

**Utah State Library**  
**Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five-Year Plan 2008-2012**  
**Formal Evaluation Executive Summary**

**GOAL I:**

Increase the ability of Utah's libraries to provide quality information services and resources to their patrons by providing access to Internet-based educational, recreational, and informational resources, and by providing materials available from other libraries.

**Target 1: This target was met.**

Usage of Public Pioneer resources will increase by 25% at the end of 2012.

**Target 2: This target was partially met, and should have been revised as environmental factors changed.**

Five percent increase from 2008-2012 in the number of materials loaned from Utah libraries to other Utah libraries (Interlibrary Loan – ILL) or to customers in other jurisdictions.

**Target 3: This target was met.**

Ninety percent of public libraries using State Library ILL services will report they are satisfied with the service by 2012.

**Target 4: This target was met.**

Eighty percent of library users surveyed who have used *Public Pioneer* will report that it provides them with resources and information they are unable to obtain from their library's shelves or from the free Internet.

**GOAL II:**

Support the diffusion of library resources, services, and information via the Internet, providing public access to unique historical materials related to Utah.

**Target 1: This target was met.**

Twenty five percent increase from 2008-2012 in the number of public libraries having a website with an online public catalog (there were 33 in 2007); target is 50 in 2012).

**Target 2: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

Ten percent increase in the number of materials digitized with LSTA funds from 2008-2012.

**Target 3: This target was partially met based on incomplete measurement data.**

Ninety percent of libraries will report through customer survey that the use of their online catalog and other Internet-based services has proven successful.

**Target 4: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

Twenty percent increase in the number of uses/accesses of images digitized with LSTA funds from 2008-2012.

### **GOAL III:**

Enable Utah's libraries to maintain an up-to-date and robust technology infrastructure in order to assure that Utahans can access networked information efficiently and effectively through their libraries.

#### **Target 1: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

The percent of sub-grant applications received that are from first-time grant applicants will increase 10% each year from 2008-2012.

#### **Target 2: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

An additional 15% of grant evaluations will incorporate outcome based evaluation (OBE) measures each year from 2008-2012.

#### **Target 3: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

Grantees will spend an amount equal to at least 20% of their LSTA mini-grant each round from 2008-2012.

### **GOAL IV:**

Serve targeted populations in Utah that require customized assistance in accessing library and information services and materials by assisting Utah's libraries to acquire special equipment, hardware and/or software, to build collections in customized formats or in languages other than English, or to offer customized training opportunities, in-house or outreach programs.

#### **Target 1: This target was met.**

Integrate annually through 2010 four to six public libraries into the "Services for Spanish-speakers Project."

#### **Target 2: This target was not met, and should have been revised when it was recognized as ambiguous and ineffective.**

Two percent annual increase in the number of qualifying individuals served. **Target 3: This target was partially met based on incomplete measurement data and revised measurement techniques.**

There will be a 5% increase in the annual circulation of blind library materials. **Target 4: This target was partially met based on incomplete measurement data and revised measurement techniques.**

The number of bookmobile customers will increase by 10% annually.

#### **Target 5: This target was partially met based on incomplete measurement data and revised measurement techniques.**

The number of public libraries that offer a Young Adult summer reading program will increase by 10% annually.

#### **Target 6: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

The number and percentage of staff who report knowing more about emergent literacy as a result of participating in a Utah Kids Ready to Read (UKRTR) workshop.

#### **Target 7: This target was met during the period that the program was in effect, and should have been revised when it was unfunded.**

The percentage of libraries that have integrated UKRTR skills into their children's programming as a result of training will increase by 40% by 2012.

**Utah State Library**  
**Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five-Year Plan 2008-2012**  
**Formal Evaluation Additional Projects**

Due to the primarily external focus of the Formal Evaluation, these internal, special partnership and pilot projects were not included by Amigos in the formal evaluation report. These deserve recognition in order to more fully demonstrate the applications and accomplishments achieved through LSTA funding. More specific outcomes will be reported in the annual SPR.

**GOAL I:**

Increase the ability of Utah's libraries to provide quality information services and resources to their patrons by providing access to Internet-based educational, recreational, and informational resources, and by providing materials available from other libraries.

**Salt Lake County Library Services Database Pilot - \$72,000**

Description: Salt Lake County Library Services is providing business resources through *Reference USA* to all public library patrons in Utah during a one-year pilot project to gauge utility of these resources for use by library patrons statewide.

Outcomes: Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**GOAL III:**

Enable Utah's libraries to maintain an up-to-date and robust technology infrastructure in order to assure that Utahans can access networked information efficiently and effectively through their libraries.

**ILS Consortium Pilot - \$20,000.00**

Description: Make available shared library services more accessible for the patrons in Northern Cache County.

Outcomes: In this pilot project, participants demonstrated change of behavior among the four libraries by working together as a partnership and collaborating in problem-solving. The staff of the four libraries have new knowledge of ILS systems, consortiums, and grant projects. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**GOAL IV:**

Serve targeted populations in Utah that require customized assistance in accessing library and information services and materials by assisting Utah's libraries to acquire special equipment, hardware and/or software, to build collections in customized formats or in languages other than English, or to offer customized training opportunities, in-house or outreach programs.

**Program for the Blind and Disabled - \$473,401 (2008 – ongoing)**

Description: Utah Library for the Blind and Disabled has expanded to serve over 12,412 patrons in Utah and Wyoming with cassette, large print, and Braille service. Additionally, nineteen states (Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Wyoming) contract for Braille service.

Outcomes: Utah State Library for the Blind and Disabled has successfully made it possible for more patrons to be served and to engage in reading activities Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**Program for the Blind & Disabled – Support - \$579,113 (2008 – ongoing)**

Description: Utah Library for the Blind and Disabled staff provide efficient and effective customer library services to over 12,412 patrons in Utah and Wyoming.

Outcomes: Blind and Disabled Library customers have increased access to library materials, and reference and readers advisory through the Utah Library for the Blind and Disabled staff. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**Blind and Disabled Warehouse Automation Project - \$401,788 (2008 – ongoing)**

Description: Utah State Library for the Blind and Disabled provides library services to eligible blind, visually and print impaired, and physically disabled individuals living in the State of Utah. This project will modernize the USL warehouse by introducing automated technology into circulation operations. Automation will create efficiencies in workflows, speed processing and reduce manual processing errors.

Outcomes: Automation is increasing the accuracy and maximizing the efficient processing of materials, and automation will facilitate shelf planning and inventory management. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**Bookmobile Collection Development Project - \$598,326 (2008 – present)**

Description: This project was developed to increase the depth and breadth of the library materials collections for the Mobile Library (bookmobile) program. More current published materials for children, teens and adults enhanced collections. Items covered a wide variety of topics in both fiction and non-fiction genres, and in multiple formats.

Outcomes: Expanded collections provide increased access to more current informational, educational and recreational materials for ML customers. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**Bookmobile Technology Upgrade Project - \$23,657 (2008 – present)**

Description: This project was developed to increase information access to bookmobile customers through up-to-date technology and Internet access. Laptop computers were purchased with LSTA funds. iPads were purchased for bookmobiles in 2010-11 as part of a pilot program, and staff were trained on information access, and patron assistance.

Outcomes: Bookmobile patrons have increased access to digital informational, educational and recreational resources through current technology. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

**Teens Read/Books for Incarcerated Teens - \$22,650 (2008 to present)**

Description: This project was developed to provide books for teens who are incarcerated at three juvenile detention centers. Books for Incarcerated Teens is a collaborative project of USL and the Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services

Outcomes: The incarcerated teens have changed their attitudes towards reading and library services. Reports indicate that teens who use the library services show increased positive behaviors. Specific outcomes will be included in the SPR.

# **Utah State Library**

## ***Library Services and Technology Act***

### ***Five-Year Plan 2008-2012***

### ***Evaluation Report***

**Prepared by  
Amigos Library Services  
14400 Midway Road  
Dallas, TX 75244**

#### **Consultant Team Members:**

Hon. Robert S. Martin, Ph.D., Independent Consultant  
Dr. Florence Mason, F. Mason and Associates  
Mr. Steve Brown, North Richland Hills Public Library  
Ms. Maribel Castro, Coronado High School Library  
Ms. Bonnie Juergens, Amigos Library Services

**April 4, 2012**

**Ms. Donna Jones Morris, Director,  
Utah State Library Division**

## Table of Contents

	Page
Evaluation Summary	2
• Major questions addressed in the Evaluation	2
• Methodologies employed to address the major questions	2
• Key findings relating to Question 1: Goal Achievement	2
○ Goal I Achievement	3
○ Goal II Achievement	3
○ Goal III Achievement	3
○ Goal IV Achievement	4
• Key findings relating to Question 2: Measures	5
• Key findings relating to Question 3: Most valuable programs	5
• Key Recommendations	5
Background of the Study	7
Methodology employed	8
Evaluation findings	10
• Introduction	10
• Goal I Achievements	12
○ LSTA Purposes	12
○ Conclusions Relating to Goal I	13
• Goal II Achievements	15
○ LSTA Purposes	15
○ Conclusions Relating to Goal II	16
• Goal III Achievements	17
○ LSTA Purposes	17
○ Conclusions Relating to Goal III	18
• Goal IV Achievements	19
○ LSTA Purposes	19
○ Conclusions Relating to Goal IV	21
• Use of Evaluation Measures	22
• Key Recommendations	24
• Conclusions	24
Annexes	
1. List of acronyms	8. Planning Retreat agenda
2. List of people interviewed	9. LSTA Five-Year Plan 2008-2012
3. Focus Group questions	
4. Survey instruments (4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D)	
5. Survey responses (5-A, 5-B, 5-C, 5-D)	
6. Combined survey responses	
7. Bibliography of all documents reviewed	

## Evaluation Summary

### **Major questions addressed in the Evaluation**

Question 1: Were the goals established for the current Utah State Library (USL) Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five-Year Plan met? (See Annex 1: List of Acronyms)

Question 2: Were adequate output and outcome measures established, tabulated or collected, and made available for evaluation processes?

Question 3: What programs are considered by library decision-makers and program participants to be of highest priority in planning for future USL LSTA programs?

### **Methodologies employed to address the major questions**

The plan for evaluating the Utah State Library's (USL) current Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five-Year Plan consisted of the following activities:

- A background review of plans, statistics, and other information obtained from the USL staff members involved in the administration and distribution of LSTA funding during the current USL LSTA Five Year Plan period (2008-2012)
- On-site interviews by members of the Amigos Library Services (Amigos) Consultant Team with USL staff members to review background information
- Focus group sessions with representatives (library directors, staff, trustees) from public, academic, K-12, and special libraries regarding their experience and opinions of USL LSTA-funded programs and the impact of those programs on their libraries and library users
- Design, distribution, and analysis of an online survey of all LSTA-recipient libraries
- A one-day Planning Retreat hosted by USL, conducted by the Consultant Team, and attended by leaders from 25 LSTA-recipient institutions

The focus group information received is qualitative, consisting of narrative, opinion and anecdote. It provides very useful and heuristic descriptions of the perceptions of the value and quality of the services provided by USL under the LSTA programs. The survey data received is both quantitative and qualitative information. The quantitative data from the surveys is categorical data, mostly limited to nominal and ordinal data types. The qualitative data is opinion and anecdote. The focus group data supplements and enriches the survey-based information.

The comparison of survey and focus group data demonstrates that the results are consistent and congruent. The Consultant Team therefore feels that the data collected accurately reflects the opinion and experience of the USL LSTA funds recipient population. The consistency of results from both data gathering methods shows that many of the services provided by USL under the LSTA program are used heavily; are perceived to be extremely important; are highly valued by both library professionals and the public; and are seen to be of high quality.

### **Key findings relating to the goals established for the current USL LSTA Five-Year Plan and whether they were met (Question 1):**

In year two (2009) of the 2008-2012 USL LSTA Five-Year Plan, due to financial concerns, USL revised the goal targets and programs to focus on programs which were deemed to have the greatest statewide services impact. Sub-grant programs were basically discontinued. USL is to be commended for having the clarity of vision to recognize that a change was needed. Thus the resulting inability to achieve certain original targets was due to a planned change in strategy on the part of USL. In most cases, the associated targets were achieved or exceeded during the short funding period in which they were supported. This report includes achievement statements about the original goals, as required by IMLS, but also reports achievements that preceded the planned change in strategy introduced by USL. This summary describes

original goals achievement as measured by defined targets at a high level; details are in the body of the report on pages 12-22.

**Goal I** is to “*Increase the ability of Utah’s libraries to provide quality information services and resources to their patrons by providing access to Internet-based educational, recreational, and informational resources, and by providing materials available from other libraries.*” Four targets were identified to measure success in accomplishing Goal I. *Pioneer: Utah’s Online Library* is the primary program utilized to meet Goal I; an output target relating to usage was established and met. An outcome measure relating to satisfaction by users of electronic content supplied through *Pioneer* was also met. User satisfaction with the results of interlibrary lending was a second outcome target, and this target was exceeded. An increase in the number of materials loaned among Utah libraries was the second output target identified to measure achievement; this target as defined was not met. However, this may represent a positive rather than negative situation if the reduction in borrowing is based on the rapid transition to digital resources (especially related to use of Pioneer electronic resources) and/or improvement in local collections to meet the needs of local users. Such a decline corresponds to a national trend but the reasons for the decline should be explored as part of USL’s new five-year Plan. Thus, of four targets set relating to Goal I, three were met and one was not met for reasons that may be positive.

As described above, USL has been very successful in implementing Goal I, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

1. Expand services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.
2. Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks.
3. Provide electronic and other linkages between and among all types of libraries.

**Goal II** is to “*Support the diffusion of library resources, services, and information via the Internet, providing public access to unique historical materials related to Utah.*” Four targets were identified to measure success in accomplishing Goal II. One output target was to increase the number of public libraries having a website with an online public catalog; this target was surpassed. A corresponding outcome target was related to successful use of online networked tools by library users. No customer survey data is available but usage statistics for *Pioneer* indicate success by library users in utilizing electronic information tools. A second output target was related to increasing the number of information resources digitized and made available for networked access and a corresponding outcome target was related to an increase in usage of materials digitized with LSTA funds. These targets were being met prior to cessation of the digitization-related sub-grant program, but could not be met without continued funding. Thus, of four targets originally set, two targets have been met but, due to program suspension, the other two targets have not been met as of March, 2012.

As described above, USL was initially completely successful and overall has been partially successful in achieving Goal II, which is related to LSTA purposes 1-3 above plus:

4. Develop public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations.

Sharing the cost of certain electronic content in the *Pioneer* program and helping to seed a state-based digitization effort that has become self-sustaining are two examples of partnering employed by USL to leverage the value of LSTA funding. Such partnering programs are described in more detail on page 15.

**Goal III** is to “*Enable Utah’s libraries to maintain an up-to-date and robust technology infrastructure in order to assure that Utahns can access networked information efficiently and effectively through their libraries.*” One output target and two outcome targets were identified to measure success in accomplishing Goal III. The three targets were related to sub-grants to individual libraries for the purpose

of upgrading and acquiring technology. These targets were being met prior to cessation of the technology sub-grant program, but could not be met without continued funding. Thus, due to program suspension that was part of a planned change in strategy by USL, the three targets that were originally set have not been met as of March, 2012.

As described above, USL was initially successful in achieving Goal III, which is related to LSTA purposes 1-3 above. Targets for the full Plan period were not met due to suspension of the sub-grant programs.

The directed sub-grant programs are very popular and serve to meet specifically-targeted technology and service goals relating to LSTA purposes. But, as resources become fewer and harder to obtain, most survey respondents agree that maintaining and enhancing the *Pioneer* program is a higher priority.

