I hear about how important high speed internet access is.

In all areas!! Strategic partnerships—we make sure we do that when we write grants.

Special needs—that’s the whole accessibility issue.

Resource sharing—yes; improved access—yes. MBLC definitely addresses them all.

Strategic partnerships: agency undertook a PR program and partnered with the Bruins and with other departments in Massachusetts—those serving immigrants especially. They’re making sure libraries do as much as possible.

Massachusetts Emergency Management—libraries are now recognized as places of information in times of disaster.

Access: I go back to the databases. No library could provide all of those on their own. LSTA funds play a big role in databases since the commonwealth funds have decline.

People have access from their homes.

Special needs: LBPH and Perkins; make website more accessible

I recently attended the opening of new library in Western Massachusetts. The Board President there talked about how helpful Shelley was in helping them plan for services to people with disabilities.

Absolutely in all 4 cases! We’re not involved with individuals with special needs, Those small grants were geared/targeted to purchase of foreign language materials literacy, adaptive technology, early child learning, etc. MBLC is doing a marvelous job with limited funds. They’re forward thinking. We collaborate/cooperate together.

We’re weakest in reaching special needs. We do have: Improved access—databases through the webpage at MALC; Shared resources—active mediated ILL, statewide delivery.

Partnerships—we’re multi-layered...MBLC, networks, legacy, library systems, types of libraries—are working at building better relations with legislature, businesses, government and non profits. We try to connect all types of libraries; build on our expertise; and extend into web of our communities.

Special needs is challenging; we have two libraries for the vision impaired in Massachusetts. People don't want to be identified as having special needs. We try to serve all equally. MBLC is very supportive of extending services to special needs—economically, languages, etc.

Partnerships—has improved; I would like that strengthened, especially in science and technology.

Special needs—I think Massachusetts does a fine job in this area.

Access—systems, jobs, etc. Are bringing people in.

Resource sharing—We do!!

LSTA has allowed improved access (databases and catalog), increased resources; there definitely is more collaboration and sharing across networks. Strategic partnerships? I don't know about those?

All of them! We've talked about the first two already. There are lots of programs to serve the underserved in communities; libraries use LSTA to reach out. Partnerships—yes, from day one here. Years ago libraries in small towns bought videos—rotated collections. In my area—On the Same Page got ten communities to read and kept it going without outside funds.

It's a strategic partnership: three networks to implement and to share a system that's a model for others and to share data and information with each other. We'll probably redo the state catalog at some point to do as well, share resources.

Special needs: state dollars are used for databases, helps libraries reach out to partners.

Access: digital and web services are increasing and growing...it just snowballs as libraries use them.

Statewide virtual catalog is heavily used by my library. It gives patrons lots more access.

Access and resource sharing are done really well. Special needs projects happen, but they're not at the magnitude of the first two. Partnerships happen—libraries and networks do those. I'm a serious hockey fan and I love the Bruins partnership. That's great that's there's the partnership at the state level with the Bruins...gives libraries visibility.

Access—definitely has increased as we went to multitype regions 10 years ago. Now we're in a statewide region with members from all types of libraries. That has lead to resource sharing and is a strategic partnership. It's a vibrant and responsive network across the state. The networks get LSTA funds...ILL and delivery are definitely resource sharing. Special needs—we have Perkins and LBPH talking books. New technology is coming there. Sometimes need is economic or language as well.

MBLC does a terrific job! Resource sharing—there have been tremendous advances.

Collaboration—libraries can't do enough and the plan encourages that. You have to show your project will do needed things. Shelley is passionate and we all get infected with that. (MBLC reaching the underserved.) Access—break down barriers; grants help to do that. Reach out to people who haven't made the public library a part of their lives.

We do all that!! All those things occurred in the few grants that we've had. We've collaborated with the town library on the Big Read. It's community building. This is the second Big Read we've done with the public library. Resource sharing is the system wide databases and purchasing through the consortia.

Access—through the networks.

We worked with the regional to educate ourselves and made a commitment to serve families with autism. We saw an increase in the local school numbers of kids with autism so we got a trainer in for the staff and other community departments. We were able to sensitize ourselves. The children's department wrote a book to introduce an autistic person to the library. We worked with a group to develop the program, doing more tactile things and signing in story hours. We have raised our awareness and institutionalized the sensitivity. We're adding a Chinese newspaper because of increased awareness of Chinese in community. Shelly is always pushing...who are we missing? She gave a workshop for us on family literacy; it was good exposure for our staff.

Resource sharing...we lend 34,000 items, borrow 33,000. A recent survey we did showed patrons liked the ability to get materials from elsewhere.

Anything else? Do you have other comments you'd like to add?

It's fantastic! LSTA funds let museums preserve and make collections available in important and meaningful ways...lets us be ore forward thinking in reaching audiences—sciences, literacy, job creation...I'm a huge fan of MBLC and their grants.

There have been successful grants in the past; I hope that can be there again.

LSTA was important in getting things off the ground: MassCat was started with LSTA seed money. Now it's essential. Digital Commonwealth was LSTA seeded. It grew slowly; now it's going to be reseeded with Boston Public Library as partner. It's more cost effective for libraries to get content mounted on the web.

There was a futures conference several years ago; it would be good to do that again. MBLC is responsive to libraries; they're open to suggestions from libraries, especially those suggestions that can be duplicated. Getting a mix of opportunities is important.

I'm not sure why paperwork for some grants is too burdensome...reducing the paperwork would increase interest in applying for grants among libraries (it's just a comment I've heard). MBLC has approached that with mini grants.

I'm impressed by what's happening throughout the state.

Libraries smaller than mine find the paperwork of grants daunting, but it's a great opportunity. It's wonderful...don't stop LSTA!

LSTA is a great deal for the networks. It allows us to share resources and gets people to get to know people in other libraries. It has improved efficiency.

As a librarian and as a patron I know that access is important and LSTA has fostered that. The Digital Commonwealth is about improving access and is in line with the MBLC plan and goals. It all fits together, regardless of whether LSTA funds are directly spent on individual libraries.

We're moving toward a statewide library card. Now people just use network cards; the public would love a statewide card. MBLC has to think through that, the pros and cons of a statewide card. Are we going to have statewide network? Seems to be a priority but I think there are issues to be resolved first.

It's critical for Congress to keep funding IMLS so we get the funds to the state. LSTA grants and state aid are critical to local libraries. It's a very grass roots use of tax dollars.

LSTA—I hope it doesn't get cut. All the grants I've worked on have been phenomenal!

There's sentiment among higher education academics that there should be more representation on SACL, more than one person to represent them.

Making ourselves aware of the needs of underserved has been important. It transforms the library.

Interviewees

Leigh Barnes, Library Teacher, Stearns & Capeless Elementary Schools, and Massachusetts School Library Association area representative

Carol Caro, Liaison to State Advisory Council on Libraries, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners

Kristi Chadwick, President, Digital Commonwealth, and Central/Western Massachusetts Automated Resource Sharing (network)

Debby Conrad, Executive Director, SAILS Library Network

Mark Contois, Director, Worcester Public Library

Katherine Dibble, Chair, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners

Molly Fogarty, Director, Springfield City Library

Ron Gagnon, Executive Director, North Boston Library Exchange

Deborah Kelsey, Treasurer, Massachusetts Library System and Director, Medfield Public Library

Dee Magnoni, President, Massachusetts Library System and Director, Olin College Library

Bonnie Mitchell, President of Massachusetts Consortia of Librarians in Public Higher Education Institutions and Director of Libraries at Framingham State

Greg Pronevitz, Executive Director, Massachusetts Library System

Ellen Rainville, President of Merrimack Valley Library Consortium and Director, J.V. Fletcher Library

Mary Reuland, President, Cape Libraries Automation Materials Sharing and Director, Snow Library

LaurieAnn Riley, State Advisory Council on Libraries Vice-Chair and Lead Librarian for Chelsea Public Schools

Amy Ryan, President, Boston Public Library

Susan Sans Soucie, Director, Montague Public Libraries

Ruth Urell, President of Massachusetts Library Association and Director, Reading Public Library

Sara Watkins, Chair, State Advisory Council on Libraries, and Curator, USS Constitution Museum

Appendix C: Web-Based Survey Summary

*Note: The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) had planned to do a web survey of the Commonwealth's library community before the LSTA evaluation process began. Fearing "survey fatigue," MBLC asked whether it would be possible to combine the LSTA survey with a general survey that included questions about State-funded programs as well as LSTA-funded programs. Himmel & Wilson subsequently designed a single survey instrument that met MBLC's needs as well as the LSTA program evaluation needs. Please recognize that the survey results summarized below include services/initiatives such as state aid to libraries and public library construction grants that **ARE NOT** funded with LSTA dollars as well as programs that are in part or in whole supported using LSTA Grants to States money.*

1. On a scale of 1 - 5 with 1 representing "Not at All Important" and 5 representing "Very Important," please rate each of the following services and programs in terms of their importance TO YOUR LIBRARY. Please select "0 - Have Not Used/ Participated In" if your library has not been involved with a given service/program.