**Goal IV** is to *serve targeted populations in Utah that require customized assistance in accessing library and information services and materials by assisting Utah's libraries to acquire special equipment, hardware and/or software, to build collections in customized formats or in languages other than English, or to offer customized training opportunities, in-house or outreach programs.* Seven targets were identified to measure success in accomplishing Goal IV. The first output target was related to adding public libraries into the "Services for Spanish-speakers Project." This target has been met through March 2012. A second output target to increase the number of qualifying individuals served by the library for the blind was consistently and strongly exceeded. A third output target was related to increasing the annual circulation of blind library materials. This target has been exceeded during the three most recently completed years of the program. A fourth output target was related to increasing the number of bookmobile customers; this target has been met during the most recently completed year of the program. The fifth output target defines an increase in the number of public libraries that offer a Young Adult summer reading program. This target has been partially met; necessary data to determine consistency of target achievement are not available. Two outcome targets relating to the *Utah Kids Ready to Read* program have not been documented as met through March 2012 due to a combination of early program suspension and very recent resumption of program activities. Thus, of seven targets, two have been consistently met or exceeded and five have been documented as being partially met (two showing recent strong performance and three with inadequate documentation to determine full achievement at this time.)

As described above, USL was partially successful in implementing Goal IV, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

5. Target 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.
6. Target 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 number of programs represent efforts by USL to meet goals that extend library services to specialized audiences (Spanish- and Navajo-speakers; residents in rural or remote locations; residents with special needs; and seniors). Most of these programs were funded through sub-grants, an approach that was suspended as part of a planned change in strategy by USL. If strengthening state-wide services to these diverse constituencies is a continuing goal, these programs may benefit from further analysis, which may result in redesign and/or expansion.

**Key findings relating to the establishment, collection, tabulation, and availability of adequate output and outcome measures for evaluation purposes (Question 2):**

In general, adequate output and outcome measures were established, collected, and tabulated for targets in programs conducted prior to program revision (cessation). Adequate measures were employed for all programs not modified mid-plan. Before key programs relating to sub-grants were suspended, library participants obtained and reported output and outcome data that helped USL understand the value of these programs. For example, the sub-grant recipients conducted surveys among library users regarding equipment provision. Output and outcome measures for sub-grant projects demonstrated that library users reported a positive change in attitude in their use of provided equipment.

Survey respondents were asked to reflect on whether any USL LSTA-funded programs have had a positive impact on the users of their libraries. A resounding 94% responded positively, with only one respondent answering “No” and one more indicating “Don’t Know”.

**Key findings relating to high-priority programs for future USL LSTA programs (Question 3):**

*Pioneer* is highly valued, utilized, and needed. This program should receive priority funding in the next five-year plan and the services and content should be enhanced and expanded. Continuing Education (CE) continues to be a priority for Utah libraries and for USL. Because of IMLS guidelines there were no output or outcome measures formulated for training in the current Plan, but accomplishment of many of the goals depended upon adequate knowledge transfer for library personnel throughout the state. Also, survey data indicates the Utah library community recognizes the ongoing need for training. USL’s current practice of conducting pre- and post-testing for training related to most programs should be continued and possibly expanded in the next Five-Year Plan.

## Key Recommendations

1. *Pioneer* is highly valued, utilized, and needed. This program should receive priority funding classification in the next five-year plan and the services and content should be enhanced and expanded. Further, this electronic distribution of information should continue to be supplemented by inter-library sharing of paper documents to expand all Utah residents’ access to information.
2. Various project and one-time grants to library agencies throughout the state are deemed important but subordinate in importance to the *Pioneer* program. Under the current restrictive financial conditions, the sub-grant programs should be prioritized and distribution of sub-grants should be tightly defined by specific criteria related to demonstrable “best practices” or “replication” beyond benefit to individual institutions.
3. Training staff members in Utah libraries remains a key strategy for increasing awareness and use of the *Pioneer* program. Informal verbal input from librarians suggests that marketing *Pioneer* as a statewide program as was undertaken during a previous five-year plan period, rather than at the local level, may result in expanded visibility that leads to heavier usage levels.
4. Exploding population growth is creating many demands. If strengthening state-wide services to diverse constituencies is a continuing goal, related programs will benefit from further analysis, possible redesign and/or expansion, and clear performance metrics.
5. Consistency and uniformity in outcome-based measures of success can be strengthened in subsequent USL LSTA Plans by clearly defining each measure and the ways in which measurement skills will be transferred to participants, and perhaps building in incentives.

6. All goals must be prioritized to establish and share expectations for responding to environmental changes, particularly relating to funding or program change requirements.
7. Major revisions to current Plan goals occurred early in the Plan cycle and resulted in the cessation of key programs. Such strategic changes should, in the future, be communicated to IMLS as part of the revision process. Clear statements about revised goals/targets/programs should be incorporated into the Plan records. Any cessation of programs should be urgently followed by usage, impact, and evaluation data-gathering while program activities are still fresh in the respondents' minds.
8. Incorporate into the next Plan a mechanism for periodic (perhaps annual) review of the Plan and, as stated above, document both locally and with IMLS any needed changes.

## **Background of the Study**

This report discusses the results of the State-wide program evaluation to determine the effectiveness of USL's current LSTA Five Year Plan. Participants in the evaluation process include USL, the Utah library community, and users of Utah libraries that participate in USL LSTA-funded programs. This evaluation fulfills an IMLS requirement and will be used by USL to assess the use and impact of the 2008-2012 LSTA Five-year Plan programs. It will provide a framework and direction for setting the goals and defining the programs of USL's next Five-Year LSTA Plan for the Utah library community. It will also be used by members of that community to understand the accomplishments of the current Plan and the ways in which current Plan activities impact planning for the next five-year Plan.

Major questions addressed in the Evaluation included the following:

- Question 1: Were the goals established for the current USL LSTA Five-Year Plan met?
- Question 2: Were adequate output and outcome measures established, tabulated or collected, and made available for evaluation processes?
- Question 3: What programs are considered by library decision-makers and program participants to be of highest priority in planning for future USL LSTA programs?

USL issued a Request for Proposal (MP 11059) in June 2011 for a formal evaluation of the programs and goals in *Utah State Library Division's Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan: 2008-2012*, "to determine which are still valid in today's environment; which should be continued or maintained as a transition to the new priorities; and which should be discontinued." Amigos Library Services was the successful bidder to provide these services. The proposed evaluation of current services was the first phase of a two-phase study to conduct the evaluation and prepare a new five-year plan for USL.

The study began in August 2011, with conference call meetings among USL staff and members of the Consultant Team for early-stage planning. The Consultant Team made a live online presentation to members of the Utah State Library Board on August 29, 2011. On October 3-5, 2011, an on-site visit was made by the consultant Team to obtain data and interview the Utah State Library Director and the LSTA Study team composed of Utah State Library staff members and members of the LSTA Advisory Committee.

Off site, the Consultant Team reviewed background documents. (See Annex 7: Bibliography of All Documents Reviewed) The evaluation process was developed following review of the IMLS document *Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation*, which presents a set of research questions to help researchers identify effective past practices as well as develop key findings and recommendations to influence the next five-year planning cycle.

The Consultant Team conducted focus groups on-site across the state during the period November 14-17, 2011 with 38 participants attending sessions in the South Utah region (Cedar City/St. George); South Central and Southeast Utah region (Richfield/Salina); North Utah region (Logan/Ogden); and Central Utah region (Salt Lake City/Orem/Provo). The online evaluation survey was distributed on November 23, 2011 to 100% of the public, school (K-12), academic and special library recipients of LSTA funding for services and programs. (See Annex 4: Survey Instruments and annex 5: Survey Responses) On December 30, 2011, the Consultant Team submitted to USL a report summarizing the design, execution and analysis of the results of the online survey and results from the focus group interviews.

After review and feedback from USL staff and the LSTA Study Team concerning the initial survey and focus group findings report, the Consultant Team prepared this written evaluation of the USL LSTA Five-Year Plan for 2008-2012.

## **Methodology Employed**

The plan for evaluating the Utah State Library's (USL) current LSTA Five-Year Plan consisted of the following activities:

- A background review of information such as the previous LSTA Five-Year Plan and its third-party evaluation; USL staff reports and program performance data; training materials and evaluations from Utah library workers who attended continuing education events; reports of program outcomes as shared by library users; previous questionnaires; reports from LSTA grant recipients regarding LSTA grant programs; and other relevant information collected by USL over the course of the five-year plan period. (See Annex 7)
- On-site interviews by members of the Consultant Team with USL staff members to discuss the program history and review background information
- Library leaders from all four types of libraries were invited to attend focus group sessions with the Consultant Team. The nine sessions were conducted with representatives (library directors, staff, trustees) from public, academic, and special libraries regarding their experience with USL LSTA-funded programs and the impact of those programs on their libraries and library users.
- Design, distribution, and analysis of an online survey of key players from all libraries identified by USL staff as being LSTA-funds-recipient institutions
- A one-day Planning Retreat hosted by USL, conducted by the Consultant Team, and attended by leaders from 25 LSTA-funds-recipient institutions

### **Focus Groups and Surveys: Process**

During the period November 14-17, 2011, the Amigos Consultant Team conducted a series of focus group meetings. Nine focus group meetings were held in widely dispersed localities throughout Utah. Two of these meetings (Moab and Price) were conducted by a single member of the Consultant Team serving as a facilitator. Two of the meetings (Cedar City and Richfield) were conducted by two members of the Consultant Team serving as facilitators. In the remaining five meetings (Provo, Ogden, Logan and two in Salt Lake City), three of the Consultant Team members were present and served as facilitators. All of the meetings included one staff member of the Utah State Library serving as a resource person. The members of the Consultant Team took copious notes of these discussions. All of the meetings were also recorded; unfortunately, the recordings varied in quality and usability.

Prior to the scheduled focus group sessions, USL solicited participation in the evaluation process through informal communications with LSTA recipients, scheduled meetings with the USL Advisory Board and the members of the LSTA Advisory Committee (currently inactive), as well as distribution of a flyer and electronic distribution of a memo inviting participation. All efforts were taken to encourage key individuals from the Utah public, academic, K-12, and special library communities to provide input about the value of the current USL LSTA Five-Year Plan.

Thirty-eight individuals from the Utah library community participated in focus group discussions. Attendance and participation in these meetings varied widely, from a single individual in one meeting (Richfield) to as many as 11 (Logan). The participants included public library directors and service specialists (e.g., reference, children's services, and AV librarians), as well as members of public library boards and faculty from institutions of higher education. No members of the K-12 library community participated in the focus groups. Although participants included representatives of academic and special

libraries, the focus groups were predominantly representative of the public library community. (See Annex 2: List of People Interviewed)

Consultant Team members used a structured set of questions (see Annex 3: Focus Group Questions) to guide Focus Group discussion and to ensure that all relevant topics were addressed. The development of the questions was informed in part by the Output and Outcome Measures in the Utah State Library's Five-Year Plan and the Institute of Museum and Library Services Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation. USL staff members also provided input and suggestions to the focus group question script. While focus group participants were asked specific questions, the discussions in each of the focus groups frequently included information on a wider range of topics and concerns beyond the scope of the prepared questions. The Consultant Team typically found the respondents in the meetings engaged, animated, and eager to share their views.

The Consultant Team also developed and administered online surveys devised to collect data describing perceptions about services provided by USL under the LSTA program. The survey questions referenced the Output and Outcome Measures in the Utah State Library's Five-Year Plan and the IMLS guidelines. Four different surveys were developed, targeted at the public, school (K-12), academic, and special sectors of the library community. During October and November, 2011, the survey instruments were developed by the Consultant Team and reviewed by USL staff members. In mid-November, the revised survey instruments were field-tested by selected staff members of USL and members of the Consultant Team.

The objective of the survey was to obtain information from library staff members at libraries that participated in LSTA-funded programs during the current five year Plan. USL communicated with each of the libraries and encouraged staff knowledgeable about the library's participation in the funded programs to respond. The Consultant Team furthered this process by developing accurate e-mail contact information for each targeted recipient.

Several days in advance of the survey, a preliminary e-mail notice was distributed to 100% of the relevant audience, i.e., every library identified by USL as having participated in one or more LSTA-funded programs in the current Five-year Plan. The e-mail alerted recipients to the pending arrival of an important survey and solicited the recipients' participation.

The surveys were distributed by email from Amigos in Dallas, Texas, on November 23, 2011. The survey distribution consisted of an email message that described the purpose of the survey and provided detailed instructions along with a link to the actual survey instrument. Responses were requested by December 7, 2011. Annex 4 contains the four survey instruments and the cover memo that introduced the online survey. Recipients totaled 65 individuals, as follows:

- 27 representing public libraries
- 29 representing the K-12 sector
- 5 representing the academic library community
- 4 representing special libraries

Response rates for the four surveys ranged from 25% to 60%, as follows:

- 15 public libraries, a response rate of 56%
- 17 school libraries, a response rate of 59%
- 3 academic libraries, a response rate of 60%
- 1 special library, a response rate of 25%

The surveys were conducted using SurveyPro software licensed by Amigos. The results were tabulated and collated by Amigos staff with expertise in conducting such data-gathering operations. The detailed results of the four surveys are provided in Annex 5.

While the recipient groups were small, they were 100% of the participating libraries as reported by USL. Response rates for each library type were over 50% with the exception of the special library community. This survey should be viewed as a “census” of the population rather than a sample of only a portion of the population. Statistically valid responses were obtained and the Consultant Team considers the response rates to be good for such targeted surveys. Annex 6 contains a summary of the combined (four library types) findings from the survey responses.

### **Focus Groups and Surveys: Results**

The focus group information received is qualitative, consisting of narrative, opinion and anecdote. It provides very useful and heuristic descriptions of the perceptions of the value and quality of the services provided by USL under the LSTA programs.

The survey data received is both quantitative and qualitative information. The quantitative data from the surveys is categorical data, mostly limited to nominal and ordinal data types. The qualitative data is opinion and anecdote. The focus group data supplements and enriches the survey-based information.

The comparison of survey and focus group data demonstrates that the results are consistent and congruent with one another. The Consultant Team therefore feels that the data collected accurately reflects the opinion and experience of the USL LSTA-funds-recipient population.

Furthermore, the consistency of results from both data gathering methods shows that many of the services provided by USL under the LSTA program are used heavily; are perceived to be extremely important; are highly valued by both library professionals and the public; and are seen to be of high quality.

## **Evaluation Findings**

### **Introduction**

The Utah State Library LSTA Five-year Plan, 2003-2007: Evaluation Report, on page 19, concluded the following:

...too many Output/Outcome targets were established for too many of the Utah State Library's activities...In future, it would be wiser and more productive to be focused and disciplined in identifying objectives within each goal, and in establishing relevant output/outcome targets... Efforts at planning and evaluation should be made in areas of strategic importance to the State Library and the Utah library community. Finally, the processes for collecting the data required to make a useful evaluation of progress must be well thought out, and they must be established early in the planning process."

This advice is reflected in the current Plan by the establishment of four rather than six Goals and clearly associated output and outcome targets. The Goals reflect the advice of previous program reviewers to strengthen the technology infrastructure programs at local libraries; this was accomplished via sub-grant programs relating to technology. However, early in the current Plan cycle and due to significant changes in the economic environment statewide, USL revised the goal targets and programs to focus on programs which were deemed to have the greatest statewide services impact. Sub-grant programs were basically discontinued. USL is to be commended for having the clarity of vision to recognize that a change was needed. Thus, inability to achieve certain original targets was due to a planned change in strategy on the

part of USL. In most cases, the associated targets were achieved or exceeded during the short funding period in which they were supported. This report includes achievement statements about the original goals, as required by IMLS, but also reports achievements that preceded the planned change in strategy introduced by USL.

USL leadership made the decision to narrow the use of LSTA funds to focus on key programs with statewide impact, i.e., *Pioneer: Utah's Online Library*, and to reduce or eliminate the distribution of LSTA funds through sub-grants, i.e., *Project Grants, One-time Equipment Grants, Mini Grants, Utah Kids Ready To Read, Services to Spanish and Navajo Speakers, and Senior Grants*. The State Library Board voted unanimously to cease the sub-grant programs on October 14, 2009. In evaluating the overall Plan accomplishments, it is important to note that the formal Plan evaluation covers the full Plan period, and a number of stated targets were not met “throughout the Plan” due to these program cuts early in the Plan cycle. In most cases, the targets were achieved or exceeded during the short funding period in which they were supported. If USL had reported these overall Plan changes to IMLS at the time of the changes, it might have been possible to revise the basis for the current Plan evaluation at that time.

As a point of reference, Tables 1 and 2 reflect survey responses from all library types.

**Table 1**  
Respondents indicating participation in  
Current LSTA Programs and Services

Service	Pub	K-12	Acd	Spc
Pioneer Online Library	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Project Grants	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
One-time Equipment	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
E-books (Overdrive, etc)	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mini Grants	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Interlibrary Loan	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
CSLP Summer Reading Program	Yes	No	No	No
UKRTR	Yes	No	No	No
Services to Spanish Speakers	Yes	Yes	No	No
Downloadable Videos	Yes	No	No	No
Blind and Disabled Services	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bookmobile Services	Yes	Yes	No	No
Services to Navajo Speakers	No	No	No	No
Senior Grants	Yes	No	No	No

**Table 2**  
Weighted Average Recipients Rating  
for “Very Important” Services

Pub	K-12	Acd	Spc	Weighted Average
86%	52%	100%	0%	69%
60%	63%	66%	100%	63%
53%	76%	0%	0%	57%
86%	86%	0%	0%	50%
53%	45%	50%	0%	48%
66%	11%	66%	0%	46%
53%	12%	0%	0%	35%
46%	0%	0%	0%	27%
26%	25%	0%	0%	23%
35%	0%	0%	0%	20%
20%	11%	0%	0%	15%
14%	11%	0%	0%	11%
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 1 compares the responses from each of the four subgroups (public, K-12, academic, and special library respondents) to the question “In the past four years has your library... received services from any of these USL programs or services?” As indicated, public libraries participate in and use the majority of services, while K-12 libraries use fewer of these services, and academic libraries focus on *Pioneer, Project Grants, Mini Grants* and *Inter-Library Loan*, including the *Lender Support Program*, as key services. Special libraries use even fewer programs: *Pioneer* and the sub-grant programs for projects and one-time equipment.

Table 2 gives the percentage of “Very Important” rankings from each category of library type to the LSTA-funded programs in USL’s current LSTA Five-Year Plan. The final column provides a view of the total: a weighted average of the four types of respondents.

It is to be expected that responses vary among the four funding recipient audiences; that expected variation is the reason four survey instruments were developed for this study.

After ranking each of the 14 programs, respondents were asked to reflect on whether any USL LSTA-funded programs have had a positive impact on the users of their libraries. A resounding 94% responded positively, with one respondent answering “No” and one more indicating “Don’t Know”. The single “No” response came from the special library community.

### Accomplishment of Goals

**Goal I** is to “*Increase the ability of Utah’s libraries to provide quality information services and resources to their patrons by providing access to Internet-based educational, recreational, and informational resources, and by providing materials available from other libraries.*”

USL has been particularly successful in implementing Goal I, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

- 1) Expand services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.
- 2) Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks.
- 3) Provide electronic and other linkages between and among all types of libraries.

The Key Output Targets are:

- Usage of Public Pioneer resources will increase by 25% at the end of 2012. *Pioneer: Utah's Online Library* is a virtual library created and paid for by USL and Utah's public, school and academic libraries. *Public Pioneer* is the part of this program that supports public libraries' provision of LSTA-funded electronic content services to their users. This target has been exceeded through March, 2012. The Consultant Team utilized relevant data in the USL document titled *201109IRSTATS.xlsx*. These data refer to searches in *Public Pioneer* and respond to Output Target #1 by indicating that usage of *Public Pioneer* resources has increased by 35%, which is ten points more than the target amount.

**Table 3:**  
*Public Pioneer Searches 2008-2011 and Estimated for 2012*

<i>Public Pioneer</i>	<i>FY2008</i>	<i>FY2009</i>	<i>FY2010</i>	<i>FY2011</i>	<i>FY2012 Est.</i>
Total Searches	944,042	960,016	805,125	1,403,950	1,459,152

- Five percent increase from 2008-2012 in the number of materials loaned from Utah libraries to other Utah libraries (Interlibrary Loan – ILL) or to customers in other jurisdictions. This target has not been met through March, 2012. ILL data in the USL document titled *lendersummary.xls* indicates an actual decrease of 5%. However, this may represent a positive rather than negative situation if the reduction is based on the rapid transition to digital resources (especially related to use of *Pioneer* resources) and/or improvement in local collections to meet the needs of local users. This decline corresponds to a national trend for declining numbers of ILL transactions but the reasons for the decline should be explored as part of USL's new LSTA Five-year Plan.

The key Outcome Targets are

- Ninety percent of public libraries using State Library ILL services will report they are satisfied with the service by 2012. This target has been met through March, 2012. Evaluation Survey responses address this measure. Eighty-seven percent of public libraries indicated participation in the program

and all of these (100%) also ranked ILL support “Very Important,” “Somewhat Important”, or “Important”.

- Eighty percent of library users surveyed who have used *Public Pioneer* will report that it provides them with resources and information they are unable to obtain from their library's shelves or from the free Internet. This target has been exceeded through March, 2012. Raw survey results are in the USL document titled *PPSurveyResults89787.xls*. To the question “Does *Public Pioneer* provide your library with resources and information you are unable to obtain from the library's shelves or from the free Internet?” the combined answers “Strongly Agree” plus “Agree” plus “Somewhat Agree” equal 84.62% of respondents.

## Conclusions Relating to Goal I

I-a. *Pioneer: Utah's Online Library* is valued, utilized, and needed. USL LSTA program funds are used to fund *Public Pioneer* and the Ebsco database products shared among public, academic, and K-12 libraries. Most survey respondents in all types of libraries say the highest priority in LSTA funding should be the continuation and enhancement of *Pioneer*. The surveys reveal that 100 percent of public library respondents, 85 percent of school library respondents, and 100 percent of academic library respondents believe that *Pioneer* was “Very Important,” Somewhat Important,” or “Important” during the time they participated in the program. Fifty-nine percent of school library respondents and 47 percent of public library respondents indicated they do not subscribe to any other commercial online services. This demonstrates how vital *Pioneer* databases are to public library researchers and school library research instruction.

There is no doubt that the *Pioneer* database sets for the various communities rank as most important of all the LSTA-funded USL programs: 69% ranked *Pioneer* as “Very Important” and an additional 27% ranked *Pioneer* as “Somewhat Important” or “Important”. Only 3% of the respondents, which consisted of one response from the special library community, ranked this service as “Somewhat Unimportant”. Respondents from public, K-12, and academic libraries all indicated a high degree of agreement that *Pioneer* databases were important in answering questions from users. One hundred percent of public and academic respondents and 94% of K-12 respondents answered in this manner. As a sample of comments received, participants stated in survey responses:

- “*Public Pioneer* has been very useful in our area. We have a lot of patrons searching for jobs...I found that the resources provided for resume building by *Public Pioneer* are excellent and we are referring our patrons to them more and more.”
- “Our students and teachers use *Pioneer Online* more often and effectively.”
- “Students use *Pioneer* to research in the library. Teachers are using *Pioneer* as a research tool with their students, rather than just having them go out on the Internet.”
- “Just today I had students in the library every period of the day researching using the *Pioneer* databases.”

As a sample of comments received in focus groups, participants stressed ways to improve *Pioneer*:

- “In public libraries, *Pioneer* use would increase if there were more popular materials added to the list.”
- “Knowing what is available in *Pioneer* is an issue; need improvements in visibility and interface.”
- “Create better access to *Pioneer*. People need [a] simple look and feel with databases.”
- “Visibility about this program needs to be enhanced.”
- “Academic users don't tend to know about *Pioneer*.”
- “Offer training to know what is available in *Pioneer*.”
- “Convenient electronic access and portability are highly desired.”

**I-b. E-books, including Overdrive, OneClickDigital, and NetLibrary:** *Overdrive* is an increasingly important service. This service provides primarily downloadable popular reading collections of interest to public libraries. It is funded by USL LSTA funding and is a part of *Pioneer*, although it is being evaluated separately because of the considerable importance Utah librarians place upon the provision of downloadable e-books and audiobooks to their users. This service ranked fourth in importance and fully half of the total respondents (mainly public library respondents) reported participating in and ranking this program as “Very Important.” Four respondents thought this service is “Somewhat...” or “Very Unimportant”, which may speak to the need for enhancements in features or training concerning use of this program. Special and academic librarians reported no participation and only three school librarians reported participating.

Both survey and focus group commentaries suggest improvements to this program need to be made, primarily to expand and enhance the collection of titles. Two primary problems were reported by survey respondents:

- a) there are not enough titles available, which means there is always a waiting list
- b) they are difficult for users to actually use, especially concerning *OneClickDigital* where the new owner/vendor has not provided one-click download capability that would make these resources easy enough for most people to use successfully

Both of these issues are important to understanding the success or failure of the downloadable audio components of the *Pioneer* program. Perhaps such enhancements would make participation in this program more attractive to the school library audience. As a further sample of comments received, participants stated in survey responses:

- “...Great attendance at Teen Book Fest. Strong increase in *Overdrive* usage.”
- “We do not have the funds to purchase access to databases. *Public Pioneer* and *Overdrive* are crucial to our patrons.”

As a sample of comments received in focus groups, respondents stressed ways to improve OverDrive:

- “*Overdrive* [sic] is important but needs improvement.”
- “Access to e-books through current library offerings is difficult; limitations apply both to large populations and small populations, because the issues include the need for more content as well as the need for more robust technology.”
- “Technology training for staff is also needed in order for staff to support the downloading of e-books to diverse e-readers for use by library users.”

**I-c. Lender Support Program and Resource Sharing through Interlibrary Loan (ILL):** USL’s Lender Support Program is very important. Thirteen (48%) respondents overall ranked this program “Very Important.” Combined “Very Important,” “Somewhat Important,” and “Important” responses equaled 18 (64%). The primary audiences for this service are academic and public libraries, not K-12 or special libraries. All three of the academic library respondents rated ILL support as either “Very Important” or “Important”. Thirteen (87%) public libraries indicated participation in the program and also ranked ILL support “Very Important,” “Somewhat Important”, or “Important”. Only one respondent from school libraries reported participating in this program, but two respondents (22%) ranked ILL support “Very Important” or “Important”. Another two K-12 respondents (22%) ranked this service as “Very Unimportant,” and five (55%) indicated they “Don’t Know” the importance of this service. Only one respondent from the special library community commented, describing this service as “Very Unimportant”. As a sample of comments received, participants stated in survey responses:

- “Without the interlibrary loan assistance we receive from the State Library, we would likely have to charge our students for interlibrary loan services.”
- “ILL services have provided much needed supplements to our collection. One patron who uses the service is so happy with our ability to “get everything” she agreed to serve on the Library Board.”

In focus group sessions, support was strong but cautionary:

- “[It] plays a role in strengthening collections.”
- “Patrons love ILL.”
- “People really use and appreciate ILL.”
- “We use it a lot.”
- “...very satisfied, vital. [We] have students, retired professors, very eclectic requests. [We] do ILL for moms, kids, every type of patron.”
- “... current programs should be retained or even strengthened, but not if it means losing *Pioneer*”
- “ILL is very important but shipping costs and the high availability of print on demand service through the Espresso book machine help reduce use of ILL somewhat.”
- “Future needs may be different.”

**Goal II** is to “*Support the diffusion of library resources, services, and information via the Internet, providing public access to unique historical materials related to Utah.*”

USL has also been successful in implementing Goal II, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

- 1) Expand services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.
- 2) Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks.
- 3) Provide electronic and other linkages between and among all types of libraries.
- 4) Develop public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations.

The key Output Targets are:

- 25% increase from 2008-2012 in the number of public libraries having a website with an online public catalog (there were 33 in 2007); target is 50 in 2012. This target has been exceeded as of March, 2012. A direct online search of Utah’s public library websites reveals that all 57 certified libraries have websites through which an online public catalog can be searched. Having a web site that provides access to “...a catalog of materials that allows the public to place holds and renew materials online” is a criterion for receiving State Certification, making local motivation for achieving this target very high.
- Ten percent increase in the number of materials digitized with LSTA funds from 2008-2012. This target was being met prior to suspension of the program in 2009. Since then, USL has not been funding most sub-grants to individual libraries in the state of Utah. Due to budget cuts and their negative effect on the financial position of the Utah State Library, the State Library Board voted unanimously to halt re-grants of LSTA funds on October 14, 2009. Prior to that time, seven digitization projects were awarded for Plan years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Output and/or outcome successes for the seven projects were reported to USL but baseline data is not available for comparison.

The key Outcome Targets are:

- Ninety percent of libraries will report through customer survey that the use of their online catalog and other Internet-based services has proven successful. It is clear that users utilize *Pioneer* in increasing numbers but this target is defined in terms of direct customer input via surveys and the Consultant Team has not obtained from USL direct customer survey data indicating that customer use of online catalogs has proven successful. Usage statistics for *Public Pioneer* indicate success in providing electronic resources to library customers, and the growing number of uses suggests user satisfaction. If customer surveys are planned as tools to measure outcome target performance in the new USL

LSTA Five-Year Plan, the process to support local libraries in obtaining such data should be strengthened.

- Twenty percent increase in the number of uses/acceses of images digitized with LSTA funds from 2008-2012. This target was being met prior to program suspension. Reducing the sub-grants for digitization has decreased the amount of materials being digitized, affecting the State's ability to achieve the outcome target related to usage. Survey data and comments received during the focus group sessions with representatives of LSTA-recipient libraries demonstrated that both USL and the Utah library community support strongly the continuation of digitization of Utah local and historical documents.

As noted above, the targets for sub-grant and digitization programs were not met due to changes in the USL LSTA funding plan. Thus the inability to fully achieve original targets was the result of a planned change in strategy on the part of USL.

Sharing the costs of certain content in the Pioneer database program represents an excellent example of USL's partnering to leverage the benefits of LSTA funding. The University of Utah's Marriott Library, on behalf of the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC), holds the statewide Ebsco account contract, making databases accessible to the entire State. USL pays a share of the total cost of this as does the Utah Education Network (UEN). LSTA funding is used to pay USL's share, but non-LSTA funding is used to pay the shares of UEN and UALC. USL partners with Salt Lake County Library to provide *ReferenceUSA* database access for many libraries' customers. USL also shares expenses with *Utahfutures* to provide statewide access to *Learning Express*. USL LSTA funding pays the largest part of this, but the rest is paid by other *Utahfutures* partners using non-LSTA funding. Additional collaboration with UEN has also provided bandwidth that benefits *Pioneer* users. All these partnerships are examples of ways USL meets another LSTA purpose, that of developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations.

## Conclusions Relating to Goal II

II-a. *Digitization:* Use of LSTA funding for digitization has resulted in a sustainable new program for Utah. USL's partnership with Mountain West Digital Library (MWDL) resulted in partial funding with LSTA money for the founding of MWDL; it is now operated as a revenue recovery operation and is a good example of federal money seeding a project that has now moved into general operation.

II-b. *Training* staff members in Utah libraries remains a key strategy in the 2008-2012 LSTA Plan for increasing awareness and use of *Public Pioneer*. Eight of 15 (53%) public library respondents indicated they offered training to the public and 14 of 15 (86.7%) indicated that formal training classes for the public were important. K-12 library respondents were asked how important it was to instruct students on specific issues. Learning basic computer functions and using *Pioneer* databases were ranked important by all K-12 respondents. Assisting students to obtain remote access to *Pioneer*, using the Internet as a teaching tool, and learning about search engines were rated important by 16 of 17 (94.1%) of the respondents.

A strong majority of K-12 library respondents felt it was important for staff to be able to instruct users in the use of the library catalog, online resources, the Internet, and search engines, in that order. All K-12 library respondents said their staff could instruct users in the use of the library catalog (17 of 17 or 100%); online resources (16 of 17 or 94.1%); the Internet (15 of 17 or 88.2%); and search engines (15 of 17 or 88.2%).