	0 - Have Not Used/ Participated In	1 - Not at All Important	2	3 - Neither Unimportant nor Important	4	5 - Very Important	Total
Public library data: online and/or customized reports	18.4% 23	2.4% 3	0.8% 1	4.0% 5	28.8% 36	45.6% 57	100% 125
State aid to public libraries	8.7% 11	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	5.6% 7	83.3% 105	100% 126
Advisory services for public library directors	16.7% 21	1.6% 2	3.2% 4	5.6% 7	30.2% 38	42.9% 54	100% 126
Advisory services for public library trustees	24.6% 31	3.2% 4	8.7% 11	13.5% 17	30.2% 38	19.8% 25	100% 126
Advisory services for public library "Friends" organizations	34.1% 43	3.2% 4	7.9% 10	18.3% 23	28.6% 36	7.9% 10	100% 126
MBLC professional collection	34.9% 44	6.3% 8	12.7% 16	16.7% 21	21.4% 27	7.9% 10	100% 126
Advisory services for early literacy, family literacy and/or English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	40.3% 50	2.4% 3	5.6% 7	20.2% 25	18.5% 23	12.9% 16	100% 124
Public library construction advisory services	16.7% 21	0.8% 1	4.0% 5	7.1% 9	18.3% 23	53.2% 67	100% 126

Public library construction grants	15.9% 20	1.6% 2	3.2% 4	4.8% 6	13.5% 17	61.1% 77	100% 126
Disaster preparedness	16.7% 21	4.0% 5	5.6% 7	18.3% 23	36.5% 46	19.0% 24	100% 126
Emergency assistance	40.3% 50	2.4% 3	2.4% 3	8.1% 10	23.4% 29	23.4% 29	100% 124
Preservation: environmental monitoring, advisory services and directory	29.4% 37	4.8% 6	4.8% 6	23.0% 29	23.0% 29	15.1% 19	100% 126
Digitization advisory services and directory	33.3% 42	1.6% 2	4.0% 5	17.5% 22	25.4% 32	18.3% 23	100% 126
Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grants to libraries	12.8% 16	1.6% 2	0.8% 1	2.4% 3	19.2% 24	63.2% 79	100% 125
LSTA "open" grants	23.8% 30	0.8% 1	2.4% 3	6.3% 8	22.2% 28	44.4% 56	100% 126
LSTA outreach grants	27.2% 34	0.8% 1	3.2% 4	7.2% 9	20.8% 26	40.8% 51	100% 125
LSTA Children's/Youth/Teen services grants	20.3% 25	0.8% 1	1.6% 2	5.7% 7	20.3% 25	51.2% 63	100% 123
Statewide licensed databases (journals, periodicals, newspapers)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.4% 3	8.7% 11	12.7% 16	76.2% 96	100% 126
Virtual catalog	4.0% 5	0.8% 1	1.6% 2	4.8% 6	15.1% 19	73.8% 93	100% 126
Telecommunications support	16.7% 21	2.4% 3	1.6% 2	7.9% 10	17.5% 22	54.0% 68	100% 126
Authentication (including geo-location for access to licensed databases)	7.3% 9	0.8% 1	4.9% 6	9.8% 12	27.6% 34	49.6% 61	100% 123
Small Libraries in Networks program	40.3% 50	3.2% 4	2.4% 3	8.1% 10	16.9% 21	29.0% 36	100% 124
Mass Libraries Open Source project	41.1% 51	3.2% 4	2.4% 3	11.3% 14	16.9% 21	25.0% 31	100% 124
E-mail mailing lists	17.6% 22	3.2% 4	5.6% 7	12.8% 16	31.2% 39	29.6% 37	100% 125

MBLC website (mass.gov/mblc)	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	3.2% 4	7.2% 9	35.2% 44	53.6% 67	100% 125
MBLC Notes	9.8% 12	2.5% 3	9.0% 11	27.9% 34	36.9% 45	13.9% 17	100% 122
Library Update (news from around the state)	3.3% 4	2.4% 3	6.5% 8	30.1% 37	43.1% 53	14.6% 18	100% 123
Legislative Agenda and template insert for Legislative Agenda	10.6% 13	0.8% 1	4.1% 5	17.1% 21	34.1% 42	33.3% 41	100% 123
Tools for promotion (e.g., sample press releases, bookmarks, annual report)	12.0% 15	3.2% 4	5.6% 7	16.0% 20	40.8% 51	22.4% 28	100% 125
Consumer web portal	30.4% 38	2.4% 3	4.8% 6	19.2% 24	28.0% 35	15.2% 19	100% 125
Summer Reading promotion	8.8% 11	3.2% 4	0.8% 1	8.0% 10	24.8% 31	54.4% 68	100% 125
Boston Bruins partnership	27.2% 34	8.0% 10	5.6% 7	24.0% 30	20.0% 25	15.2% 19	100% 125
Library jobs listing	4.8% 6	0.8% 1	1.6% 2	6.3% 8	25.4% 32	61.1% 77	100% 126
Library directory	3.2% 4	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	5.6% 7	30.6% 38	59.7% 74	100% 124
Workshops (e.g., state aid, databases, Friends, Trustees, preservation, etc.)	1.6% 2	1.6% 2	2.4% 3	8.7% 11	30.2% 38	55.6% 70	100% 126
Other (Please specify.)	60.7% 17	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	7.1% 2	3.6% 1	28.6% 8	100% 28

If you selected "other," please specify here.

Count	Response
1	In a school library and would like to see more support.
1	LSTA support of Networks is critical
1	MBLC staff
1	New trends in libraries
1	State certification standards

Count	Response
1	Continuing education for staff
1	Workshops on Cape Cod!
1	It would be great if there were legal advisors for us. Especially to navigate MGL. I know it isn't what you would do, but it would be great for that help.
1	Public library data is invaluable, but very difficult to use in its present online format. Not at all intuitive for report creation.

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

Count	Response
1	I can't possibly rank any of my 5s as 4s. They are that important to us.
1	I use state data reports constantly to make my case for more staff or collection money.
1	I use virtual catalog every day and I'm always referring students to the online databases.
1	LSTA grants and Network support funding make service possible that would otherwise not happen
1	LSTA grants are essential to the small public library since funds are so limited
1	LSTA youth services/teen grant
1	State Aid funds are vital to the continued service levels we offer.
1	State Aid grants are an essential piece of our overall budget.
1	State-supported databases have enabled us to provide many more resources for our students
1	Telecommunications support helps to make the cost of network participation affordable.
1	The virtual catalog levels the playing field between the have and have not communities.
1	We have an active ILL program here, and robust database usage.
1	We have no inter net service available to us other than the Satellite service provided by the MLS
1	We use the databases daily for student research
1	Database access especially an online encyclopedia
1	These are the services that allow us to function well
1	Advisory services at all levels are crucial to helping libraries form appropriate, strong partnerships among Director, Trustees, and Friends. This makes for a healthy, unified library.

Count	Response
1	I received a LSTA grant a few years ago that supplied me with technology, books, and field trips for my students.
1	If our high school / middle school library did not have access to the state licensed databases, we would not have this information available for our students. Our library budget has shrunk so much over the past few years that we are extremely dependent on this service for our students.
1	State Aid - Without it we would have far fewer programs, would be behind common expectations in technology and have little flexibility over the course of a year. Without the incentive of State Aid, our municipality might not consider certification to be a sensible economic proposition. Underfunded by \$x and endanger a significantly larger amount. The further we fall behind, however, the less convincing is the tradeoff. Still it is important to have that economic incentive of State Aid and grant eligibility along with the service incentives. Databases come in a close second.
1	Top 3: Virtual catalog, database access, and delivery make it possible for our small library to give our patrons the access to materials and information on a par with the largest libraries. Our mission of equal access for all is fulfilled because of this!
1	Telecommunications support is very important to the Lincoln Public Library because it helps us connect to the Minuteman Library Network.
1	As a small library with a minimal staffing level, our use of state aid funds to provide library service on Fridays stands out as having the biggest direct impact on our patrons. We also count on the state sponsored databases to provide much needed access to reference material for students and the general population. We are able to participate in the C/WMARS consortium due to the SLIN/LSTA grants. This has made our small library a portal to a much larger library collection and the Hopedale community truly appreciates and uses this service.
1	I am a school librarian so access to the databases for my students is very important to me. Also, I love to take advantage of the workshops and professional development programs.
1	I am a K-5 library - we used the online databases consistently, especially Grolier. It's gone now and we pay for it ourselves, which is a burden. We use Infobits and SIRS, but not as often.
1	1. I have the job I have today because of MBLC job listings service 2. Statistics across the state are imperative for positioning the success of our library against others. These comparisons result in increased funding for us. 3. State funding is crucial, and needs to increase
1	State aid makes a big difference in our ability to purchase the materials and equipment we need for basic services; Data provided is invaluable in evaluating our services and advocating for support; Construction grants have made a major renovation and addition possible; LSTA grants have kick-started program and outreach initiatives that live beyond the life of the grant (staff training & inspiration)
1	The library construction program afforded us the ability to build a beautiful, well used new building. Without the construction grant, our town would never have expanded our

Count	Response
	library.
1	We use library data and reports for comparisons and budget justifications; LSTA grants are very important for literacy and outreach needs.
1	We use the MBLC paid databases on a daily basis in my high school library. We could not function as well without them and have built our program around their availability. We could not afford to buy what you offer but would be forced to make painful cuts somewhere if we had to pay for even a portion of them.
1	Our library is in the process of planning a new building so we are working with both the grant program and advisers. We are also planning to upgrade our handling of important historical materials so we are using those services. Data collection and those statistics are useful in our annual budget preparations We use the databases every day. Things like the professional collection and mailing lists, and state aid help us to be aware of current services and implement them. The legislative agenda and speaking with one voice rather than competing with other libraries puts our focus on improving all libraries and attracting funds to the overall library service in the state instead of other legislative funding priorities.
1	We simply could not afford to maintain databases without the aid of the MBLC. We save thousands of dollars every year because we don't have to pay for these resources ourselves.
1	The state aid advisory service was invaluable when members of our town finance committee pushed for zero funding, and the library was threatened with closure.
1	The students of the Hanover Middle School routinely use the online reference databases when researching. Students are instructed in their use in Grade 5 and again in Grade 8, but they are used at all grade levels, 5-8. This has been a very valuable resource to the youth of Hanover, MA.
1	With limited budget, ALL of the items I checked have been used and will continue as long as they are available to us here in our public school library. Most especially are the Databases, Grants and Training/Professional Development programs.
1	We use the subscription databases extensively. We depend on it for teaching students to use reliable resources. We would appreciate the addition of an encyclopedia. We have also applied for and received LSTA mini-grants in the past which have been very helpful.
1	Construction grants obviously have to rank high because they have such a profound and long-term effect on the library and the community. Advisory services to Library Directors and Trustees on MGL, governance, emergency management, disaster preparation, etc. are also very important the MBLC is the only entity in the unique position to provide that service. Areas that affect all libraries where the MBLC can serve as leader and catalyst - legislative agenda, the Evergreen Open Source project, and libraries as DRCs- are also crucial to the growth and success of libraries in MA. Finally, state standards for certification such as the MAR, open hours and materials expenditure are also critical. There is often political pressure to relax these standards but they are key to preventing libraries from being disproportionately cut.