Academic library respondents indicated their staff members were all very skilled in instruction of all the areas indicated by the K-12 library respondents, plus all were very skilled in providing assistance with Pioneer and other commercial databases. Only on the assessment regarding basic computer functions were staff rated less than “very skilled,” at 66.7%.

The issue of awareness provided a less-positive response, especially noted by individuals attending focus groups. Efforts to train staff so that individual libraries can “market” the use of Pioneer have not been effective. Among focus group participants, there is a strong sense that library resources are underutilized due to lack of visibility. As a sample of comments received, focus group participants stated...

- “Knowing what is available in *Pioneer* is an issue; need improvements in visibility and interface”
- “Visibility about [the *Pioneer*] program needs to be enhanced.”
- “Academic users don’t tend to know about *Pioneer*.”
- “Offer training to know what is available in *Pioneer*.”

Marketing *Pioneer* at the statewide level, rather than at multiple local levels, may produce more effective results. Such an approach appears to have been successful in the past.

**Goal III** is to “*Enable Utah’s libraries to maintain an up-to-date and robust technology infrastructure in order to assure that Utahns can access networked information efficiently and effectively through their libraries.*”

USL has been partially successful in implementing Goal III, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

- 1) Expand services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages.
- 2) Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks.
- 3) Provide electronic and other linkages between and among all types of libraries.

The key Output Target is:

- The percent of sub-grant applications received that are from first-time grant applicants will increase 10% each year from 2008-2012. This target was met during the time the program was funded. Due to program suspension, this target has not been fully met as of March, 2012. Raw survey results are in a USL document titled *Eval Data New Grantees OBE LSTA.xls*.

The key Outcome Targets are

- An additional 15% of grant evaluations will incorporate outcome based evaluation (OBE) measures each year from 2008-2012. This target was met during 2008, but, due to program suspension, this goal has not been met from 2009-2012. Again, raw survey results are in a USL document titled *Eval Data New Grantees OBE LSTA.xls*.
- Grantees will spend an amount equal to at least 20% of their LSTA mini-grant each round from 2008-2012. This target was met during 2008, but, due to program suspension, this goal has not been met from 2009-2012. Raw survey results are also in the USL document titled *Eval Data New Grantees OBE LSTA.xls*.

The objectives of Goal III were significantly impacted by the discontinuation of technology-related sub-grants to individual libraries. While this program was suspended as part of a planned change in USL strategy, it remains a key objective for the library community. In the face of limitation of funds, USL has shifted its priorities to goals that produce high usage levels over a large base of users (i.e. *Pioneer*.)

### **Conclusions Relating to Goal III**

The directed sub-grant programs are very popular. Various project and one-time grants to library agencies throughout the state are deemed important. Before they were suspended in the current Plan, they were well-targeted to meet specific goals. If such programs are included in the next Plan cycle, they should be clearly prioritized and distribution of funds should be tightly defined by specific criteria related to demonstrable “best practices” or “replication” beyond benefit to individual institutions.

III-a. *Project Grants to Libraries* were deemed very important. This grant category received the second-highest “Very Important” ranking (63%) from the total set of respondents, including the single special library respondent.

III-b. *One-time equipment purchase grants* also received a high ranking from the public and K-12 participants, the only respondents who reported participating in this service. Of the respondents, 57% ranked this service as “Very Important”. Fewer public library respondents said they participated in this program than ranked it in importance. Only 6 (40%) of Public library respondents said their library participated in this program, but 11 (79%) of Public library respondents ranked this program as “Very Important”, “Somewhat Important,” or “Important”. No Public library respondent ranked this as “Somewhat...” or “Very Unimportant”. Likewise, only eight (47%) of K-12 library respondents said their library participated in this program, but 11 (85%) of 13 K-12 respondents to this question ranked this program as “Very Important” or “Important”, and only one K-12 respondent described it as “Somewhat Unimportant.”

Many respondents would like to see the sub-grant programs return to earlier levels – but not at the cost of losing *Pioneer*. Both the *Project Grant* and the *Mini Grant* programs are designed to place project design and implementation decision-making at the local level, an aspect that may add to the popularity of these programs. Guidelines and procedures have been improved and for many are more than adequate, but some continue to be unclear to some respondents. As a sample of comments received, participants stated in survey responses:

- “[This] LSTA program works very well, is easy to manage and is SO helpful to our library.”
- “Through project grants, I have learned new research strategies, have been updated on copyright laws, and received eBook training. I have shared these skills and information with students and faculty in the library setting at my school. Many of the students use *Pioneer* while researching in the labs. I am better able to teach *Pioneer* skills because of training.”
- “The equipment I purchased with the mini grant allowed me to teach online services which helped the students know what is available and to use it.”
- “We received a \$37,000 LSTA grant to create a 36 unit computer lab in the library. Before the grant we had about 6 computers that worked, and it was impossible to teach anything computer-related to students. With the computer lab, I teach students (and they learn by doing, not by just showing) how to use the library catalog, how to Google Search, how to use *Pioneer Library* and *World Book Web* databases. I have given instruction on PowerPoint, creating bibliographies in Word, and creating Excel charts. I also use online common formative assessments to assess my teaching. Many more classes visit the library since we received the computer lab. It has made all the difference in the world in the library! Thanks so much.”
- “We received a grant to purchase a computer lab for our library. The lab has significantly increased patron use of our library. As a result, our circulation has increased as well. The computer lab is a major draw for students.”
- “The guidelines for managing the grant funding and how to implement the program locally are made clear in the paperwork and on the website, and the expectations for measurable outputs are well defined.”

- "The guidelines and instructions are challenging, but with the USL staff to help us we got 'er done."
- "The guidelines and instructions have become more 'user friendly' in the last few years."

As a sample of comments received in focus groups, participants stated:

- "It allows for innovation."
- "Retain this but broaden the application areas for grants."
- "It supported both English and Spanish materials, technology updates, and even shelving to hold the expanding collection."
- "[I would like to see this program return]...but not if it means losing *Pioneer*."
- The program guidelines and procedures appear to be unclear and difficult for some...

Technology infrastructure is robust in parts of the state but is inadequate or unsustainable in others. Small towns and rural areas still lack adequate bandwidth and bandwidth demands overall may increase. In addition, library respondents say they are finding it difficult to replace and sustain their current level of technology infrastructure as budgets remain static or are, in some cases, reduced.

In survey responses to the question "Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?" 10 of 14 (71%) public library respondents said "Yes." Four of 14 (28.5%) said "No." Thirteen of 17 (76%) K-12 library respondents said "Yes." One of 17 (5.8%) said "No" but an additional three of 17 (17.6%) said "Don't Know." There was no way for survey respondents to insert comments relating to this question. As a sample of focus group comments received, participants stated:

- "Enhancement of technology capabilities and capacities is consistently needed, but local funding doesn't come close to meeting demands"
- "We need more self-service options such as self-checkout because staffing is limited."
- "USL Sub-grants have frequently been used to make local technology infrastructure more robust."

**Goal IV** is to *serve targeted populations in Utah that require customized assistance in accessing library and information services and materials by assisting Utah's libraries to acquire special equipment, hardware and/or software, to build collections in customized formats or in languages other than English, or to offer customized training opportunities, in-house or outreach programs.*

USL has been partially successful in implementing Goal IV, which is related to the following LSTA purposes:

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

The key Output Targets are:

- Integrate annually through 2010 four to six public libraries into the "Services for Spanish-speakers Project." This target has been met through March 2011. The project target over five years was to have 20-30 libraries participate and the total number of participants in the Plan period was 27 libraries.
- Two percent annual increase in the number of qualifying individuals served by the Blind Library. This target has been consistently and strongly exceeded through March 2012. USL document

*Workload Performance Indicators* for the years 2006-2011 demonstrates the addition of new users to the data base at a minimum of double the target: 7% (2006-07); 4% (2007-08); 5% (2008-09); and 6% each for 2009-10 and 2010-11.

- There will be a 5% increase in the annual circulation of Blind Library materials. This target has been exceeded during the three most recently completed years of the program. USL document *State Library Division Workload/Performance Indicators* for the years 2006-2011 demonstrates significant achievement in annual circulation of blind library materials for FY2008/09 (6%); for FY2009/10 (9%); and FY2010/11 (14%). As of this writing, it is clear that this goal is being met and surpassed.
- The number of bookmobile customers will increase by 10% annually. This target has been met for the most recently completed year of the program. The data for earlier years is faulty due not only to the use of disparate systems but also to retention of old and outdated patron records in the various systems. Correction was effected by installation of a common system and completion of a major record updating project associated with the move to a new system. Data from FY2010/11 are considered to be accurate and they demonstrate a trend towards meeting this target. Table 4 demonstrates the impact of faulty data in evaluating achievement of this target.

**Table 4**  
Changes in Number of Bookmobile Users 2008-2011

	<b>2007 Baseline</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Registered Users	60,008	56,555	50,242	31,086	34,377
Increase/Decrease		D	D	D	I
Percentage		5.75%	11.16%	38.13%	10.59%

- The number of public libraries that offer a Young Adult summer reading program will increase by 10% annually. This target has been partially met. According to a Summer Reading Survey conducted by USL in 2010, the number of libraries that reported using the Teen Summer Reading Program was 27, and in 2011 there were 32 libraries that had a summer reading program for teens. This represents a 16% increase for that year. Equivalent data for all years of the Plan are not available.

The key Outcome Targets are:

- The number and percentage of staff who report knowing more about emergent literacy as a result of participating in a Utah Kids Ready to Read (UKRTR) workshop. The number and/or percentage measure is not explicitly stated in this target. In 2008, USL suspended this program because updated content was not available. Late in the Plan cycle, USL again conducted training and during 2011-12, 128 library workers from 69 library sites and six organizations participated in this knowledge transfer. Assuming the learners were satisfied with and can apply knowledge from these training sessions, the impact will apply to over half (50%+) of the public library sites in Utah.
- The percentage of libraries that have integrated UKRTR skills into their children's programming as a result of training will increase by 40% by 2012. The recent training occurred so late in the Plan cycle that USL does not yet have outcome data to measure the achievement of this target.

## **Conclusions Relating to Goal IV**

**IV-a. Library Services to Spanish Speakers:** Nine respondents indicated participation in the Library Services to Spanish Speakers program: eight public library and one school library respondents. Four (26.7%) public library respondents ranked the program as “Very Important,” two (13.3%) as “Somewhat Important” and three (20%) as “Important.” Of school respondents, two (25%) ranked this program as “Very Important,” and two more (25%) ranked it as “Important.”

Exploding population growth is creating many demands. If strengthening state-wide services to a growing Spanish-speaking constituency is a continuing goal, the *Services to Spanish Speakers* program may benefit from expansion. As a sample of comments received, participants stated in survey responses:

- “...provide Spanish language materials to augment our collection.”
- “Spanish Speakers grant helped a patron who came into the community not speaking any English learn to read and speak English with the funds received from the grant. She checked out items that were bilingual, audio and video based programs as well. She is now fluent in English.”
- “My collections are renowned and I have lent Spanish books to numerous other libraries. My bilingual collection helps those who are struggling in either language.”

Comments shared in focus groups included:

- “The bilingual Spanish speaking population is increasing dramatically.”
- “We need more Spanish language resources on *Pioneer*.”
- “...there are Spanish-speaking people, divergent needs... [Our community] used to be young, blue collar, but no longer.”
- “...more unemployed persons, more Spanish speakers”
- “The bilingual population is increasing dramatically. The rate is now 30%. There is little support for Spanish [in the schools]”
- “It took years of working [with our multi-cultural center] to bring Spanish speakers into the library, but now ...they come and check out stacks of books.”
- “We need more Spanish language resources on *Pioneer*.”

**IV-b. Blind and Disabled Services:** Nine (60%) public library respondents and one (5.8%) school library respondent reported participating in the *Blind and Disabled Services* program. No academic or special library respondents indicated participation. Ten (66.7%) public library respondents ranked this service as “Very Important,” “Somewhat Important,” or “Important.” One (11.1%) K-12 respondent and one (50%) academic library respondents ranked the service as “Very unimportant.” Nine (33.3%) respondents overall reported they “Don’t Know” how to value this program.

**IV-c. Bookmobile Services:** Two respondents (14.3%) from public libraries ranked the *Bookmobile Services* “Very Important” with an additional two (14.3%) public libraries ranking it “Important”. However, five (35.7%) public library respondents ranked it “Somewhat Unimportant” or “Very Unimportant”, and another five (35.7%) reported they “Don’t Know” the value of this program. Nine school library respondents rated this service: three (33.3%) placing it in the “Very Important,” “Somewhat Important,” or “Important” categories; two (22.2%) ranking it “Very Unimportant;” and four (44.4%) reporting they “Don’t Know” how to value it. Overall, eight (30.7%) respondents ranked *Bookmobile Services* “Very Unimportant” and 10 (38.4%) reported they “Don’t Know” how to value it.

**IV-d. The Library Services to Navajo Speakers service** is perceived to be a service to public libraries, but no respondents from any of the four library types indicated they participated in this service. No respondent ranked this service “Very Important.” Seven (28%) ranked it “Very Unimportant.” Fifteen

(60%) respondents reported that they “Don’t Know” the value of this service. These responses suggest respondents who utilized and valued this program before it was suspended didn’t respond to the survey.

**IV-e. Senior Grants:** One public library respondent (2.7% of 36 total responses) indicated participation in this program. No respondent rated this service “Very Important.” However, five (19% of 26 total responses) rated it “Important” and another five rated it “Very Unimportant.” Again, at sixteen (62%), the largest single response was “Don’t Know”.

**IV-f. The Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP** serves primarily public libraries. Twelve of 15 (80%) public library respondents said they participated in this program; no school libraries indicated participation. Eight of 15 (53.3%) public libraries ranked this service as “Very Important,” two of 15 (13.3%) as “Somewhat Important,” and one (6.7%) as “Important.” ‘

As indicated above, a number of programs were designed to meet goals relating to extending library services to specialized audiences (Spanish- and Navajo-speakers; residents in rural or remote locations; residents with special needs; and seniors). If strengthening state-wide services to these diverse constituencies is a continuing goal, these programs may benefit from further analysis, which may result in redesign and/or expansion.

Continuing Education sponsored by USL continues to be valued: Although continuing education is not identified as a separate LSTA-funded program in the list of 14 programs, it is a critical component of the current Five-Year LSTA Plan because significant education is required for libraries to deploy USL LSTA-funded programs. Results from the survey indicate users frequently need library staff assistance with the Internet, with use of databases, both Pioneer and commercial, and with basic computer functions and programs. Comments shared during focus group sessions reveal that continuing education programs from USL are very much needed, very much valued, and very much respected for their quality. Training session evaluation comments support this perception, and careful analysis of all such comments reveals ways in which such training has been improved in the past few years along with ways to continue the improvement curve. As a sample of comments received, participants in focus groups stated:

- “Current offerings are well focused.”
- “Training is a keystone and the impact is huge.”
- “Generally, training has been very effective. It is better facilitated, held in more locations, features more current content, and is more generally effective.”
- “We need the three T’s: more Training, more Titles and more Technology.”
- “Barriers to training are taking time off, distance to travel due to isolation.”
- “CE to expand the training and outreach roles of the library is needed”
- “Technology training for staff is also needed in order for staff to assist library users with all aspects of technology use”
- “Pioneer and Overdrive online training works well.”
- “Providing continuing education to users is difficult and expensive.”