Count	Response
1	State Aid to Public Libraries is very important not only for the monetary support State Aid provides but also for the incentive for the town to maintain the library's certification. It definitely helps keep the library strong.
1	I was very new (3 months as Director) to this position when my community was funded for their library construction project in 1998. I can honestly say I would not have gotten through that time with the help of Roe and Patience. My community was very split on it, and my building committee was very tired but wanted to take the one last shot. It was a hot-button topic in town and became circus-y and political. She was very supportive to me - and my board - both professionally and personally.
1	Everything from summer reading to online databases, but youth services professional development opportunities are the most important.
1	We receive a "Small Libraries in Networks" grant and are able to be a CWMARS mininet member. Without the grant we would have trouble paying the assessment and might not be able to participate. Network membership provides increased access to materials and access to digital materials.
1	Having a construction grant of 7.5 million dollars certainly helps sell the project. This service is extremely important to any library. This grant round the % was increased-great!
1	The Construction grant and construction grant advice that we have received from both Roe Waltos and Patience Jackson has been invaluable to us as we have battled with our town regulatory boards this year. I would not have been able to do what I have done without them. Databases are widely used and very necessary. The information on the Legislative Agenda that we receive allows me to make the case for funding in my own town. Workshops and Advisory services are so necessary - this is sometimes the only place we can get them from.
1	The availability of Databases and available archival information is very important for our library and students.
1	As a children's librarian I know that the support for summer programs makes a big difference to the level of programming that we can offer our public. However the construction grants have been even more important to our library, which opened its new facility in April 2009.
1	We have been intensely focused on comparative funding (piece of the pie, for example) statistics and trends in budgets/municipal funding for several months now - the stats on the MBLC website are enormously helpful - wish that the figures online were more recent (FY 11?) Thank you!
1	Advisory services for public library directors - as a new director, I had many, many questions about state aid and grant programs and really needed the expertise of the staff at the MBLC to help me get up to speed.
1	State Aid resources are extremely helpful, especially since the city does not fund our books and materials to the extent that we need. Also, it is helpful in purchasing furniture and consulting services. The waiver system, however, is flawed and beyond the time when it should be revisited.

Count	Response
1	LSTA funds have provided the impetus for our library to start new programs over the past 25 years. Construction funds helped our library secure town and other funding to build our beautiful addition.
1	We are in the process of applying for a State Construction Grant to expand our 1895 building and make it handicapped accessible. The scope of the project would make it impossible for our smallish town to do without the grants. Navigating the grant process would be almost impossible with Patience and Rosemary.
1	The summer reading program keeps kids busy and in the reading readiness mode. Without state aid our town would not have a library.
1	The databases are very important for research for students. Also the professional classes are super helpful for both new and older librarians.
1	An LSTA Grant for teens and tweens allowed us to buy much needed furniture for YA room, and have some great programs for that age group.
1	1. The LSTA grant awarded to our library was critical in leveraging cooperative links with town agencies and organizations. 2. The success of the LSTA grant allowed us to apply for more initiatives. 3. The impact of LSTA grants on cash-strapped libraries cannot be underestimated. They allow libraries to develop focus areas that are not covered by line-item budgets.
1	State Aid allows us to offer services at a level with other communities and levels the playing field for all residents of the Commonwealth.
1	The licensed databases have been invaluable for students doing research. Without them, we would have to rely solely on web resources and mostly out of date print resources.
1	Money, both state aid and LSTA grants provide extra services & maintenance. Geo-location finally makes statewide databases user friendly. Having state requirements, stats in one location is extremely useful as well as workshops for completing the Annual Report Information Survey (ARIS) & financial aid reports
1	It's hard to pick one; many are very important. The databases for the customers, construction funds, state aid, grants and support have all been vital for our library and continue to be.
1	The LSTA design grant enabled us to have preliminary expansion plans drawn up. The project is on hold at the moment.
1	I rely on the public library to fill the gaps I have as a school library. Many of my students do not have access to the internet from home; we depend on the public library and their librarians to assist the students. I enjoy, depend on and look forward to collaborating with the public library.
1	The Millis Public Library has participated in three LSTA grants: Construction Grant -- most important Teens and "Tweens" Grant and "Mother Goose on the Loose." The expertise, training, and resources provided by the MBLC at every juncture in each of these grants have been irreplaceable. MBLC staff members have been exceptional resources -- the staff at the MBLC is knowledgeable, informed, and so very ready to

Count	Response
	offer assistance. The successful implementation of LSTA grants is due, in great measure, to the level of skill and commitment provided by the MBLC staff. MBLC staff is really the highest ranked service/resource for all of the grants we have implemented.
1	We personally benefitted from a teen LSTA grant - both financially, programmatically the support provided by Shelley when we were going through the process. LSTA grants are critically important. I know people rely on the library job listings- so those are important as well. Public library data helps support information for grants and other documents and proposals. Summer reading support and promotions are important as well. Without local state aid, we would be really hurting. This is very important to our funding.
1	We use the state aid program as leverage to get our materials budget up each year. We also use the comparative stats a lot.
1	Providing resources and funding for the library as well as promoting services and literacy to younger populations: the future of library survival.
1	Having grants available to apply for allows our library to grow and offer our patrons more and better services.
1	State aid provides us with the funds for all our technology improvements in the library (new computers, wireless upgrades etc.) Public library data is essential in showing how we are doing versus other libraries in the state.
1	We benefit from all around services MBLC provides and depending upon the present need, all services become a priority. Thank you!
1	LSTA grants and State Aid to Libraries have permitted the Bellingham Library to offer programs, services and equipment to the library community that would not be feasible to obtain in the town budget.
1	The new Paul Pratt Memorial Library facility was built with LSTA construction grant monies and private donations. The library is also grateful for the LSTA grant opportunities that have helped us to develop and enrich library programs and collections. Finally, we rely on the research databases funded by MBLC and would really like to offer even more of them to our patrons.
1	We rely on State Aid to Public Libraries and make every effort to continue to receive it. Our library cannot afford the state wide licensed databases and our patrons rely on them. The Summer Reading program is very important to our community. The MBLC continues to make this a positive experience for our library's patrons.
1	Most important service is library construction help. Difficult to be sure of all the decisions that are necessary especially since the decisions, once made, are almost ironclad. The construction consultant is invaluable to a community that has chosen to improve their facility
1	Grants and the materials purchased with the funds are still heavily used and will need updating soon. Summer reading is CRUCIAL as are databases and connections to all libraries in MA.
1	We have a beautiful new library thanks to help from a construction grant and support. We use state aid \$ for new computers and other capital expenses. I always use the

Count	Response
	public library data at budget time to show the town heads how the library does on a comparative basis. We love the Virtual Catalogue and regularly receive items for our patrons through it. So simple to use. We depend on our Small Libraries in Networks (SLIN) grants to be able to afford to belong to CWMARS.
1	Emergency assistance was wonderful when our library burned. The workshops are helpful - with technology changing all the time it helps librarians keep current.
1	Without Library State Aid I would not be able to maintain the Library building, pay some of my part-time staff and buy supplies. In short, I would have to lay off staff and spend less money on materials so that I could maintain the physical building.
1	We have taken full advantage of the grants offerings and Summer reading. We would not be able to serve our patrons adequately without the Virtual Catalog and Telecom aid to the networks.
1	The Scituate Library is currently 7th on the waiting list for a public library construction grant. Without the excellent advisory assistance provided by the MBLC construction specialists, I don't think I would have had the confidence to even attempt the grant. Thanks to them, I wrote the building program and completed the grant.
1	We've had many LSTA grants over the years that have enabled us to present innovative new public programs that have raised the library's visibility and value in our community. We use data collected by MBLC for budget presentations and comparisons to other communities. We are hopeful that we'll receive a construction grant in the next few years to update and expand our 115 year old library building.
1	Library services have become a demand for a community hit hard by the economic downturn. We have become the place that is very accessible for everyone. We have to service everyone who walks through the door, there are no ethnic, financial or gender differences that would not allow someone to use the library.
1	The construction award made the new facility happen. The ongoing state aid to libraries program is sufficient leverage to keep the town honest.
1	For example, advertising the summer reading program more widely has brought focus to the importance to children of reading over the summer. I think all databases should be licensed for the state through MBLC. I think it would save money for the BLC, MLS and libraries. There isn't any other good place for list and search for library jobs in MA, please keep the jobs listing available. Keeping technical (and emotional support) available for those libraries planning buildings is paramount. It's lovely to have someone at the BLC to answer questions and assist with the grant program.
1	State aid is expended entirely on technology. Construction grant partially covered the cost of renovation of the facility. LSTA grants for projects have allowed the library to expand services to meet community needs. Statistics are useful to justify the library's budget. The job site is the only place jobs are posted by the library. Open source ILS is the way forward. Authentication makes database access easier.
1	1. State aid is VITAL. 2. Library advisory & construction grants helped create the building I am sending this from 3. Tel-Com support is bringing broadband to this underserved town and we are grateful; it wouldn't be happening w/o the MBLC. 4. The statewide jobs

Count	Response
	listing located my present position as director; I am appreciative of that!
1	The Bruins partnership has been great for us. We even spun it off and had our own reading competition as the Bruins raced to the Stanley cup last season. LSTA grants have allowed us to start programs we might not have had the startup money to do in the first place, but we now continue them to the benefit of our customers
1	Small Libraries in Networks made it possible to join CWMARS and keeps it affordable for our library
1	I have used many of these services over the years. I can't imagine not having these resources or support services available. Every venue brings new challenges for Library Directors, Staff, Trustees and Friends groups that require continued support services, even if it doesn't occur every day.
1	This public Library relies on the \$ 8,000 - 10,000 we receive in the State Aid program each year. This allows us to have some wiggle room in the activities, services, and events we can plan. I appreciate the 41 or so databases that are offered through the State to the local libraries. The consultants are an important part of the library success processes.
1	State Aid -- enormous financial assistance; Dianne Carty et al are wonderful MBLC website, jobs postings, statistics, etc., all so very helpful. Workshops excellent, especially the one on State Aid
1	LSTA funds made possible a construction project, grant initiatives, and support for projects that have been popular and important to the community.
1	Grants help us show credibility in our community, virtual catalog, databases, etc. let us have access to professional sources and services, summer reading is bread and butter. Ability to post jobs is very important, placing ads is too expensive and the internet produces too many applicants with no qualifications, legislative agenda keeps us in the loop, digitization and new technologies is our future
1	The most important service will probably remain state aid unless there is a serious turn-about in our country's economy in the near future. For the time being we depend on our state aid money for everything besides payroll and the physical maintenance of the buildings.
1	These days, State Aid is essential to our budget. We use VirtCat every day. The telecommunications subsidy to our network makes the cost of membership possible. We anticipate embarking on a building project and desperately need the help of the building specialists.
1	LSTA grant program has spurred us to create new services and programs. Virtual catalog is very important to our community.
1	The databases save us thousands of dollars per year that we could not pay if we lost this service.
1	The construction advisory services have been invaluable to our library for several projects. This is not an area in which we have much expertise and the advice given by MBLC directly resulted in more informed decision making and cost savings. We rely on

Count	Response
	the reports and statistics to provide metrics for self-evaluation and information to the public and Town officials. The LSTA grants we have received have allowed us to enhance resources and services beyond municipal appropriations.
1	Summer reading support is invaluable, particularly the materials supplied and the clip art and manual with ideas. We have had several grants in the past that helped us build our collection of foreign language materials, audio visual materials and others. The construction grant was invaluable.
1	Our "Suntime" Reading Program for children, teens, and adults is eagerly anticipated every year and of primary importance to our programming agenda, but the aid to public libraries is a key to getting our town to at least keep us off the waiver list.
1	After the loss of a proposal to build a new library facility in 2005, we utilized our state aid funds for the makeover of our 1969 building. We purchased furniture, paint, updated the technology in our meeting rooms, etc. LSTA grants for Teens and Tweens contributed to the makeover of our Teen Zone, LSTA Customer Service open grant provided funding for customer service training and for developing professional marketing materials.
1	I am in an elementary library. Promoting and running the summer reading program is huge for us - otherwise kids may not read much if at all.
1	LSTA grants help us go the extra mile. Once we have the funding, we take time to do things that make a difference. The ARIS reports are invaluable for comparing our status with other libraries our size.
1	State Aid to Public Libraries: State Aid has been most important to the Needham Free Public Library for many years. If it were not for State Aid payments the library would not have been able to embark on a building program. State Aid paid for the original feasibility study and for the architect who did the plans and drawings that enabled the library to obtain a successful Proposition 2 1/2 override vote. State Aid enabled a building project to begin than resulted in the Town having a new and expanded library building. Current payments permit the library to have a museum pass program, to pay to lease a parking lot to accommodate the patrons who use the new library, to pay for programs (children and adult) and to purchase needed equipment.
1	We have benefitted from Construction funding, LSTA grants, advisory expertise, legislative advocacy, marketing and programming support and statistical data, as well as workshops and incessant use of the web site.
1	Both the LSTA children and teen grants have been great for us. Summer reading support and promotion are most helpful.

3. On a scale of 1 - 5 with 1 representing "Not at All Important" and 5 representing "Very Important," please rate each of the following services and programs in terms of their importance ON A STATEWIDE BASIS. Please select "0 - Have Not Used/ Participated In" if your library has not been involved with a given service/program.

	0 - Have Not Used/ Participated In	1 - Not at All Important	2	3 - Neither Unimportant nor Important	4	5 - Very Important	Total
Public library data: online and/or customized reports	5.8% 7	1.7% 2	2.5% 3	6.7% 8	25.8% 31	57.5% 69	100% 120
State aid to public libraries	4.1% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	1.7% 2	93.4% 113	100% 121
Advisory services for public library directors	8.3% 10	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	7.4% 9	31.4% 38	51.2% 62	100% 121
Advisory services for public library trustees	11.7% 14	1.7% 2	5.0% 6	14.2% 17	40.0% 48	27.5% 33	100% 120
Advisory services for public library "Friends" organizations	18.3% 22	3.3% 4	5.0% 6	21.7% 26	35.0% 42	16.7% 20	100% 120
MBLC professional collection	24.2% 29	4.2% 5	6.7% 8	29.2% 35	22.5% 27	13.3% 16	100% 120
Advisory services for early literacy, family literacy and/or English for speakers of other languages (ESOL)	18.3% 22	1.7% 2	5.0% 6	12.5% 15	28.3% 34	34.2% 41	100% 120
Public library construction advisory services	6.6% 8	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	5.0% 6	19.0% 23	68.6% 83	100% 121
Public library construction grants	7.6% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	4.2% 5	9.2% 11	79.0% 94	100% 119
Disaster preparedness	5.8% 7	1.7% 2	4.2% 5	18.3% 22	34.2% 41	35.8% 43	100% 120
Emergency assistance	14.9% 18	0.8% 1	2.5% 3	12.4% 15	32.2% 39	37.2% 45	100% 121
Preservation: environmental monitoring, advisory services and directory	15.0% 18	1.7% 2	5.0% 6	20.0% 24	33.3% 40	25.0% 30	100% 120

Digitization advisory services and directory	16.7% 20	0.8% 1	3.3% 4	16.7% 20	34.2% 41	28.3% 34	100% 120
Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grants to libraries	7.4% 9	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.5% 3	14.9% 18	75.2% 91	100% 121
LSTA "open" grants	12.8% 15	0.0% 0	0.9% 1	6.8% 8	23.1% 27	56.4% 66	100% 117
LSTA outreach grants	15.1% 18	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	6.7% 8	25.2% 30	52.1% 62	100% 119
LSTA Children's/Youth/Teen services grants	8.5% 10	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	5.1% 6	22.2% 26	64.1% 75	100% 117
Statewide licensed databases (journals, periodicals, newspapers)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	5.0% 6	12.4% 15	82.6% 100	100% 121
Virtual catalog	1.7% 2	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	4.1% 5	19.8% 24	73.6% 89	100% 121
Telecommunications support	10.2% 12	0.8% 1	1.7% 2	7.6% 9	27.1% 32	52.5% 62	100% 118
Authentication (including geo-location for access to licensed databases)	2.5% 3	0.8% 1	0.8% 1	7.6% 9	36.4% 43	51.7% 61	100% 118
Small Libraries in Networks program	19.8% 24	0.8% 1	5.0% 6	9.9% 12	24.0% 29	40.5% 49	100% 121
Mass Libraries Open Source project	27.1% 32	3.4% 4	3.4% 4	15.3% 18	22.0% 26	28.8% 34	100% 118
E-mail mailing lists	11.6% 14	1.7% 2	5.0% 6	19.0% 23	25.6% 31	37.2% 45	100% 121
MBLC website (mass.gov/mblc)	0.0% 0	1.7% 2	1.7% 2	11.8% 14	33.6% 40	51.3% 61	100% 119
MBLC Notes	5.8% 7	5.8% 7	9.9% 12	25.6% 31	34.7% 42	18.2% 22	100% 121
Library Update (news from around the state)	3.3% 4	3.3% 4	7.4% 9	28.9% 35	33.9% 41	23.1% 28	100% 121
Legislative Agenda and template insert for Legislative Agenda	5.0% 6	0.8% 1	3.4% 4	20.2% 24	31.1% 37	39.5% 47	100% 119

Tools for promotion (e.g., sample press releases, bookmarks, annual report)	9.9% 12	3.3% 4	0.8% 1	18.2% 22	41.3% 50	26.4% 32	100% 121
Consumer web portal	24.0% 29	3.3% 4	4.1% 5	19.0% 23	28.9% 35	20.7% 25	100% 121
Summer Reading promotion	4.2% 5	2.5% 3	0.8% 1	9.2% 11	22.5% 27	60.8% 73	100% 120
Boston Bruins partnership	15.0% 18	5.8% 7	8.3% 10	23.3% 28	33.3% 40	14.2% 17	100% 120
Library jobs listing	3.4% 4	2.5% 3	1.7% 2	7.6% 9	18.5% 22	66.4% 79	100% 119
Library directory	2.5% 3	0.8% 1	1.7% 2	6.6% 8	28.9% 35	59.5% 72	100% 121
Workshops (e.g., state aid, databases, Friends, Trustees, preservation, etc.)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.7% 2	7.6% 9	25.2% 30	65.5% 78	100% 119
Other (Please specify.)	46.2% 12	0.0% 0	3.8% 1	7.7% 2	11.5% 3	30.8% 8	100% 26

4. We're interested in knowing what types of support or assistance you would like in the future from the Board of Library Commissioners. Following is a list of services. Please select the six that are highest in importance to your library and drag them from the left column to the right column. (Please select only your top six and place your highest ranked service on top of the list on the right. You can still re-arrange your choices after you have moved them to the right column.)

Item	Total Score¹	Overall Rank
Statewide library card	1207	1
Support for services targeting children and teens	1045	2
Assistance with planning for technology	1010	3
Institutes on issues and trends affecting libraries	928	4
Developing centralized collections of non-print materials (e.g., DVDs, e-content, streaming media, etc.)	910	5
Advisory services for library space redesign	866	6
Assistance in promoting library service	855	7

Item	Total Score ¹	Overall Rank
Assistance with strategic planning	839	8
Digitization of locally held resources	680	9
Bandwidth (broadband) coordination	544	10
Advisory services and workshops for facilities management	486	11
Performer's directory	459	12
Website design and support	447	13
Assistance with evaluation of services (such as surveys)	388	14
Design of reading programs	348	15
Design of literacy programs	347	16
Support for services for groups with special needs (mobility challenged, visually challenged, etc.)	301	17
Assistance with disaster preparedness planning	296	18
Design of programs for elderly populations	165	19
Other (Please Specify below.)	101	20

¹ Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.