## **Use of Evaluation Measures**

Survey respondents were asked if their library was using outcome measures to assess the impact of the *Pioneer* online library program. Six of 35 (17%) were using measures and seven of 33 (21%) were starting to develop measures. Twenty of 33 (61%) stated they need help to develop assessment measures. Two of 14 (14%) public library respondents indicated they are using locally-developed outcome measures; five of 13 (38.5%) indicated they are starting to develop measures; and eight of 13 (61.5) indicated they need assistance to develop measures. Among K-12 respondents, two of 16 (12.5%) were already using measures; two of 17 (11.7%) were starting to develop measures; and 12 of 16 (75%) would

benefit from assistance. Two of three (66.7%) academic library respondents indicated they were already using measures to assess the impact of *Pioneer*.

After ranking each of the 14 programs, respondents were asked to reflect on whether any USL LSTA-funded programs have had a positive impact on the users of their libraries. A resounding 94% responded positively, with one respondent answering “No” and one more indicating “Don’t Know”. It is instructive to note the single “No” response came from the special library community.

As noted throughout this report, in year two (2009) of the 2008-2012 USL LSTA Five-Year Plan, USL introduced a change in strategy. Due to financial concerns, USL suspended sub-grant programs and retained programs which were deemed to have the greatest statewide services impact. Participating libraries appear to obtain and submit outcome data most readily for sub-grant-based projects. Some survey respondents revealed their need for more knowledge and assistance concerning outcome measures and associated data-gathering processes. As USL defines and prioritizes the elements of its next five-year Plan, it will be important to determine which outcome measures are needed and assist library workers who participate in LSTA-funded programs to obtain and report the required data. USL should plan to include more training and support for production of desired performance metrics.

### **LSTA Impact on Utah Libraries**

Respondents were asked if use of their libraries has increased in ways they can relate to participation in USL LSTA-funded programs.

*Library Use:* The majority of respondents reported that USL LSTA-funded projects have had an impact on their libraries. Of 36 responses, 28 (78%) were “Yes.” Eleven of 14 (78.6%) public library respondents, 14 of 17 (82.3%) K-12 respondents and two of three (66.7%) academic library respondents indicated there has been a positive impact on their local libraries.

*Impact on Users:* Respondents also felt USL LSTA-funded projects impacted their users in positive ways. Fifteen (100%) of the public library respondents, 15 of 17 (88.2%) K-12 respondents and all three of the academic library respondents (100%) indicated LSTA-funded programs and services have had a positive impact on their users. One of one (100%) special library respondent said the impact on users has been positive.

*Continuation of Programs:* Responding public, school, and academic libraries indicated LSTA funding has stimulated the creation of locally funded programs. Thirteen of 15 (86.6%) public library respondents said USL funded programs were continued with local funds. Thirteen of 17 (76.4%) K-12 respondents and all three (100%) academic library respondents agreed. One of one (100%) special library respondent “Somewhat Disagreed” but gave no further explanation.

*Financial Benefits of participating in USL LSTA-funded programs:* Sixteen of 36 (44%) respondents stated that USL programs for technology funding have “resulted in additional sources of local funds, other than from grant sources.” Eighteen of 36 (50%) responded “No” to this question. Thirteen of 36 (36%) respondents feel participation has “assisted the library to develop partnerships with other institutions in [the local] community.” Six of 15 (40%) public library respondents and nine of 17 (52.9%) K-12 respondents indicated USL programs have helped in obtaining additional local funding. But 19 of 36 (53%) responded “No” to this question. Two of 15 (13.3%) public library respondents and three of 17 (17.6%) K-12 respondents indicated USL LSTA funding assisted in obtaining grants from other sources. Two of three (66.7%) academic library respondents found USL programs helped to obtain grants from other sources and develop partnerships.

## **Key Recommendations:**

1. *Pioneer* is highly valued, utilized, and needed. This program should receive priority funding classification in the next five-year plan and the services and content should be enhanced and expanded. Further, this electronic distribution of information should continue to be supplemented by inter-library sharing of paper documents to expand all Utah residents' access to information.
2. Various project and one-time grants to library agencies throughout the state are deemed important but subordinate in importance to the *Pioneer* program. Under the current restrictive financial conditions, the sub-grant programs should be prioritized and distribution of sub-grants should be tightly defined by specific criteria related to demonstrable "best practices" or "replication" beyond benefit to individual institutions.
3. Training staff members in Utah libraries remains a key strategy for increasing awareness and use of the *Pioneer* program. Informal verbal input from librarians suggests that marketing Pioneer as a statewide program as was undertaken during a previous five-year plan period, rather than at the local level, may result in expanded visibility that leads to heavier usage levels.
4. Exploding population growth is creating many demands. If strengthening state-wide services to diverse constituencies is a continuing goal, related programs will benefit from further analysis, possible redesign and/or expansion, and clear performance metrics.
5. Consistency and uniformity in outcome-based measures of success can be strengthened in subsequent USL LSTA Plans by clearly defining each measure and the ways in which measurement skills will be transferred to participants, and perhaps building in incentives.
6. All goals must be prioritized to establish and share expectations for responding to environmental changes, particularly relating to funding or program change requirements.
7. Major revisions to current Plan goals occurred early in the Plan cycle and resulted in the cessation of key programs. Such strategic changes should, in the future, be communicated to IMLS as part of the revision process. Clear statements about revised goals/targets/programs should be incorporated into the Plan records. Any cessation of programs should be urgently followed by usage, impact, and evaluation data-gathering while program activities are still fresh in the respondents' minds.
8. Incorporate into the next Plan a mechanism for periodic (perhaps annual) review of the Plan and, as stated above, document both locally and with IMLS any needed changes.

## **Conclusions**

The consistency of results from both focus group and survey data gathering shows that many of the services provided by USL under the LSTA program are used heavily; are perceived to be extremely important; are highly valued by both library professionals and the public; and are seen to be of high quality.

Overall, both survey and focus group sessions provided strong indicators that USL LSTA-funded programs are needed and the library community has confidence in and respect for the ways in which USL implements and supports these programs. Differences of opinion occur mostly relating to the cessation of sub-grants programs that are generally seen to be valuable in addressing IMLS purposes at the local level. These programs are generally seen to be of lower priority than continuing maintenance and enhancement of the *Pioneer* program as Utah libraries face continued budget restrictions in the near future.

## **Annex 1**

### **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

Amigos	Amigos Library Services
Consultant Team	Amigos Library Services Consultant Team
Current five-year plan	Utah State Library Division's Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan: 2008-2012
IMLS	Institute of Museum and Library Services
K-12	School Libraries
LSTA	Library Services and Technology Act
MWDL	Mountain West Digital Library
OBE	Outcome Based Evaluation
Sub-Grants	Project Grants, One-time Equipment Grants, Mini Grants, Utah Kids Ready To Read, Services to Spanish and Navajo Speakers, Senior Grants
UALC	Utah Academic Library Consortium
UEN	Utah Education Network
USL	Utah State Library

## **ANNEX 2**

### **List of People Interviewed**

#### Focus Group Sites and Attendees

Tuesday, November 15, 2011                    10:00-11:30 a.m. (both locations)

Cedar City Public Library in the Park, 303 N 11 E, Cedar City, UT 84720 – 435-586-6661

- Vik Brown, Southern Utah University
- Steve Decker, Cedar City Public Library
- Bonnie Percival, Dixie State College (Special Collections Librarian)
- Niki Satter, Minersville Public Library
- Janine Utterback, Cedar City Library (board member)

Grand County Public Library, 257 E Center St, Moab, UT 84532 – 435-259-1111

- Charlotte Hurley, Grand Canyon Public Library, (Head of Children's Services/Tech Services)
- Robert Magleby, Grand Canyon Public Library, (GCPL Board Member)
- Sara Wever, Grants Coordinator, USL

Tuesday, November 15, 2011                    2:30-4:00 p.m. (both locations)

Richfield Public Library, 83 E. Center, Richfield, UT 84701 – 435-896-5169

- Robin Davis, Richfield Public Library (Children's Librarian)

Price City Library, 159 E Main, Price, UT 84501 – 435-636-3188

- Diana Bordea, Price City Library (Assistant Librarian)
- Norma Procarione, Price City Library (Director)

Wednesday, November 16, 2011                10:00-11:30 a.m.

Provo City Library at Academy Square, 555 N University Ave, Provo, UT 84601 – 801-852-6650

- Dennis Bernards, Brigham Young University (Serials Librarian)
- Deb Greathouse, Delta City Library (Director)
- Calli Hales, Provo City Library (board member)
- Suzanne Julian, Brigham Young University
- Sharon Kutter, Provo City Library (Support Services Manager)
- Sheena Parker, American Fork Library (Director)

- Kent Slade, Highland City Library (Director)
- Carla Zolliner, Provo City Library (Manager)
- Craig Neilson, USL

Wednesday, November 16, 2011      1:00-2:30 p.m.

Orem Public Library, 58 N State, Orem, UT 84057 – 801-229-7050

- Michele Graves, Eagle Mountain Library (Director)
- Kristi Seely, Lehi Library (Director)
- April Harrison, Pleasant Grove Library (Director)
- Louise Wallace, Orem Public Library (Director)
- Craig Neilson, USL

Wednesday, November 16, 2011      6:00-7:30 p.m.

Salt Lake City Public Library, Main Branch, 210 E 400 S, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 – 801-524-8200

- Julianne Hancock, Salt Lake City Public Library (Manager of Communications & IT)
- Sandra McIntyre, Mountain West Digital Library (Program Director)

Thursday, November 17, 2011      10:00-11:30 a.m.

Logan City Library, 255 N. Main, Logan, UT 84321 – 435-716-9123

- Joseph N. Anderson, Logan Library (Librarian)
- Rachel Anderson, Logan Library (Librarian)
- Karen Bowling, Smithfield Library (Children's Librarian)
- Karen Clark, Logan Library (Senior Librarian)
- Jason Cornelius (Librarian)
- Nick Eastmond, Independent (Instructional Tech, Emeritus Professor)
- Kim Griffiths, Tremonton Library (Director)
- Sheri Haderlie, University of Southern Utah (School Library Media Program Coordinator)
- Puanani Mateaki, Stevens Hernager College (Librarian)
- Robyn Patterson, North Logan Library (Acting Director)
- Robert Shupe, Logan Library (Director)

Thursday, November 17, 2011      2:30-4:00 p.m.

Utah State Library, 250 N 1950 W, Salt Lake City, UT 84116 – 801-715-6722

- Danny O'Rourke, Murray Library (Assistant Director)
- Mary Ross, University of Utah (Grants Administrator)

USL LSTA RETREAT – March 6, 2012  
Attendees List - 25 Institutions

Name	Organization
<b><u>Public Library attendees</u></b>	
Jami Carter	Tooele City Public Library
Dan Compton	Summit County Public Library System
Jim Cooper	Salt Lake County Library System
Debbie Ehrman	Salt Lake City Public Library
Linda Fields	Richfield Public Library
Dustin Fife	San Juan County Library
Carole Larsen	Emery County Library
Carla Zollinger	Provo City Library
Robert Shupe	Logan Library
Kent Slade	Highland City Library
Linda Tillson	Park City Public Library
Ginny Tremayne	Hyrum Library
Carrie Valdes	Grand County Public Library
Pam Vaughn	Springville Public Library
<b><u>Academic Library attendees</u></b>	
Richard Daines	Salt Lake Community College, South City Campus
Mike Freeman	Utah Valley University Library
Kenning Arlitsch	University of Utah, Marriott Library
Diane Vanderpol	Westminster College Library
Joan Stoddart	University of Utah, Eccles Library
Kimberly Rollins	Utah Academic Library Consortium
Gerrit Van Dyke	Brigham Young University Library
<b><u>3 Other Library attendees</u></b>	
Julie Atwood	Instructional Tech/Media Center/Salt Lake City Schools
Randy Olsen	LDS Church Library
Karl Smith	Axis Technology
<b><u>6 Utah State Library Attendees</u></b>	
Doug Gould	Library Services program
Steve Matthews	LSTA Study Project Coordinator
Donna Morris	State Librarian
Craig Neilson	Library Services Program Manager
Paula Stewart	Multistate Center West
Sara Wever	LSTA Grants Coordinator

**USL Staff Interviewed Individually**

Coleen Eggett, Librarian III Training Coordinator  
Craig Neilson, Library Resources Program Manager  
Lisa Nelson, Library for the Blind Program Manager  
Sara Wever, Grants Coordinator

## **Annex 3**

### **Focus Group Questions**

#### **Focus Group Questions**

##### *Introduction*

Consultant Team members welcome attendees and provide very brief background relating to a mandated evaluation process of the 2008-2012 use of LSTA Grants to States funds. Information shared by attendees will be combined with survey results and other evaluative data already collected by USL to develop the evaluation report. Looking ahead, USL has to file a plan for the future (five years) use of LSTA Grants to States funding.

##### *General*

What do you believe are the strengths of your library service program?

What areas do you feel you need improvement in your library service program?

Who are your most important user groups?

##### *LSTA Grants to States Program*

If you participated in any LSTA Grants to State funds in the past five years?

What was the program/grant (s)?

Was this the first time you applied?

Did you incorporate any outcomes-based evaluation measures in your project?

Overall what was your experience?

If no,

If you did not, what was your experience?

Why did you not participate?

##### *Pioneer*

Has the usage of (library types represented at the session) Pioneer increased in the past five years? How much?

Do the Pioneer databases provide your users with resources and information they would be unable to obtain from your library or from the free Internet?

Does your library have an online catalog on your website?  
Has use of your online catalog increased and the use of other Internet-based services been successful?

How important will it be for your library to use such USL programs and services to maintain the stability and capability of the local library technology base (bandwidth, routers, etc) over the long term?

#### *Interlibrary Loan*

How much do you and your users rely on interlibrary loan from other Utah libraries?

How satisfied are you with State Library Interlibrary loan services?

#### *Digital*

Have you used LSTA Grants to State funds to create any digital resources? If yes

Has your library created any digital copies of unique materials?

How you seen an increase in the number of users of digital images/resources?

What is the current level of technological capacity in your library?

What conditions must be present for users to make the most effective use of technology-based information resources?

Have you already integrated various electronic information resources (local OPAC, Pioneer online databases, and your office software, educational software, Internet) into an easy-to-use interface for the library user?

Do you think it is important for your library to do this in the future?

What do you consider to be the fundamental technology-related services and/or products that libraries of your type and size should offer?

#### *Other grants*

Do you participate in

Services for the Spanish-speakers program?

Services for the Navaho -speakers program?

Does your library offer a Young Adult summer reading program?

Did you or your staff participate in a UKRTR workshop? If so, do you feel like you know more about emergent literacy as a result?

Have you integrated UKRTR skills in your children's programming?

How important is it to continue LSTA funding for programs such as these?

*Training*

What are the most common categories of user information requests you receive at your library?

Are classes related to information technology currently offered in your library?

What are the barriers to staff obtaining training?

How important is it for your library to use LSTA Grant to States funds to maintain the stability and capability of staff skills and training over the long term?

Other comments on USL programs and services you have received or would like to share?

## Annex 4-A

### **Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds**

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

1. The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services? (*Check all that apply.*)

Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)
Blind and Disabled Services
Senior Grant
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)
Library Services for Spanish Speakers
Library Services for Navajo Speakers
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)
Bookmobile Services
Mini Grants
One time equipment purchases
Interlibrary loan lending support
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)
Downloadable Videos
Project Grants to Public Libraries
Other ( <i>specify below</i> )

Other:

2. Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [Examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services; increased circulation; or more library cards issued without expanding the service area]

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, explain.

3. Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Blind and Disabled Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Senior Grant	5	4	3	2	1	9
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Bookmobile Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mini Grants	5	4	3	2	1	9
One time equipment purchases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Interlibrary loan lending support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

Downloadable Videos	5	4	3	2	1	9
Project Grants to Public Libraries	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other ( <i>Specify below</i> )	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other:

4. Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

The program guidelines are easy to follow	5	4	3	2	1	9
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	5	4	3	2	1	9
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	5	4	3	2	1	9

6. Clarify your responses to each of the above three statements here:

7. Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in such USL programs? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

Such USL program categories do not meet local library needs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Such USL program categories are too limited	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of interest in such USL programs by local board	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other ( <i>Specify below</i> )	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other:

8. LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library... (*Choose one response for each question.*)

Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know

9. If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

10. Have such USL programs for technology funding...

Resulted in additional sources of local funds, other than from grant sources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	Yes	No	Don't Know

**Section 2: Technology Resources**

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

11. How important are Pioneer databases to answer inquiries from library users?

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a.
- b.
- c.

12. Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used?

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---------------------	-------

13. Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

14. How important is it for your library to use any of the above-listed USL technology funding programs to maintain the stability and capacity of your library's technology base (bandwidth, routers, etc.)?

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

15. How important for users of your library are the following technology factors? (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Updated personal workstations available	5	4	3	2	1	9
Speed (Bandwidth)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Access to Pioneer Databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Availability of staff with technology skills to assist users	5	4	3	2	1	9
Degree of user technology skills	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

16. Does your library provide at least one workstation that is... (*Choose one response for each question*)

Accessible to persons with physical disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Accessible to persons with hearing disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Accessible to persons with vision disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know

17. Does your library have unique special collection materials (for example, archives, photographic images, letters, or manuscripts) in digital format?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, describe:

18. Are any of the digitized materials available over the web?

Yes	No	Do Not Know
-----	----	-------------

19. Other than in the library, are there places in your community where the public can gain access to the Internet at no charge?

Yes	No	Do Not Know
-----	----	-------------

If yes, specify one or two sources:

20. In order to maintain your current level of public access computing, prioritize the importance of each of the following. (*Number 1 is your top priority*)

Rank	
	Desktop computers & associated equipment
	Online library catalog installation, upgrade, or replacement
	Enhanced connectivity (more bandwidth, more speed)
	Technical training
	More online databases
	Website development
	Information security
	Other (specify below)

Other:

21. How important do you believe the following factors are in creating support for adequate technology infrastructure in your library? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Leadership from city/county officials	5	4	3	2	1	9
Commitment from city/county administrators	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of adequate financial resources	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of technology support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mission to integrate technology into the library	5	4	3	2	1	9
Integration of library technology with other community partners	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of a long-range plan for technology integration	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequately trained staff	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequately sized facilities	5	4	3	2	1	9

Adequacy of equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequate time to train	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequate staffing	5	4	3	2	1	9

**Section 3: Training Needs**

This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff.

22. Does your library offer any technology related classes to the public?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

23. How important is it for the library to offer formal training classes for users?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
----------------	--------------------	-----------	----------------------	------------------	------------

24. How frequently do staff members help library users do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

At least 2-3 times per day 5	Daily 4	2 – 3 times per week 3	1-2 times per month 2	Never 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------------------	------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	------------	-----------------

Assist users in downloading e-books, music, etc.	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to check personal e-mail accounts	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to set up free e-mail accounts	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist visitors to check email while traveling	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to learn/apply basic personal computer skills (use of mouse, keyboard, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to conduct general searching on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to search Pioneer databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to search other commercial databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize educational programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize word processing programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize spreadsheet programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize database programs						
Assist users to utilize presentation programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize gaming programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize scanning equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
Provide computer troubleshooting (printing, resetting of programs, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Advise users on Internet filters	5	4	3	2	1	9
Advise users about use of parental controls for Internet use	5	4	3	2	1	9
Help users evaluate the quality and reliability of online resources	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize the library's online catalog	5	4	3	2	1	9

25. Overall, how skilled is your staff in instructing users... (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Skilled 5	Somewhat Skilled 4	Skilled 3	Somewhat Unskilled 2	Very Unskilled 1	Don't Know 9
-------------------	-----------------------	--------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------

In the use of the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
In the use of basic computer functions	5	4	3	2	1	9
In the use of the library catalog	5	4	3	2	1	9
In the use of online resources	5	4	3	2	1	9
In the use of search engines	5	4	3	2	1	9
In finding financial information on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
In locating genealogical sources on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
In accessing legal resources on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
In searching for medical/health resources on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9

#### Section 4: Library Identification

Library Name:

City where your Library is located:

What is your latest annual expenditures budget:

#### Section 5: Respondent Identification

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (Person completing the survey)

Respondent's Title:

Respondent's E-mail Address:

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## Annex 4-B

### **Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds**

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

1. The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services? (*Check all that apply.*)

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	
Senior Grant	
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	
Bookmobile Services	
Mini Grants	
One time equipment purchases	
Interlibrary loan lending support	
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	
Downloadable Videos	
Project Grants to K-12 Libraries	
Other ( <i>specify below</i> )	

- 
2. Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [Examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services; increased circulation; or more library staff assistance to students/faculty without expanding the user base]

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, explain \_\_\_\_\_

---

*FINAL of Survey 1 for K-12 Libraries*

3. Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated?  
*(Choose one response for each statement)*

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Senior Grant	5	4	3	2	1	9
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Bookmobile Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mini Grants	5	4	3	2	1	9
One time equipment purchases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Interlibrary loan lending support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Downloadable Videos	5	4	3	2	1	9
Project Grants to K-12 Libraries	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other ( <i>Specify below</i> )	5	4	3	2	1	9

---

4. Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

---



---

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? *(Circle one response for each statement)*

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

The program guidelines are easy to follow	5	4	3	2	1	9
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	5	4	3	2	1	9
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	5	4	3	2	1	9

6. Clarify your responses to each of the above 3 statements here:

---



---

7. Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in the above-listed USL programs?  
 (Choose one response for each statement)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

Such USL program categories do not meet my library's needs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Such USL program categories are too limited	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of interest in such USL programs by school administrators	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (Specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9

8. LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library.

Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know

9. If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.
- 
- 

10. Have any of the above-listed USL programs for technology funding...

Resulted in additional sources of local funds?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	Yes	No	Don't Know

## Section 2: Technology Resources

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

11. How important are Pioneer databases

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

To assist in answering student inquiries?	5	4	3	2	1	9
To assist in answering faculty inquiries?	5	4	3	2	1	9

12. List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. \_\_\_\_\_

13. Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

14. If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used? (*Choose one response*)

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---------------------	-------

15. Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

16. Does your school district replace the library's technology every 2-5 years?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

### **Section 3: Training Needs**

This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff

17. How important is it for the library to offer the following instruction for students? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Learning about search engines	5	4	3	2	1	9
Learning basic library catalog functions	5	4	3	2	1	9
Using Pioneer databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Using Pioneer databases at home	5	4	3	2	1	9
Using the Internet as a teaching tool	5	4	3	2	1	9
Accessing music files on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
Creating web pages	5	4	3	2	1	9

18. Can your staff instruct users in the use of

The Internet?	Yes	No	Don't Know
The library catalog?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Online resources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Search engines?	Yes	No	Don't Know

19. How important is it for your staff to be able to instruct users in the use of... (*Choose one number for each question*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

The Internet?	5	4	3	2	1	9
The library catalog?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Online resources?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Search engines?	5	4	3	2	1	9

**Section 4: Library Identification**

Library Name: \_\_\_\_\_

City where your Library is located: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 5: Respondent Identification**

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (*Person completing the survey*) \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## Annex 4-C

### Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services?

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	
Blind and Disabled Services	
Senior Grant	
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	
Bookmobile Services	
Mini Grants	
One time equipment purchases	
Interlibrary loan lending support	
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	
Downloadable Videos	
Project Grants to Academic Libraries	
Other ( <i>Specify below</i> )	

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

---

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services, or increased circulation]

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

- (3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated? (*Choose one response for each statement.*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Blind and Disabled Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Senior Grant	5	4	3	2	1	9
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Bookmobile Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mini Grants	5	4	3	2	1	9
One time equipment purchases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Interlibrary loan lending support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Downloadable Videos	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

Project Grants to Academic Libraries	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (Specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other:	<hr/>					

- (4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

---



---

- (5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

The program guidelines are easy to follow	5	4	3	2	1	9
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	5	4	3	2	1	9
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	5	4	3	2	1	9

- (6) Clarify your responses to each of the above 3 statements here: \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

- (7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in any of the above-listed USL programs? (Choose one response for each statement)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

Such USL program categories do not meet my library's needs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Such USL program categories are too limited	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (Specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

---

- (8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library.

Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know

- (9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.
- 
-

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

(10) Have any of the above-listed USL programs for technology funding... (Choose one response for each question.)

Resulted in additional sources of funds?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other campus departments or external organizations?	Yes	No	Don't Know

**Section 2: Technology Resources**

**This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.**

(11) How important are Pioneer databases to answer inquiries from library users? (Choose one response)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

(12) List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. \_\_\_\_\_

(13) Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

(14) If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used?

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---------------------	-------

(15) Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

(16) How important is it for your library to use any of the above-listed USL technology funding programs to maintain the stability and capacity of your library's technology base (bandwidth, routers, etc)?

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

(17) How important for users of your library are the following technology factors? (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Updated personal workstations available	5	4	3	2	1	9
Speed (Bandwidth)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Access to Pioneer Databases	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

Availability of staff with technology skills to assist users	5	4	3	2	1	9
Degree of user technology skills	5	4	3	2	1	9

(18) Does your library provide at least one workstation that is... (Choose one response for each question)

Accessible to persons with physical disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Accessible to persons with hearing disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Accessible to persons with vision disabilities?	Yes	No	Don't Know

(19) Does your library have unique special collection materials (for example, archives, photographic images, letters, or manuscripts) in digital format?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, describe \_\_\_\_\_

(20) Are any of the digitized materials available over the web?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

(21) What form of technology support does your library have? (Choose one response for each statement)

Library's own technology support staff	Yes	No
Campus-wide technology support staff	Yes	No
Contract for external technology support	Yes	No
Other (specify below)	Yes	No

Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

(22) Is your library's technology support adequate? (Choose one response)

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

(23) How important do you believe the following factors are in creating support for adequate technology infrastructure in your library? (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Commitment from your institution's administrators	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of adequate financial resources	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of technology support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mission to integrate technology into the library	5	4	3	2	1	9
Presence of a long-range plan for technology integration	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequate staff technology skills	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequately sized facilities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequacy of equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequate time to train	5	4	3	2	1	9
Adequate staffing	5	4	3	2	1	9
Quality of computer technology available	5	4	3	2	1	9
Expectations of faculty	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other: (Describe): \_\_\_\_\_

(24) Currently, how important are the following technology capability issues you face? (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Cost of computer hardware	5	4	3	2	1	9
Cost of computer software	5	4	3	2	1	9
Cost of training and education	5	4	3	2	1	9
Cost of phone charges	5	4	3	2	1	9
Inadequacy of local telecommunications access	5	4	3	2	1	9
Physical space limitations	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of training on how to use the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of in-house technology expertise	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of management support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Staff's limited time for using technology	5	4	3	2	1	9
Limited staff skills in using technology	5	4	3	2	1	9
Faculty's lack of skills in using technology	5	4	3	2	1	9
Students' lack of skills in using technology	5	4	3	2	1	9
Inadequacy of Internet speed	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of adequate funding	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 3: Training Needs

This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff.

(25) How frequently do staff members help users to do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---------------------	-------

Assist users in downloading e-books, music, etc.	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to check personal e-mail accounts	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to set up free e-mail accounts	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist visitors to check email while traveling	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to learn/apply basic personal computer skills (use of mouse, keyboard, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to conduct general searching on the Internet	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to search Pioneer databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to search commercial databases	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize educational software	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize word processing programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize spreadsheets programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize database programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize presentation programs	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

Assist users to utilize gaming programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize scanning equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
Provide computer troubleshooting (printing, resetting of programs, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Advise users on Internet filters	5	4	3	2	1	9
Help users evaluate the quality and reliability of online resources	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist users to utilize the library's online catalog	5	4	3	2	1	9

(26) Overall, how skilled is your staff in instructing users in the use of... (*Choose one response for each question*)

Very Skilled 5	Somewhat Skilled 4	Skilled 3	Somewhat Unskilled 2	Very Unskilled 1	Don't Know 9
-------------------	-----------------------	--------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------

Pioneer databases?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other commercial databases?	5	4	3	2	1	9
The Internet?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Basic computer functions?	5	4	3	2	1	9
The library catalog?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Search engines?	5	4	3	2	1	9
Online resources?	5	4	3	2	1	9

(27) How frequently do library staff members use online resources to help faculty do the following? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---------------------	-------

Use or assist with classroom software such as Blackboard, e.college, WebCT, etc.	5	4	3	2	1	9
Create instructional materials/handouts	5	4	3	2	1	9
Get images from the Internet for use in projects	5	4	3	2	1	9
Assist with digitizing course-related materials	5	4	3	2	1	9
Provide instruction on specific computer applications (spreadsheets, etc)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Create web-based courses or tutorials for students	5	4	3	2	1	9
Create web-based courses or tutorials for faculty	5	4	3	2	1	9

(28) How important are the following as barriers to your ability to obtain technology training? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Lack of training funds	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of staff backup	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of transportation to training site	5	4	3	2	1	9
Training needed is not offered	5	4	3	2	1	9
Timing of training is not appropriate to staff schedule	5	4	3	2	1	9
No time to practice	5	4	3	2	1	9

Not knowing what training is needed	5	4	3	2	1	9
Quality of training needed is not available	5	4	3	2	1	9

#### **Section 4: Library Identification**

Name of your college or university: \_\_\_\_\_

What is the primary classification of your library's parent institution? (Choose one response)

Private Academic-Research Institution	Public Academic-Research Institution
Private Academic 4-year institution	Public Academic 4-year institution
Private Academic 2-year institution	Public Academic 2-year institution
Private Academic-public health institution	Public Academic-public health institution

City where your library is located: \_\_\_\_\_

What is your latest annual expenditures budget? \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Section 5: Respondent Identification**

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (Person completing the survey) \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## Annex 4-D

### Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services? (Choose all that apply.)

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	
Senior Grant	
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	
Bookmobile Services	
Mini Grants	
One time equipment purchases	
Interlibrary loan lending support	
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	
Downloadable Videos	
Project Grants to Special Libraries	
Other (specify below)	

- 
- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services, expanded ability to offer desired and utilized services.]

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, explain

---

- (3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated? (Choose one response for each statement)

Very Important 5	Somewhat Important 4	Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Very Unimportant 1	Don't Know 9
---------------------	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Senior Grant	5	4	3	2	1	9
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	5	4	3	2	1	9
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Bookmobile Services	5	4	3	2	1	9
Mini Grants	5	4	3	2	1	9
One time equipment purchases	5	4	3	2	1	9

FINAL of Survey 1 for Special Libraries

Interlibrary loan lending support	5	4	3	2	1	9
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	5	4	3	2	1	9
Downloadable Videos	5	4	3	2	1	9
Project Grants to Special Libraries	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (Specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9

(4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
-----	----	------------

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

---

(5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9
These program guidelines are easy to follow	5	4	3	2	1
The instructions for managing LSTA-funded programs are clear	5	4	3	2	1
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	5	4	3	2	1

(6) Clarify your responses to each of the above three statements here:

---



---

(7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in the above-listed USL programs? (Choose one response for each statement)

Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	9

Such USL program categories do not meet our user needs	5	4	3	2	1	9
Such USL program categories are too limited	5	4	3	2	1	9
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work	5	4	3	2	1	9
Other (Specify below)	5	4	3	2	1	9

Other:

---



---

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library

Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	Yes	No	Don't know

*FINAL of Survey 1 for Special Libraries*

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

---

---

(10) Have any of the above-listed USL programs for technology funding...

Resulted in additional sources of funds?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	Yes	No	Don't Know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	Yes	No	Don't Know

**Section 2: Library Identification**

Library Name: \_\_\_\_\_

City where your library is located: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 3: Respondent Identification**

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (Person completing the survey) \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## Annex 5-A

**Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds****This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.**

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services?