If you selected "other," please specify here.

Count	Response
1	Assistance with issues specific to small libraries.
1	How will MBLC and MLS work together to avoid providing the same services?
1	I would not use any of these services
1	Library Construction Projects
1	Library Management support
1	More focused training for Trustees on their roles and responsibilities
1	Required use of Independent Public Library Consultant Services for those libraries that fall into this category
1	A mentoring program for new directors similar to new superintendent mentoring program in education.

5. In your opinion, which of the services or initiatives identified above as being supported with LSTA funds has the greatest POTENTIAL for improving library services in Massachusetts?

Count	Response
2	Advisory services for libraries
1	Advisory services for libraries and continuing education.
1	Advisory services for libraries/
1	Continuing Ed
1	Continuing Ed Public library statistics
1	Continuing Education
1	Continuing Education and Online database licensing
1	Continuing ed.
4	Continuing education
1	Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.)
1	Continuing education, advisory services for libraries, grants for outreach
1	Customer web portal and statewide library card
1	Database licensing, Summer Reading, continuing ed, mbic website.
1	Digitization
1	Digitization Projects
1	Digitization Projects; Advisory Services
2	Grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services projects
1	Grants for Children/s Youth/ etc., projects and for outreach efforts.
1	Grants for Kids/ Teen etc., services projects
1	Grants for Outreach Efforts
1	Grants for children's/youth/teen services projects--hook them while they're young!
1	Grants for children's/youth/teen services
1	Grants for outreach
3	Grants for outreach efforts
1	Grants for outreach efforts and grants for children's youth and teen services projects
1	Grants for outreach efforts.
1	Grants, Summer Reading and Public Library Statistics
1	Grants for Children/Youth/Teens service projects

Count	Response
2	Mass Libraries Open Source Project
2	Mass Libraries Open Source project
1	On-line database licensing
1	Online Database Licensing, Summer Reading promotion, Grants for outreach efforts
14	Online database licensing
1	Online database licensing, digitization projects, grants for children/youth, advisory services
1	Online database licensing, followed by Digitization Projects
1	Online database licensing, pub lib stats collection, grants for outreach, continuing education
1	Online database licensing.
1	Online databases
1	Open Source Project; digitization projects;
1	Open source project Grants for Children's/youth/teen services projects
1	Open source project and grants for all services, including construction grants.
1	Public Library Statistics and coordination
1	Public Library Stats. If you cannot benchmark, you cannot plan.
1	Public library coordination.
2	Public library statistics collection and coordination
1	SLIN project
1	SLIN; database licensing; continuing education; MBLC website; advisory services.
1	Small Libraries in Networks, Online database licensing, Statistics
1	Small Libraries in Networks project; public library statistics; advisory services
1	Small Libraries in Networks project
1	Small libraries in Networks Projects.
1	Small Libraries in Networks, online database licensing
1	Summer Reading promotion
1	Summer Reading promotion - the importance of reading needs to be instilled when they are young.
1	Summer reading, continuing education, database licensing, advisory services
1	advisory services for libraries

Count	Response
2	consumer web portal
1	Mass Libraries Open Source project
1	on-line database licensing; summer reading promotion, small libraries in networks
1	online database licensing
1	online database licensing continuing education
1	Online databases, statistics, summer reading. I did not know website support was offered.
1	Online databases. As a state we offer far less than other states.
1	small libraries in networks grants
1	I believe that all of the above are very important. It is really difficult to choose which one has the greatest impact. The grants are always very helpful because it allows libraries to take one task and purchase materials that their budgets may not be able to support.
1	Generally, providing grants and overseeing them and providing funds for building construction and management as well as technology support.
1	Digitization projects, statistics and online database licensing in that order. I'm sorry to say I don't know what Open Source project is but if it is Evergreen, then that too is important
1	online database licensing and summer reading promotion are important to students while in or out of school
1	statistics, continuing ed, Small Libraries in Networks, summer reading, not necessarily in this order
1	Online database licensing is very helpful for our budget (!) and for our tech savvy patrons who need these resources...
1	Public library statistics collection and coordination, Advisory services for libraries, Online database licensing, Small Libraries in Networks project
1	Continuing education for librarians to keep us on the cutting edge...also any grants/services for kids because they are our future.
1	Small Libraries in Network Public Library Statistics Collection and coordination, Online Database licensing, Summer Reading Promotion, Continuing education
1	I think the Mass. Libraries Open Source project has the potential of the greatest impact in improving library services as it controls system costs and tailors a system to meet the specific needs of Mass. libraries, thereby improving service.
1	Advisory services for libraries because they educate library staff so they can provide better programs and services to the public.
1	Online database licensing Grants for Children... Grants for outreach Digitization projects Public library statistics

Count	Response
1	Online database licensing, Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.), Digitization Projects, Grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services projects, Grants for outreach efforts
1	Mass Libraries Open Source project, Small Libraries in Networks project, Public library statistics collection and coordination, Online database licensing
1	Mass libraries Open Source project, Online database licensing. What do you mean by consumer web portal?
1	Grants for outreach services to can help us increase library use to special groups. We need to increase our base beyond our regular patrons. Special groups could be teens, young parents, local government, and businesses. Outreach sometimes implies those in poverty or non-English speaking, populations which may not be part of many MA communities. Also important are continuing education institutes for staff.
1	online database licensing, advisory services for libraries, summer reading promotion, digitization projects
1	Grants for children's, youth, teen services consumer web portal continuing education workshops
1	MBLC needs to demonstrate leadership in assisting libraries in responding to the shift in the delivery of services in a 21st century environment. Given this, the above services most likely to provide the biggest bang for the buck is Mass Libraries open source project and online database licensing. We also need advisory services and training that is up to date and relevant. State aid requirements need to reflect the changing environment. Allow the programming funds, and computer purchases to be put toward the materials expenditure requirement. Given the dramatic changes in library services in the last seven years, having a 2005 space planning guide on the MBLC web site is ill advised.
1	Public library statistics collection and coordination Advisory services for libraries Continuing education
1	Advisory services for libraries, Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.), Grants for outreach efforts, Online database licensing, Summer Reading promotion
1	Online database licensing, Grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services projects, Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.)
1	Continuing education, offered in various regions of the state, with a focus on new and emerging media and the ability to market what the library has to offer in that regard.
1	Public library statistics collection and coordination, Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.)
1	For all school communities, the online databases are essential, especially at the elementary level where students are encouraged to participate online with local libraries. This is the largest audience currently missing valuable learning experiences that are directly linked to library service.
1	online database licensing summer reading promotion digitization projects grants for Children's/Youth/Teen projects

Count	Response
1	<p>Coordinated online database licensing - not split functions between MBLC, MLS and local subscriptions - would be huge improvement. We can't be promoting libraries as "all about technology" but have different groups of resources that are confusing to patrons. Where they start from makes a difference in what they know is available to them. Perhaps I'm dreaming but we need one interface to all these resources that is consistent and makes is easy for patrons to know everything available to them. This problem won't be easy to solve but it's important because it's our future. The other area that will have a huge impact is the Open Source Project. I'm in CLAMS, so not participating - yet - but I think this project is such a step forward. We can tailor the ILS to operate the way we want it to, and with more (all!) networks on the same ILS, it should certainly enhance any ILL solutions, help with one library card, etc., not to mention the budgetary impact!</p> <p>Thank you for working on this.</p>
1	Grants for outreach efforts - provides flexibility for library to choose area of need, whether it is children's/YA/seniors/disabled/unemployed/small business/ESOL/etc.
1	Advisory services for libraries, Online database licensing, Summer Reading Promotion, Grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services projects
1	Database licensing is crucial. Individual libraries often cannot afford databases on their own. Group pricing is far more practical and economical. These are resources patrons need, expect, and deserve. Providing licensing statewide also ensures access for all, preventing the creation of a group of haves and one of have-nots. We need to bridge the digital divide, not deepen it.
1	Grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services and projects Summer Reading Promotion Small Libraries in Networks project
1	Mass Libraries Open Source project - if we can get all our networks on one system and merge the organizations we would save a ton of money and finally have the statewide library card we've all wanted for years and years.
1	Advisory services for library, online database licensing, summer reading promotion, grants for outreach efforts, Open Source project
1	Online database licensing Continuing education (workshops, institutes, etc.) Summer Reading promotion
1	Public library statistics collection and coordination, advisory services, continuing education, grants for Children's/Youth/Teen services, grants for outreach efforts
1	Small Libraries in Networks project

6. Among the LSTA Grants to States program priorities are: encouraging resource sharing, fostering strategic partnerships and serving individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services. Please share any examples from your library that you believe illustrate that these kinds of activities are resulting from the services/initiatives that the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners has undertaken using LSTA funds.