Yes	
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	15 – 100.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	15 – 100.0%
Interlibrary loan lending support	13 – 86.7%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	12 – 80.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	10 – 66.7%
Blind and Disabled Services	9 – 60.0%
Mini Grants	9 – 60.0%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	8 – 53.3%
One time equipment purchases	6 – 40.0%
Downloadable Videos	6 – 40.0%
Project Grants to Public Libraries	5 – 33.3%
Senior Grant	1 – 33.3%
Bookmobile Services	1 – 6.7%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [Examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services; increased circulation; or more library cards issued without expanding the service area] (Choose one response.)

Yes	No	Don't Know
11 – 78.6%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 21.4%

Replies 14; Forms 15

If yes, explain:

1. Based upon patron feedback, increased attendance at and circulation of library materials has resulted.
2. We have had a large increase in patron cards in the last couple of years. We also just entered into an agreement with the local high school and middle school to help their students utilize Overdrive and OneClickDigital to help them obtain copies of books required for their classes. I am excited to see how that works out.
3. I believe the use of Audio books and EBooks has really picked up. I don't know how to get the statistics on that, but it is a general impression. Also, many more people are using the career databases to look for career options, work on their resume and job seeking skills, etc.
4. Increased circulation; e-books & e-audiobooks available and used by our patrons, which otherwise would not be available from our library
5. Increase in website access as a portal.
6. We are a very small and new library. ILL service has been critical to being able to supply titles or OP or hard to find titles.
7. Increase in Spanish-speaking patrons--received Spanish grant.
8. Use of our library has definitely increased due to these programs and services. They enhance the lives of all who participate. We have more children attend the library for summer reading, we have an increase of Spanish patrons due to our Spanish Project Grant, we have patrons get library cards in order to have access to audio-books and e-books
9. Our increase in patronage continues to rise, as does our usage statistics.
10. Increased usage, increased card holders and increased circulation.

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

11. A tremendous increase in use of online services. Faster and more effective service to patrons in-house using technology and online services.

12. The Pioneer databases and OverDrive have been a great service to provide. We tell people about the services every day and our usage continues to increase.

(3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated?  
*(Choose one response for each statement)*

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases) <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	13 – 86.7%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books) <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	13 – 86.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Interlibrary loan lending support <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	10 – 66.7%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 13.3%
Project Grants to Public Libraries <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	9 – 60.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	6 – 40.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	8 – 53.3%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%
Mini Grants <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	8 – 53.3%	2 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 20.0%
One time equipment purchases <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	7 – 50.0%	3 – 21.4%	1 – 7.1%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 21.4%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program) <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	7 – 46.7%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 20.0%
Downloadable Videos <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	5 – 35.7%	2 – 14.3%	2 – 14.3%	2 – 14.3%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 21.4%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	4 – 26.7%	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%
Blind and Disabled Services <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	6 – 40.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%
Bookmobile Services <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	2 – 14.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 14.3%	1 – 7.1%	4 – 28.6%	5 – 35.7%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 7.1%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 7.1%	4 – 28.6%	8 – 57.1%
Senior Grant <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 13.3%	8 – 53.3%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	6 – 100.0%

Other: None

(4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
15 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

1. Multiple patrons have reported their discovery of genres and topics through materials purchased that they would not have discovered otherwise.

Children are learning to use computers in a library setting for literacy purposes, daily.

2. Public Pioneer has been very useful in our area. We have a lot of patrons searching for jobs since ATK started layoffs. Patrons who have been in the workforce for 20 or 30 years are now looking for jobs. These patrons do not have a lot of experience with writing resumes and job hunting. I found that the resources provided for resume building by Public Pioneer are excellent and we are referring our patrons to them more and more. We also utilize the k-12 Pioneer library for our younger patrons. They have helped tremendously with world fair reports and other reports required of our students.

3. LSTA grants have provided up-to-date computers and a new server, with a wireless router. There have been many people that come to the library, just to use our wireless signal, and end up using more services. One person was a reporter from the Salt Lake Tribune, doing a story about a stranded snowmobiler in our area. In speaking with him, he became interested in our financial plight and passed the story on to the appropriate representative at the paper. No article has resulted, but I believe still could be visited. Also, in advertising that these services, such as downloadable books, are available to patrons, more people come into the library to learn how to participate, and in turn also see something they want to check out, which increases our circulation.

4. E-audiobooks are important and heavily used by truck drivers who are based in Richfield  
Phonics books bought with LSTA mini-grant increased our usage of phonics books by 200% and we have heard from the elementary school that these books are very useful to parents who are supporting beginning readers

5. Great attendance at Teen Book Fest. Strong increase in Overdrive usage

6. ILL services have provided much needed supplements to our collection. One patron who uses the service is so happy with our ability to "get anything" she agreed to serve on the Library Board. Another patron has been able to ILL recommended picture books that we do not have and was able to read them for her family and preschool class.

7. Provide Spanish language materials to augment our collection. Overdrive, etc. is only source for our patrons for e-books or e-audio books.

8. We were able to install a copy center in our library, with the only color copy machine in the city.  
Our library received a Spanish grant for materials that has benefited our high population of Hispanic patrons.

9. Spanish Speakers grant helped a patron who came into the community not speaking any English learn to read and speak English with the funds received from the grant. She checked out items that were bilingual, audio and video based programs as well. She is now fluent in English.

Also, we rely heavily on online resources as we are a small, rural library. Our residents commute outside of our community for work so they like to access information online at home or work.

10 All of the people who participate in our summer reading program love the themes and the activities.

We have quite a few patrons who use the Overdrive. They love being able to download books from home.

11. We do not have the funds to purchase access to databases. Public Pioneer and Overdrive are crucial to our patrons. We recently had a new teacher in the community that needed to study for the Praxis test. We didn't have any study guides but she was able to prepare through Learning Express.

12. Patrons are better informed about our collections, services, and programs through digital signage purchased with LSTA. Patrons are very actively using Heritage Quest online, 24/7, and actively downloading e-books and audio books; these online services greatly expand our ability to serve patrons.

13. Patrons and staff have used Pioneer extensively and LSTA grants always give the general fund a boost.

14. We received 2 early literacy stations this year that we will put in our new Coalville library. We have been telling children about them and they can't wait to try them out. It will be a very nice addition to the services we provide. Pioneer and OverDrive give people access to information and electronic materials 24 hours a day. I have had numerous patrons thank us for providing this valuable resource.

## (5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	7 – 46.7%	1 – 6.7%	5 – 33.3%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%
The program guidelines are easy to follow	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%

*Replies 15; Forms 15*

## (6) Clarify your responses to each of the above three statements here:

1. For the most part I find the guidelines easy to follow. Patrons continue to struggle with Overdrive and the new one-click-digital downloadable sites. We purchased computers and equipment with the mini-grants and support and upkeep of these are supported by local funds.
2. The guidelines and instructions are challenging, but with the USL staff to help us we got 'er done. Audiobooks and playaways for kids are now being purchased after we saw the success of those that we purchased with the mini-grant. E-audiobooks and e-books are available and popular with our patrons due to LSTA supporting them at the state level - it would be very hard for us to find the money in the budget and stay up to date with this offering.
3. The LSTA program works very well, is easy to manage and is SO helpful to our library.
4. Even though I have applied for and received LSTA grants for our library, the process is always very time consuming and almost overwhelming for us who have little expertise in grant writing.
5. Guidelines: clearly stated and explained

Managing: as above

Local funds: city has seen the impact of the grant funds and have been willing to provide a larger budget for certain items in order to keep them

6. The guidelines are always great. They are easy to use and trainings are fantastic. Once we implement these programs the patrons want them to continue but with a very small city budget sometimes it is hard to keep up with demand.
7. The guidelines and instructions have become more 'user friendly' in the last few years. Most projects are completed with the LSTA funds, but occasionally the local funds have been used to complete or continue the project.
8. I have not had any problems following the programs and instructions. If anything, they have become easier over time. We have started purchasing our own copies of e-books for OverDrive in addition to what the State Library provides.

## (7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in such USL programs? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	3 – 20.0%	5 – 33.3%	2 – 13.3%	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%
Such USL program categories do not meet local library needs <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	6 – 40.0%	6 – 40.0%	1 – 6.7%
Such USL program categories are too limited <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%	6 – 40.0%	6 – 40.0%	0 – 0.0%
Lack of interest in such USL programs by local board <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 33.3%	10 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below) <i>Replies 4; Forms 15</i>	2 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 25.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 25.0%

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library... (Choose one response for each question.)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 13; Forms 15</i>	8 – 61.5%	5 – 38.5%	0 – 0.0%
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 13; Forms 15</i>	5 – 38.5%	8 – 61.5%	0 – 0.0%
Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	2 – 14.3%	12 – 85.7%	0 – 0.0%

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

1. Just starting to analyze
2. We have begun keeping track of the e-books and e-audiobook usage in the last two years.
3. Analyzing statistical data as we consider usage
4. Pioneer database usage reporting is non-existent. The State Library needs to do a better job of communicating usage by our patrons.
5. Monthly and annual statistical analysis, and evaluative comments from patrons and staff.
6. We are keeping track of the OverDrive downloads and have set goals to reach as a library system.

(10) Have such USL programs for technology funding...

	Yes	No	Don't know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	7 – 46.7%	7 – 46.7%	1 – 6.7%
Resulted in additional sources of local funds, other than from grant sources?	6 – 40.0%	8 – 53.3%	1 – 6.7%
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	2 – 13.3%	11 – 73.3%	2 – 13.3%

*Replies 15; Forms 15*

#### Section 2: Technology Resources

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

(11) How important are Pioneer databases to answer inquiries from library users?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
10 – 66.7%	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 15; Forms 15*

List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a.
- Auto Repair
- Overdrive
- I don't know how to find this data.
- Genealogy
- Ebsco
- Ebsco
- Pioneer
- Oneclickdigital
- Ebsco Host
- Home work help
- Summer Reading Program
- Overdrive

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

Ebsco  
Overdrive  
OverDrive

b.

Genealogy/Family History  
Utah Futures  
Auto Repair  
Overdrive  
Overdrive  
overdrive  
Overdrive  
Auto Repair  
OverDrive and OneClickDigital  
Overdrive  
Learning Express  
Newsbank  
Learning Express  
Ebsco

c.

Current events  
Homework helps  
Sirs  
Learning Express  
Heritage Quest  
Netlibrary  
Auto repair  
Overdrive  
Preschool Pioneer  
Inter Library Loan  
Ebsco  
Factiva  
Learning Express

(12) Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
8 – 53.3%	7 – 46.7%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used?

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
3 – 37.5%	3 – 37.5%	1 – 12.5%	1 – 12.5%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 8; Forms 15

(13) Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
10 – 71.4%	4 – 28.6%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 14; Forms 15

(14) How important is it for your library to use any of the above-listed USL technology funding programs to maintain the stability and capacity of your library's technology base (bandwidth, routers, etc)?

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
7 – 46.7%	2 – 13.3%	2 – 13.3%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%

Replies 15; Forms 15

(15) How important for users of your library are the following technology factors? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Updated personal workstations available	12 – 80.0%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Speed (Bandwidth)	11 – 73.3%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Availability of staff with technology skills to assist users	11 – 73.3%	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Access to Pioneer Databases	11 – 73.3%	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Degree of user technology skills	3 – 20.0%	8 – 53.3%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

(16) Does your library provide at least one workstation that is... (Choose one response for each question)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Accessible to persons with physical disabilities?	12 – 80.0%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%
Accessible to persons with hearing disabilities?	6 – 40.0%	9 – 60.0%	0 – 0.0%
Accessible to persons with vision disabilities?	6 – 40.0%	9 – 60.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

(17) Does your library have unique special collection materials (for example, archives, photographic images, letters, or manuscripts) in digital format?

Yes	No	Don't Know
4 – 26.7%	11 – 73.3%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

If yes, describe:

1. Local history and city records
2. Provo Historical Photos part of Mountain West Digital Library
3. local history and the local newspapers for last 90 years.
4. Local history photo digitization project.

(18) Are any of the digitized materials available over the web?

Yes	No	Don't Know
2 – 20.0%	7 – 70.0%	1 – 10.0%

Replies 10; Forms 15

(19) Other than in the library, are there places in your community where the public can gain access to the Internet at no charge?

Yes	No	Don't Know
4 – 26.7%	10 – 66.7%	1 – 6.7%

Replies 15; Forms 15

If yes, specify one or two sources:

1. Some restaurants
2. Local restaurants and motels provide wireless services. We are the only source of public access computers.

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

3. Senior Citizen's Center
4. McDonalds, Starbucks

(20) In order to maintain your current level of public access computing, prioritize the importance of each of the following. (Number 1 is your top priority)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Desktop computers & associated equipment <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	3 – 100.0%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Technical training <i>Replies 14; Forms 15</i>	2 – 14.3%	4 – 28.6%	4 – 28.6%	2 – 14.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 14.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Speed (Bandwidth) Online library catalog installation, upgrade, or replacement <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	2 – 13.3%	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%
Enhanced connectivity (more bandwidth, more speed) <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%
Information security <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	7 – 46.7%	0 – 0.0%
More online databases <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 13.3%	4 – 26.7%	4 – 26.7%	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%
Website development <i>Replies 15; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%	6 – 40.0%	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%
Other (specify below) <i>Replies 3; Forms 15</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 100.0%

Other: None

(21) How important do you believe the following factors are in creating support for adequate technology infrastructure in your library? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Adequacy of equipment	13 – 86.7%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequate staffing	13 – 86.7%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of adequate financial resources	13 – 86.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequately trained staff	12 – 80.0%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequate time to train	12 – 80.0%	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of technology support	11 – 73.3%	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Commitment from city/county administrators	11 – 73.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequately sized facilities	10 – 66.7%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Leadership from city/county officials	7 – 46.7%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Mission to integrate technology into the library	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	7 – 46.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of a long-range plan for technology integration	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	5 – 33.3%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Integration of library technology with other community partners	1 – 6.7%	5 – 33.3%	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

**Section 3: Training Needs****This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff.**

(22) Does your library offer any technology related classes to the public? (Choose one response)

Yes	No	Don't Know
8 – 53.3%	7 – 46.7%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 15; Forms 15

(23) How important is it for the library to offer formal training classes for users?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
4 – 26.7%	4 – 26.7%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 13.3%

Replies 15; Forms 15

(24) How frequently do staff members help library users do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

	At least 2-3 times per day 5	Daily 4	2-3 times per week 3	1-2 times per month 2	Never 1	Don't Know 9
Provide computer troubleshooting (printing, resetting of programs, etc.)	10 – 66.7%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize the library's online catalog	10 – 66.7%	3 – 20.0%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to check personal e-mail accounts	5 – 33.3%	8 – 53.3%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize word processing programs	5 – 33.3%	6 – 40.0%	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users in downloading e-books, music, etc.	5 – 33.3%	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to learn/apply basic personal computer skills (use of mouse, keyboard, etc.)	4 – 26.7%	3 – 20.0%	2 – 13.3%	6 – 40.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to conduct general searching on the Internet	4 – 26.7%	8 – 53.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to search Pioneer databases	3 – 20.0%	7 – 46.7%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist visitors to check email while traveling	3 – 20.0%	3 – 20.0%	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%
Assist users to set up free e-mail accounts	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	5 – 33.3%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Help users evaluate the quality and reliability of online resources	2 – 13.3%	1 – 6.7%	6 – 40.0%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%
Assist users to search other commercial databases	2 – 13.3%	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize spreadsheet programs	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%	7 – 46.7%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.7%
Assist users to utilize database programs	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	5 – 33.3%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%
Advise users on Internet filters	1 – 6.7%	3 – 20.0%	5 – 33.3%	5 – 33.3%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize scanning equipment	1 – 6.7%	2 – 13.3%	3 – 20.0%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	2 – 13.3%
Assist users to utilize presentation programs	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%	7 – 46.7%	1 – 6.7%	1 – 6.7%
Assist users to utilize gaming programs	0 – 0.0%	4 – 26.7%	3 – 20.0%	4 – 26.7%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize educational programs	0 – 0.0%	3 – 20.0%	7 – 46.7%	5 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Advise users about use of parental controls for Internet use	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	4 – 26.7%	2 – 13.3%