Count	Response
1	All resource sharing is crucial to a library as small as Goshen
1	Consultant to the Underserved
1	Have not specifically utilized any of these.
1	Have not used.
1	Virtual Catalog and delivery system are huge for us--people love them.
1	cooperative library programs and community partnerships
1	Database support is perfect example of resource sharing.
1	huge increase in interlibrary loan
1	Students in our school being able to access the online databases in order to conduct research.
1	Outreach service delivery to homebound and patrons with disabilities was developed via an LSTA grant.
1	The virtual catalog allows scholars and researchers in my town to have access to materials from libraries across the state without having to travel to them or be a student at their institution. The Bruins partnership has generated enthusiasm for summer reading, and has encouraged kids to read more in order to try to win some of the great prizes that they offer.
1	We rely heavily on the summer reading program. We integrate the themes and use the promotional material to complement our programming. We also try to take advantage of continuing education when it is not too far to travel. In person training seems to work better for my staff, and we try to make time to do it.
1	Resource sharing is a huge need for our patrons. One even received an Emmy for his work and the library was recognized for getting the items through resource sharing.
1	LSTA grants give a library the opportunity to approach/find partners with a specific goal and purpose in mind.
1	Through LSTA funds we have provided services for individuals with differing abilities. We provide resource sharing and partner with local government and local schools and local groups such as the Historical Society. Our library and our community are much stronger as a result of LSTA funds coming to our community through our library.
1	Our newly built library is being utilized as a community center by providing traditional services along with non-traditional library services. The art gallery, the disaster center and social group gatherings have offered our community a sense of "place" while still a library.
1	Construction Grant -- the new library that will be built, with MBLC funding and local funding, will allow the library first of all to be accessible to all members of the community--so individuals who now are unable to use the library because of mobility issues will have those issues resolved. In addition, we are working on developing strategic partnerships within the community (Schools, Lions, Garden Club, etc.) to work with the

Count	Response
	Library Trustees as the project developed. Last year, we also initiated a doorstep delivery program to serve patrons in the community who find it difficult to get to the library. Given the mild winter this year, the program has been popular, but not as popular as it would be if there was more snow or ice!
1	Encouraging resource sharing - I see this as the backbone of our services today. Through our Networks, we have been able to provide patrons with access to so many more items/titles that we could possibly ever provide as a stand-alone library. As a director, I am able to use this as a talking point whenever the Finance committee or Selectmen start talking about "Regionalization"
1	We use ILL a great deal, which helps during budget crunches, as we purchase fewer books. Students in rural communities can't always get to their local public libraries. Having the ability to request books at school alleviates many issues for them.
1	I constantly form strategic partnerships in order to forward our library's strategic plan. For example, we have recently partnered with the local community center and senior housing facility to improve our services to older adults. We are also partnered with our local chamber of commerce to attract more tourism (and tax revenue) to our downtown.
1	Using LSTA fund to improve the networks increases resource sharing for all libraries by making materials easier to find and to receive (thanks to delivery)
1	An LSTA grant to Brooks Free Library allowed us to expand our VITAL - (Vision Impaired Technology Assistance at the Library) program. Our Assistive Technology Coordinator was originally funded using our State Aid to Libraries funds the year before the grant was received, and then for two years by the grant. She developed the program and curriculum and trains our volunteer tutors. We teach people with vision loss who have never before used a computer to become independent users of computers and assistive software programs. The one-on-one tutoring proceeds at the student's pace and can take 9 months to complete. This training isn't available anywhere else in southeastern Mass., even for a fee. It has a direct impact on people's lives, allowing them access to print again and independence in daily living. We had started the program before applying, but the grant enabled the program to grow and become established. We were so successful at demonstrating the value of the program to the community that we were successful at having the 6-hour Coordinator position included in our municipal budget when the grant ended - something I had not anticipated we would ever be able to do! We know of only other library in the country that provides instruction - but that is changing now. The Chicopee Public Library has now received a two year LSTA grant to set up an instructional program modeled on VITAL. We have partnered with them, providing them with our curriculum and the benefit of our experience so they don't have to develop the program from scratch. This epitomizes what an LSTA grant should do - provide the seed money to develop a program or service that has a direct impact on improving people's lives.
1	As a small library in western MA, we use ILL to the max. It is important for our patrons to have access to materials we are not able to afford, so resource sharing is vital to small libraries.
1	We used the LSTA grant, On the Same Page, to actively develop programming with local agencies. We now include these agencies in our thinking and planning all the time.

Count	Response
	This kind of cooperation helps build our support for library funding in town.
1	we had a LSTA grant that focused on teens- our teens were definitely not your typical teens and could be considered nontraditional
1	The relationship between school libraries and public libraries is a strategic partnership that I find extremely important.
1	At our high school many students do not have library cards (unbelievably) and the services we offer through MBLC allow them the same advantages as students from families who are economically, educationally and socially advanced (for want of a better word).
1	We have gotten LSTA funding for a "One Book One Barnstable" program that allowed us to partner with the 6 other village libraries of Barnstable, schools, youth organizations, the senior center, cultural organizations, bookstores, businesses, and more.
1	I had many students researching the same topic and the online database made this easy for them to do at home and still use sources that could be cited.
1	Thanks to the SLIN grants, the Leverett Library has been able to belong to C/W MARS. Even though we are one of the smallest libraries in the consortia, our patrons borrow items at one of highest per capita rates in the state (MBLC no longer provides this statistic, but for many years we were listed in the top 10 statewide; our claim to fame!). Our patrons love that we belong to CWMARS!
1	For a short time my library was decertified and my patrons were not able to borrow materials from other libraries. We were not always able to provided that materials that they requested on such a small budget. By being able to borrow materials from other libraries and resources really expands what we can offer our patrons and community.
1	Our students and faculty use the shared databases regularly and would benefit from access to more (especially a general purpose encyclopedia)
1	With an "On the Same Page" grant we were able to reach out in our community and form some wonderful partnerships that have served us well.
1	Resource sharing, especially statewide databases, has been essential to this library, which is small.
1	We have a unique historical resource in the original Community Minutes for the Hopedale Community and a complete collection of the Practical Christian newspaper. A LSTA grant provided funds for digitization for part of this collection, which made it a shared resource across the world. We have had scholars from several states and colleges visit to take advantage of the part of the collection that has not yet been digitized. This collection was a hidden asset until it was put on the web, a resource for the citizens of Massachusetts and the world.
1	Mass resource sharing has been the most successful MBLC operation in terms of direct impact on patrons. We loaned 43,000 items from other libraries last year, loans that would not have occurred or been much less timely if not for the resource sharing systems and cooperative arrangements MA has in place.

Count	Response
1	We have been the beneficiary of 3 recent LSTA grants, each of which illustrates a different priority. The Teens & Tweens Grant enabled us to serve teens (a difficult demographic for traditional library services). The Community Read and Job Seekers and libraries grants have given us the ability to partner with other local organizations, specifically local business and community groups.
1	The LSTA money going to the networks for resource sharing is very important to our users. Our users don't know about the open source program yet but if it leads to more integrated and more user friendly user interfaces it will be a great asset.
1	We use the statistics collection and coordination to illustrate market values for each library position when we discuss same with our Selectmen. We cite numbers from libraries with similar positions, similar population, and located in our part of the state. We use both beginning and experienced rate of pay for each position. This employment of the statistics certainly fosters strategic partnerships by encouraging a uniform pay scale.
1	The LSTA grants we have received have allowed us to reach out to the large ESOL population in our community and provide needed services that forged a bond between the library and these groups that have helped us create a stronger community with an educated citizenry.
1	Resource sharing is second nature at our library; we welcome all opportunities to network with other librarians, scholars, legislative leaders, and finance specialists who can assist us in doing our job - providing the best library services possible - for our community.
1	As a library director, I have been very grateful for LSTA grant opportunities that have allowed my libraries to develop services for the physically challenged/disabled, for the elderly, and for youth. Making it possible for blind people to access library materials; helping students excel in school from help in a Homework Center; bringing the library to the homebound through Outreach; encouraging citizens of all ages to be part of a community reading initiative; helping older citizens learn to use technology and communicate using social networking are all examples of grant initiatives we have implemented.
1	Our LSTA grants for children, teens, allowed for more partnering with the schools, scouts, home schooled. Community reads program led to partnering with community center for events. Homework center continues after 10 years. Delivery is the ultimate shared resource, and Evergreen will be the next big \$ saver and shared resource.
1	The Readers' Advisory Grant has helped to train Library Staff so that they are better prepared to serve patrons' RA questions. This goes back to one of the public library's basic services and since it is not taught in library school, this is the only way library staff has to get trained. The One Book/One Town Grant has helped numerous communities come together and get excited around reading.
1	Digitization: working with the BPL, our Library, SAILS, our Historical Museum and the local church are working together. (I think this is an example of two: resource sharing and strategic partnerships).
1	We have a large virtual catalog presence and spend time sending and receiving from

Count	Response
	many libraries throughout the state. We also offer a small service for our homebound patrons.
1	This library has implemented a weekly Job Seekers Network -- a new initiative under LSTA funding to create and forge new partnerships to assist the long-term unemployed actively seeking new skillsets to attract a job offer.
1	Our students use the regional system to request books and other materials as well as use the state-licensed databases. We have been able to forge a good relationship with our local public library, too.
1	Our most satisfying experience has been in the area of fostering strategic partnerships. The LSTA grant we received for One Town One Read allowed us to work with almost 20 other town partners. The collaboration has served us well and set up a pattern that we have repeated in consecutive years.
1	Summer reading shows a huge increase in circulation and need for public libraries. Program attendance is up, readership is up and improved literacy for youth leads the way for a successful student and future taxpayer.
1	On the Same Page LSTA mini grant supported the library to initiate a community-wide reading effort. Cultural partnerships were formed between the library, the historical society, the schools, local cable station, nonprofit gallery, local businesses, local faith communities, etc.
1	Our local history collections have a wealth of rare and fragile manuscript items that were unavailable to the public before extensive preservation projects were undertaken.
1	We have had several LSTA grants and always coordinate with other groups in the community. From a planning perspective it is very important to always collaborate.
1	The SLIN grant makes full membership in our regional consortium possible, so 'encouraging resource sharing.'
1	We are far more connected to other city agencies serving youth than in the past due in good part to the planning for services to Young Adults grant followed on by a grant to improve services to YAs. These programs provided training and resources to "up our game" and we did. The Parlin library now has a vibrant teen room rather than the single wall of six shelving units devoted to Young Adults that was specified when the building was renovated 20 years ago. Not only has our service to this population improved, we also have stronger connections to the schools, to the Boys and Girls Club, Joint Committee on Children's Healthcare in Everett, and charter schools as result of LSTA grants.
1	Falmouth Library partners with Falmouth Hospital to provide a cancer resource center for cancer patients and their families. The center provides monthly programming, medical database access, and links to authoritative websites, printed materials and special programs throughout the year. Library staff meets bimonthly with a doctor and a specialist from the hospital and often with a rep from the American Cancer Society to discuss activities for the year. Doctors have information in their offices regarding the Cancer Resource Center for their patients.

Count	Response
1	We've made a lot of progress in serving people with Autism, which came about as a result of an MBLC initiative, and we took the lead in training our town and library staff to provide outstanding service to people with special needs, including incorporating new ideas into routine programs, story hours, etc.
1	Our situation is unique here in Barnstable. The limit of funding available for many of these grants is \$5,000. The time and energy it takes to write and receive the funding, to have it split 7 ways among all Barnstable libraries, results in a net of \$715 each. Not enough to make much of an impact nor is it cost effective in the time it takes to secure the grant initially.
1	The creation of our Teen Advisory Board as part of the activities undertaken during our Teens and Tweens grant has resulted in developing better partnerships with the schools, and with other town service providers such as the Veteran's agent. Our TAB group also demanded that the library develop a Facebook page, which has resulted in increased communication with parents of young children and the teens themselves.
1	Resource sharing is important to all size libraries. It's critical that all libraries have an opportunity to partake fully. Grants have been very important to enable us to provide services not just to disabled people but also to people who need literacy services and assistance learning English.
1	Our library is all about strategic partnerships with groups in our community. As a low income-high needs city, all nonprofits work together towards common ends, in particular the library works collaborations around literacy, early childhood learning and ESOL.

7. If you could improve the LSTA program in Massachusetts in any way, what would that be? How would you change the program? What program or programs would you prioritize?

Count	Response
1	Assistance in writing the grants - simplify
1	Expand list of database offerings to include those lost when the area systems were disbanded.
1	Fewer Bigger Grants based on potential for impact
1	Have not used.
1	Helping the smaller libraries with resource sharing and professional assistance.
1	I am grateful for all programs and am not up to date enough to suggest changes.
1	I am happy with the LSTA program in MA!
1	I have only been in the state for 4 months so I really don't have a sense yet.
1	I really do not see any flaws in the program as it currently stands.

Count	Response
1	I think SLIN grants and Summer Reading programs are most important.
1	I think digitization programs should be prioritized.
1	I would like to see an increase in funding and a less onerous reporting process.
1	Make it easier to review examples of successful projects conducted in MA and throughout the US.
1	Make the applications simpler to complete. Make the quarterly reports simpler to complete.
1	More Money! Streamlined grant process would also be nice. Continue emphasis on group efforts.
1	More funding would obviously help!
1	More grant funding for library projects that are NON construction.
1	More programs designed to publicize/educate communities about the value of their public library.
1	Not familiar enough with the e-program to make this recommendation
1	Simplifying follow-up reporting would be desirable.
1	Use the money to help develop Open Source initiatives and develop a statewide library card.
1	Youth/Teen services, Small library grants Literacy programs
1	Youth/Teens especially
1	make some of the material more understandable to us that have not been to library school
1	net lender reimbursement should be reinstituted ASAP
1	I'm new to MA libraries so really can't answer
1	Eliminate paperwork. I was awarded a grant
1	Survey libraries in the state to see what areas they need the most help....e.g., facilitate conversation toward resolving many issues libraries are facing in dealing with e-reader services and their monopoly of the industry
1	I think the summer reading program is very important but since its start the themes and graphics seem much more appealing to librarians than to children. I cannot remember any summer that focused on things kids like: dinosaurs, machines, animals... instead we get things like music, hats, etc. I think it is a shame that every year we blow the opportunity to get kids excited about the library and reading with graphics that really speak to them.
1	More assistance staying current with the explosion of Technology - what should we be doing, how do we afford it, how can the small library implement new technologies when we do not have IT people on staff.

Count	Response
1	<p>I would definitely look at all the types of public libraries serving patrons in Massachusetts. Figure out how you can support libraries that are not purely Municipal. Provide grant opportunities that could better serve the number of patrons in these communities. Provide consulting services as part of a requirement for State Aid to Public Libraries to these libraries. Municipal libraries have a much easier time in accessing funding and support services from the MBLC. I have had wonderful success in this effort in times past. We had the opportunity to provide a community languages program with LSTA funding, and to develop young adult services and increase YA materials with LSTA funding. All of that funding went to one library, which allowed us to make a positive impact on our community.</p>
1	<p>Less paperwork. Figuring out how to have a statewide network so customers only need one card and can search one database instead of the many networks in the state. Lower the cost of belonging to a network</p>
1	<p>I think you need to start using technology. Have the grant application be online. Have the workshop for the grant be a webinar instead of having folks drive all over.</p>
1	<p>There's a real need for a coordinated state-wide digitization effort, both for hosting the data and for helping public libraries figure out how to get going with their local collections.</p>
1	<p>The LSTA grants 1. to expand aiding the most users i.e. job information, computer skills training, workshops for life skills i.e. taxes, planning for retirement, selecting health care, etc. and 2. To expand aiding the underserved in libraries.</p>
1	<p>I think the Homework Center program is a very effective initiative. It delivers a service and resource we can provide that is not as readily adaptable to computers, and therefore underlines the worth of libraries.</p>
1	<p>Please remember that libraries in Western Mass and on Cape Cod have unique situations: small communities, patrons craving a lot of books, libraries needing technical support (broadband etc.). We are able to do so much with a small amount of help.</p>
1	<p>I think the biggest bang for the buck is giving all public libraries access to statewide databases AND supporting our automated networks. In order to accomplish this I would be in favor of letting go of some grants to individual libraries.</p>
1	<p>I'm not sure, but as a new teacher-librarian, I look for anything that will enhance library experiences for my students</p>
1	<p>It should allow us to do something we could not ordinarily do within our budget-- something special with a lot of bang and impact on our community. That is why I like the category grants from the past. I really like to program-especially as a leg us in library building</p>
1	<p>Open the LISTA program to innovative ideas from libraries, do not restrict funding to forced partnerships, and/or handicapped-only services</p>
1	<p>I am not sure if I understood all the LSTA funds. This survey led me to look in to the Small Libraries in Networks grants. I thought we were not eligible but now I want to look again.</p>

Count	Response
1	Instead of offering grants to start new services/programs, offer grants to sustain current services. Targeted populations i.e. teens, seniors, with the grant we could provide services but we cannot get the town to pick up the position on payroll. The overall percentage increase for materials is a disincentive in this situation.
1	Currently, it is very time consuming to write a grant. It could be more concise so that it is less time prohibitive for libraries to apply.
1	Of course, more money would always be nice. ;-) I'd like to see more programs/opportunities for idea-sharing among medium-sized libraries.
1	Continue to support innovative programs that build on teamwork and the core of our services. I found the readers advisory program to be excellent and worth every minute. If we could borrow a snapshot of what other libraries do out there it would be excellent. I see a resurgence of the info literacy program needs with all of the e-resources out there.
1	Less reporting and paperwork. It makes small libraries reluctant to apply. More projects to fund new technologies and evolving formats in libraries, e.g. obtaining e-books as they evolve, so that staff can learn to assist patrons with the various types; grants for start-up collections of items such as videogames, Blu-ray videos; computer replacement program, especially for small libraries. More projects to fund collections and technologies for people with disabilities, non-English speakers, and 20-40 year-old age group, all are under-served.
1	I would think that workshops that have a strong impact on how to handle what libraries are experiencing right now: large numbers of patrons with new technological demands, working with tighter budgets; ways in which libraries have met these demands with reduced funds, downloadable resources and the problems meeting the demand for new titles along with library difficulties with the publishing world; the role of library consortia in this new downloadable world; and lastly changes that should be made to requirements for certification and the receipt of state aid that would be more realistic, yet still pack some punch.
1	Some of the grant categories seem to have more impact than others. For example, I see services to under-served populations being more important than community reads - often applied for and received by libraries that already know how to run successful community read programs and are just using the grant for a source of funds for that year. I'd like to see more emphasis in grants on targeted areas - conversation circles, early literacy in low income communities - addressing a real need I guess I'd say - not just nice to have programs which seem to give money to libraries in communities that already have sufficient resources. Readers Advisory grants are ones that could be considered 'nice to have', too - although it is our mission as libraries and a skill that's really lacking in most libraries/librarians (myself included). I'd like to see a more structured program developed centrally by the MBLC - a here's how you do it. Right now the library applying comes up with its own plan - and often misses the mark. A lot of it is based on having staff meetings where staff discuss particular books in a genre and use the RA tools, but it seems like if you have the expertise on staff to do that, you could do that already. While the libraries getting the grants follow the process, which I'm sure is better than nothing, I wonder about the quality of the training. It seems like there could be a curriculum, and maybe a group of advisors around that state that the MBLC

Count	Response
	provides that grant recipients could contract with to lead the process so that they learn how to do good readers' advisory from people who know how to do it well. Not a one-time workshop - but structuring the training program and leading the different monthly sessions.
1	Drop the Bruins if they're not going to award prizes that libraries have promised to youth in promoting the summer reading program. Seek out other funding sources that are more dependable. Prioritize ANY and ALL youth programs above all else. They are our future taxpayers and library supporters. We must sustain their faith in lifelong library services and resources.
1	New ideas for mini grants. Do not force grant libraries to partner with a particular entity. More grants that impact the customers of library and less about staff learning.
1	I would suggest a larger "staff" of people who can administer the grants, advise on them; we need more training- workshop opportunities. Sometimes, if you cannot make one on a particular day, you are doomed for a year or more.
1	The online database program is absolutely crucial to library operations at this time since most of us are not subscribing to individual databases. However, we need better access to database content and better promotion of what these tools are and how to use them. After all these years, we still find database use an obscure concept to the average person. Keyword access via Google?
1	I'd simplify the application and reporting process - it's a lot of work administratively and requires a huge chunk of a staff member's busy time.
1	Grants to upgrade and improve library buildings and collections to serve changing needs of the residents of MA.
1	LSTA programs in Massachusetts have traditionally been cutting edge. Before we knew we needed to provide services to the underserved LSTA was there to help us understand how to do this. Before we knew we needed to provide services for the very young and their parents LSTA programs in Massachusetts showed us the way. The MBLC staff who work with libraries on these projects help us make the magic work. Keep up the good work.
1	Library marketing is critical in the competitive information environment. Libraries need to identify services their patrons want and then develop a marketing plan. The LSTA grants need to support this kind of project. Libraries need help funding technology. LSTA funds need to be available for libraries to stay current in training and with new equipment. MBLC needs to explore resource sharing on multiple levels...statewide card, central places for physical materials, sharing electronic resources, databases, e-books, downloadable audio etc. The fragmentation of the state in terms of statewide library services is not sustainable nor is it cost effective in the long term. LSTA funds need to support resource sharing.
1	Better advisory service to libraries as they are going through the process. Need to have MBLC advisors helping staff reach their goals & budget throughout the term of the grant. Allow libraries more flexibility to create a grant based on their community's needs.
1	A focus on advocacy/marketing/community relations - with grants given to regional

Count	Response
	agencies or larger libraries that would develop materials to be used by all libraries.
1	LSTA grants should be larger. Libraries spend almost 2/3 of funds from other sources to meet the goals of the project. This makes grants less desirable in tight fiscal times. Open source, construction, resource sharing, and outreach.
1	Improve the grant review process by giving better guidelines to reviewers and reining in their negativity. I have been both a reviewer and an applicant in the last year and was appalled at the grants that were rejected or under-valued for some of the most arbitrary seeming decisions.
1	At this point having high speed connectivity is a priority for us. We have a difficult time participating in any program without it.
1	Allowing more money for grant materials. More open-ended grants. More input from librarians on types of grants. Getting rid of repetitive questions about outputs on grant applications.
1	The paperwork and staff time involved is often more effort than it's worth especially for small grants. Unless we can get over \$10,000 it is not worth staff time.
1	I would suggest that the advisors from the BLC have a firm grasp of what we do and the time it takes.
1	Review the Professional development offerings to make applicable to all members in terms of content and timing
1	I really like the way you administer the LSTA. I'd prioritize Network support, Buildings, Coordinated Digitization, databases, and education on current and upcoming trends.
1	I'd like to see both more flexibility in the program and more standardization. While these two goals might sound contradictory, they are not. Why not simplify the process for applying, by providing guidelines and outlines of services that are expected to be offered with programs that have been repeatedly offered by libraries successfully, but also allow flexibility for the libraries that are either doing open grants or newer grant programming to try out ideas, that may or may not be successful, the program could be more dynamic.
1	I find it frustrating to prepare a grant application and to have ideas that are not strictly forbidden in the guidelines, be recommended for removal or modification, because someone thinks they won't work. I think better communication and collaboration is needed between MBLC, former grant recipients and current grant applicants. A lot of bumps in the road could be worked out if even a workshop was held where current recipients discuss their successes and pitfalls with those who plan on applying for the grant in the coming year.
1	For me the aggravation level of the reports was high. I realize that the data is all required by the Federal government, but it seemed to me that it was as much paperwork for a \$7500 grant as for a \$20,000 one.
1	I would make increasing young adult services in all public libraries a priority. Middle school students (my students) are often not welcome in public libraries that are generally not prepared to deal with young teens. It would be a community service to improve this relationship.

Count	Response
1	I would put more stress on coping with the issues of new immigrants. My community is inhabited mainly by Latino people who are immigrants or first generation Americans. I would like to see libraries have the ability to better address the huge lack of sufficient literacy services for these people.
1	I would convene a panel of librarians from around the state to come up with some new mini-grant opportunities -- some of the LSTA grants have been around for a while (One Book program, Mother Goose on the Loose, etc.). I think there are some dynamic opportunities for libraries to apply for funding that could have a greater impact on their community and enhance library programs and services.
1	I think that the LSTA grant developers have done a great job in creating grant programs that target current and future needs. Obviously, it would be great to have more LSTA funds available from IMLS so that more programs could be developed. Also, funding to help MA libraries have access to better telecommunications and technology would be very helpful. We need to facilitate the user experience so that our technology is easy to use and effective so that more people will be motivated to search our catalogs and research databases.
1	Sometimes all the requirements do pile up. Libraries have fewer administrative staff to fill out all the forms, write planning documents and complete reports. Indeed one sometimes feels that all the paperwork becomes more important than the work itself. So, to improve it - keep making it easier. Example is the electronic report form for statistics is an improvement because it fills in some of the data from previous years -- now if it could only do the addition? Check to make sure forms are consistent - a little like Turbo Tax. Ah... that would be so helpful.
1	I'm not sure how I would improve it. I'd prioritize the virtual catalog, summer reading promotion, open source project and grants.
1	Keep the LSTA grants- they are very important in supporting libraries I am highly biased to focus and children and teens and especially early literacy support.
1	I would make the application process for the LSTA grants for schools and libraries easier and more streamlined.

8. Please indicate the size of the community served by your library.

Value	Count	Percent %
Fewer than 250	1	0.8%
250 - 499	5	4%
500 - 2,499	20	16%
2,500 - 9,999	37	29.6%
10,000 - 49,999	50	40%
50,000 - 99,999	6	4.8%
100,000 - 499,999	4	3.2%
500,000 or more	1	0.8%
Does not apply	1	0.8%

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

Value	Count	Percent %
Less than \$10,000	13	10.4%
\$10,000 - \$49,999	9	7.2%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	6	4.8%
\$100,000 - \$249,999	20	16%
\$250,000 - \$499,999	29	23.2%
\$500,000 - \$999,999	24	19.2%
\$1 million - \$ 3 million	16	12.8%
More than \$ 3 million	4	3.2%
Don't Know/Not Sure	4	3.2%

APPENDIX D - List of Acronyms and Terms

FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
ILL	Interlibrary Loan
ILS	Integrated Library System
IMLS	Institute of Museum and Library Services http://www.ims.gov
LSTA	<p>Library Services and Technology Act - LSTA is part of the Museum and Library Services Act, which created the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and established federal programs to help libraries and museums serve the public. The LSTA sets out three overall purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promote improvements in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States.• Facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; and• Encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public. <p>The LSTA Grants to States program is a federal-state partnership. The Program provides funds using a population-based formula, described in the LSTA, to each state and the territories through State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs).</p>
MBLC	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners http://mblc.state.ma.us/
SLAA	State Library Administrative Agency
SPR	State Program Report. An annual report filed by the SLAA with IMLS describing activities under the LSTA Grants to States program.

Appendix E - Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

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

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

Manjarrez, C., L. Langa, K. Miller. (2009). *A Catalyst for Change: LSTA Grants to States Program: Activities and the Transformation of Library Services to the Public*. (IMLS-2009-RES-01). Institute of Museum and Library Services. Washington, D.C.

Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners. (2007) *Library Services and Technology Act Massachusetts Long Range Plan 2008-2012*. Boston.

Miller, K., Swan, D., Craig, T., Dorinski, S., Freeman, M., Isaac, N., O'Shea, P., Schilling, P., Scotto, J., (2011). *Public Libraries Survey: Fiscal Year 2009* (IMLS-2011-PLS-02). Institute of Museum and Library Services. Washington, DC

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

See also Appendix D (List of Acronyms and Terms) for links to websites reviewed.

APPENDIX F - Summary of Coding Used in Qualitative Analyses

The chart below includes coding of one set of qualitative data:

- Descriptive codes come from responses to four open-ended questions included in the online survey, completed by 124 individuals. These comments did not yield any negative statements.
 - Q2: Briefly tell us about the impact that your highest ranked service(s) has had in YOUR library.
 - Q5: Which of the services or initiatives listed has the greatest POTENTIAL for improving library services in Massachusetts? Explain why.

	<i>Survey Open-end Responses</i>	
	<i>Q2</i>	<i>Q5</i>
<i>Descriptive Codes</i>	+	+
Sub-grants/open grants	45	32
Statewide database licenses	29	38
Public library statistics	19	19
Advisory services (directors, trustees, Friends, outreach, construction)	13	19
Summer reading program	12	18
Virtual catalog	9	
Continuing education	7	27
Telecommunications	2	
Communications (e-mail, newsletter)	5	
Small libraries in networks	4	15
Open source integrated library system	2	15
MBLC website	2	5
Authentication/geolocation	2	
Digitization	1	10
Disaster preparation/emergency assistance	1	
Preservation	1	

APPENDIX G – Research Instruments

Massachusetts LSTA Interview Questions

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

Major programs and initiatives that currently receive LSTA funds in Massachusetts include access to licensed databases, consulting services to libraries, continuing education and training for library staff, MBLC website support, statistical data collection and analysis, support for the summer reading program, disaster preparedness services. Massachusetts also provides many smaller grants to individual libraries through a competitive grant program.

LSTA "Grants to States" funding for Massachusetts has decreased from more than \$3.5 million in FY 2010 to just over \$3.3 million in FY2011 as total Federal funding for the program has been reduced.

1. Have any of the major LSTA-funded programs or jointly-supported (State and Federal dollars) had a significant impact on your library?
 - a. In what ways is your library better able to serve the public because of this program or initiative?
 - b. In what ways are you as a library director/library staff member/other better able to serve the public?
2. Many of the activities of Board of Library Commissioners such as consulting services, collection and analysis of library statistics and continuing education would not be possible without LSTA support. In what ways do these activities of the Board of Library Commissioners make a difference to your library?
 - a. What is the impact of consulting services offered by MBLC on your library? What about continuing education services?
3. One of the ways that LSTA has had an impact on libraries over the years has been in fostering innovation? Where does innovation "live" in Massachusetts libraries? How do new efforts or initiatives get started? Does LSTA play a role?
4. Have specific improvements or advances in library services taken place in the last five years that you believe are largely attributable to the availability of LSTA funding? What are the most important things that would NOT have been accomplished if LSTA funding had not been provided?
5. The LSTA "Grants to States" program purposes highlight activities that improve access to library services, increase resource sharing activity, reach out to individuals with special needs and build strategic partnerships. To what extent do you believe Massachusetts' implementation of the program has furthered these purposes?