Replies 15; Forms 15

25. Overall, how skilled is your staff in instructing users... (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Skilled	Somewhat Skilled	Skilled	Somewhat Unskilled	Very Unskilled	Don't Know
In the use of the Internet	4 – 26.7%	7 – 46.7%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In the use of basic computer functions	2 – 13.3%	10 – 66.7%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In the use of the library catalog	7 – 46.7%	5 – 33.3%	3 – 20.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In the use of online resources	2 – 13.3%	5 – 33.3%	7 – 46.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In the use of search engines	3 – 20.0%	2 – 13.3%	9 – 60.0%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In finding financial information on the Internet	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%	6 – 40.0%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In locating genealogical sources on the Internet	2 – 13.3%	4 – 26.7%	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
In accessing legal resources on the Internet	1 – 6.7%	5 – 33.3%	2 – 13.3%	5 – 33.3%	2 – 13.3%	0 – 0.0%
In searching for medical/health resources on the Internet	1 – 6.7%	4 – 26.7%	5 – 33.3%	4 – 26.7%	1 – 6.7%	0 – 0.0%

Rеспuestas 15; Formas 15

#### Section 4: Library Identification

Library Name:

- 1 Eagle Mountain Library
- 1 Lehi City Public Library
- 1 Provo City Library
- 1 Garland Public Library
- 1 Logan Library
- 1 Richfield Library
- 1 Grand County Public Library
- 1 Mt. Pleasant Public Library
- 1 Spanish Fork Public Library
- 1 Highland City Library
- 1 Orem Public Library
- 1 Summit County Library
- 1 Hyrum Library
- 1 Pleasant Grove City Library
- 1 Tremonton City Library

Rеспuestas 15; Formas 15

FINAL of Survey 1 for Public Libraries

City where your Library is located:

- 1 Eagle Mountain
  - 1 Logan
  - 1 Pleasant Grove Utah
  - 1 Garland, Utah
  - 1 Moab
  - 1 Provo
  - 1 Highland
  - 1 Mt. Pleasant, UT
  - 1 Richfield
  - 1 Hyrum, UT 84319
  - 1 Orem
  - 1 Spanish Fork
  - 1 Lehi
  - 1 Park City, Kamas, and Coalville
  - 1 Tremonton, Utah
- Replies 15; Forms 15*

What is your latest annual expenditures budget:

- 1 \$1,735,246
  - 1 \$1,056,667
  - 1 \$39,067
  - 1 \$110,633
  - 1 \$143,768
  - 1 \$547,925
  - 1 \$233,500
  - 1 \$150,000
  - 1 \$988,676
  - 1 \$3,053,413
  - 1 \$200,000
  - 1 \$500,000
  - 1 \$3.7 million
- Replies 13; Forms 15*

**Section 5: Respondent Identification**

*Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results*

Respondent's Name: (*Person completing the survey*)

Respondent's Title:

Respondent's E-mail Address:

*Thank you  
for completing this survey!*

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## ANNEX 5-B

**Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds****This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.**

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services? (Check all that apply.)

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	15 – 88.2 %
One time equipment purchases	8 – 47 %
Mini Grants	5 – 27.8%
Project Grants to K-12 Libraries	5 – 27.8%
Bookmobile Services	3 – 17.6%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	3 – 16.7%
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	1 – 5.6%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	1 – 5.6%
Interlibrary loan lending support	1 – 5.6%
Senior Grant	0 – 0.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	0 – 0.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Downloadable Videos	0 – 0.0%
Other (specify below)	0 – 0.0%

Replies 17; Forms 17

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [Examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services; increased circulation; or more library staff assistance to students/faculty without expanding the user base] Circle one response.

Yes	No	Don't Know
14 – 82.3%	1 – 5.8%	2 – 11.7%

Replies 17, Forms 17

If yes, explain

1. More students have access to information because of the computers received through the grant.
2. The Koha ILS funded though the LSTA grant has allowed for 25 plus library access in the region to have a full functioning library system. Schools have a much more affordable, reliable and robust ILS.
3. The computer lab awarded to my library through the LSTA Grant is being used by students before school, after school, during lunches, and with teachers during instructional time. It is has been a great asset for my library. The library usage has increased dramatically in the past four years.
4. Our students and teachers use Pioneer Online more often.
5. Reference materials that I could not purchase without the funds
6. The kiosk has become the one place students, parents and teacher turn to for their technology needs. They know the equipment works and that there is always assistance if needed. Many projects have been completed here - video, audio, color print, ppt's, OCR docs, scanning, web development, etc.

7. Increased circulation; increased use of technology by students; increased use of Pioneer for research; improved automation applications
8. The equipment I purchased with the mini grant allowed me to teach online services which helped the students know what is available and to use it.
9. The project grant funded (four, maybe five years ago) software for print disabled students (WYNN) for print disabled (dyslexic) as well as books and audio books to support below grade-level readers. We also purchased presentation equipment which is used constantly to teach access skills.
10. More Spanish books are available for the students and are being checked out regularly.
11. We received a \$37,000 LSTA grant to create a 36 unit computer lab in the library. Before the grant we had about 6 computers that worked, and it was impossible to teach anything computer-related to students. With the computer lab, I teach students (and they learn by doing, not by just showing) how to use the library catalog, how to Google Search, how to use Pioneer Library and World Book Web databases. I have given instruction on PowerPoint, creating bibliographies in Word, and creating Excel charts. I also use online common formative assessments to assess my teaching. Many more classes visit the library since we received the computer lab. It has made all the difference in the world in the library! Thanks so much.
12. Through project grants, I have learned new research strategies, have been updated on copyright laws, and received eBook training. I have shared these skills and information with students and faculty in the library setting at my school. Many of the students use Pioneer while researching in the labs. I am better able to teach Pioneer skills because of training.
13. We received a grant to purchase a computer lab for our library. The lab has significantly increased patron use of our library. As a result, our circulation has increased as well. The computer lab is a major draw for students.
14. Before receiving the LSTA grant we had 20 computers in our library computer lab. Now we have 35. This makes it possible for each student to be at the computer and learn the skills necessary to live in this digital world. Just this week I have had classes in every day learning computer skill. Because the lab is here in the library, they have access to a certified instructor to teach them important concepts such as using article databases, advanced searching techniques, etc. I am the only school in the district that as a 35 station computer lab, and I wouldn't have it without that wonderful opportunity the LSTA grant gave me. There has been an increased circulation of books and use of databases because more teachers and students coming to the library. There has been more library staff assistance to students/faculty without expanding the user base because entire classes come and use the lab for research and word processing of research projects whereas beforehand there were not enough computers to facilitate this.

(3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
One time equipment purchases <i>Replies 13; Forms 17</i>	10 – 76.9%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 7.6%	1 – 7.6%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 7.6%
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases) <i>Replies 17; Forms 17</i>	9 – 52.9%	5 – 29.4%	4 – 17.6%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Project Grants to K-12 Libraries <i>Replies 5; Forms 17</i>	7 – 63.6%	2 – 18.2%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 9.1%	1 – 9.1%
Mini Grants <i>Replies 11; Forms 17</i>	5 – 45.5%	3 – 27.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 9.1%	2 – 18.2%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	2 – 25.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 25.0%	1 – 12.5%	1 – 12.5%	2 – 25.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	1 – 12.5%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 25.0%	5 – 62.5%
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services <i>Replies 9; Forms 17</i>	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	4 – 44.4%
Bookmobile Services <i>Replies 9; Forms 17</i>	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	1 – 11.1%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 25.0%	4 – 44.4%
Interlibrary loan lending support <i>Replies 9; Forms 17</i>	1 – 11.1%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 11.1%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 22.2%	5 – 55.6%
Downloadable Videos <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	4 – 50.0%	2 – 25.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 25.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books) <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 12.5%	1 – 12.5%	3 – 37.5%	1 – 12.5%	2 – 25.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 12.5%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 12.5%	6 – 75.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program) <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 12.5%	2 – 25.0%	5 – 62.5%
Senior Grant <i>Replies 8; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 12.5%	7 – 87.5%
Other (specify below) <i>Replies 5; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 100.0%

(4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
15 – 88.2%	1 – 5.8%	1 – 5.8%

Replies 17, Forms 17

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

1. Students with disabilities use computers for Core Testing. Business Communication class uses computers, including Pioneer for research papers.
2. Of course, the Pioneer library is important for our schools as well as the LSTA grant funding for Koha.
3. When I started working here at Bingham High School I had 20 old cast off computers that were very hard to maintain because of their age. We have a student body of 2,500 students that were very underserved with computer access. When I had classes come into the media center to do research I could give instruction to all of the students but if they weren't working on a team project they had to take turns on the computers. This was discouraging for teachers and the students alike. Now I can have the entire class explore the different databases and start their individual research. Teachers see my library now as a valuable resource because I have the workstations available to meet the student and teacher needs.  
Students use the media center for their research needs before school, during their lunches, and after school. We have approximately 300 kids coming to the media center before school and during lunches. The students line up early to make sure they have access to the computer lab. My lab is the only supervised one available for students in the morning and during lunches. The media center has become "The" place to be!
4. We were able to purchase computers for the library that we did not have funding for before. We also purchase printers and a few programs that have benefited students with technology exposure. Teachers have utilized these programs to add variety to the classroom activities.
5. The students and teachers use the features of pioneer
6. We cater to our ESL, blind and reluctant learners. Our gifted and talented students are using the kiosk for many of their sterling scholar projects and science Olympiad studies.
7. Students use Pioneer to research in the library. Teachers are using Pioneer as a research tool with their students, rather than just having them go out on the Internet.
8. LSTA funds have provided technology for the seven school libraries in our district. Without LSTA funds, online resources would not be available. LSTA funds have provided automation applications for the seven schools in our district which allows librarians and students to search and access materials remotely.
9. The equipment helped students to navigate Pioneer and OPAC.
10. We use Pioneer databases routinely and continue to circulate the books for below-grade level readers. The equipment is used daily and allows us to help students as they search for and access information from the catalog, online databases and eBooks.
11. My collections are renowned and I have lent Spanish books to numerous other libraries. My bilingual collection helps those who are struggling in either language.
12. 1) Students in my school frequently use Pioneer Library databases for research. In the past week, I have had science, U.S. history, and Language Arts students in the library using these databases for different projects—a Revolutionary War newspaper, a PowerPoint on endangered species, and gathering information about different aspects of teen violence.  
2) Last year 734 different classes used the library during the school year for research and instruction. Most of the time, computers in the computer lab were accessed during class visits. In addition, the school yearbook staff used library computers after school to put together the school yearbook.
14. The funds have been spent to provide guest speakers with expertise in their fields. For example, the copyright expert was a copyright lawyer. The speakers providing eBook information were also well respected in their field. Those who attended learned a lot that they are now able to take to their respective school districts and apply.

15. Students come after school to check their grades and work on online homework assignments. Students who come to the library to use the computers, often stay to look at books and check them out.
16. Just today I had students in the library every period of the day researching using the Pioneer databases. In two of the classes, students were doing research papers and learning about article and research databases and advanced search techniques. The combination of each student having a computer and having the teacher librarian there to instruct the students makes a win-win situation for students AND classroom teachers.
- With LSTA funds we also purchased an LCD projector, screen, and printer that assist in teaching students. The students can see what is going on in the lesson and then practice on their own computer.
- Not only is our lab used for classroom students it is used extensively before and after school, during lunch and extended opportunity hours. It is also used for teacher in-service in the school and for the yearly district technology workshop, Brainblast.

(5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	6 – 35.2%	2 – 11.7%	5 – 29.4%	1 – 5.8%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 17.6%
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	5 – 29.4%	4 – 23.5%	6 – 35.2%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 11.7%
The program guidelines are easy to follow	3 – 17.6%	7 – 41.1%	5 – 29.4%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 11.7%

Rplies 17; Forms 17

(6) Clarify your responses to each of the above 3 statements

1. Program guidelines are in writing on the website and help was received by State Library personnel when necessary. School and District monies are used for update and tech support of computers.
2. The LSTA grant that I was awarded was very clear on criteria needed to apply and the requirements/conditions upon receiving the award. I feel that it is very straight forward and a great resource to get libraries up to date with the tools necessary to provide the patrons with information access.
3. I have received grants to further the collection, for example adding books to my Spanish section and special collections.
4. The process is easily understood and the assistance that applicants receive really helps!
5. I am not sure to what "guidelines" refers.
6. Funding in schools is limited and projects, although still in use, have not been adequately replaced or updated.
7. Applying for the project grant was a bit difficult only in time necessitated. I could understand the instructions for the most part, but difficult in following only because of the reporting data needed. The data was necessary, but compliance was not particularly easy.
8. We are now trying to find more room to purchase more Spanish books. Our library is limited in space.
9. Because I was unfamiliar with these types of guidelines, I was glad I had a mentor in my district (someone who had previously received an LSTA grant) to help me understand what I needed to do. Instructions for managing the program were clear and direct. The computers in the library computer lab are now part of the rotation of computers in our school, and the lab will be maintained as one of the research labs in the building.

10. The librarian who applied for the grant has since retired, but it is my understanding that she did not have too much trouble in the application process.  
 Local funds have been used to keep the lab running and to extend library hours for the lab's use.
11. As with most grant processes, sometime terminology gets in the way of making guidelines and instructions easy to follow. However, Rose Frost, assisted me every step of the way to work through any problems I had.  
 Before I could apply for the grant, our district technology coordinator insisted that I have funding in place so that computers would be replaced according to district policy. I did that and our leased computers were replaced this past year, per the district rotation system.

(7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in the above-listed USL programs?  
 (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Such USL program categories do not meet my library's needs <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	2 – 12.5%	1 – 6.2%	5 – 31.2%	5 – 31.2%	3 – 18.7%
Such USL program categories are too limited <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 6.2%	6 – 37.5%	5 – 31.2%	4 – 25%
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	1 – 6.2%	1 – 6.2%	1 – 6.2%	3 – 18.7%	4 – 25%	6 – 37.5%
Lack of interest in such USL programs by school administrators <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	0 – 0.0%	2 – 12.5%	0 – 0.0%	5 – 31.2%	4 – 25%	5 – 31.2%
Other (Specify below) <i>Replies 6; Forms 17</i>	1 – 16.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 16.7%	4 – 66.7%

Other:

1. I don't know anything about any programs other than Pioneer.
2. Even if funding were available, I would likely be unable to apply for grants as I represent a one librarian library and would not have the staff needed to comply with the time requirements. I do teach access to eBooks and Pioneer, however.
3. Lack of room.
4. Grants to K-12 libraries seem to have diminished in the past 2 years

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library... (Choose one response for each question.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	12 – 75%	3 – 18.8%	1 – 6.2%
Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 17; Forms 17</i>	2 – 11.7%	13 – 76.4%	2 – 11.7%
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Replies 16; Forms 17</i>	2 – 12.5%	12 – 75.0%	2 – 12.5%

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

1. Use by classes both in the library and on portable labs throughout the school.
2. Each year the entire sophomore class comes to the media center to receive an orientation on the media center and the resources available. Pioneer is one of the databases that they are introduced to. At the conclusion of the orientation the students are given an assignment that uses Pioneer databases to complete it. The students hand in the assignment.
3. We as a district calculated Pioneer use a few years ago and worked on increasing the use of the site.
4. I'd like to know what measures other schools are using to evaluate use of Pioneer databases. Since my staff was recently reduced, I am not able to collaborate with teachers as much and, therefore, have access to visual assessment of use. Is there a digital accounting per school?
5. We are using Pioneer, but we haven't been using measures to evaluate the frequency of its use.

(10) Have such USL programs for technology funding... (Choose one response for each question.)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Resulted in additional sources of local funds?	9 – 52.9%	7 – 41.1%	1 – 5.8%
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	3 – 17.6%	13 – 76.4%	1 – 5.8%
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	3 – 17.6%	12 – 70.5%	2 – 11.7%

Replies 17; Forms 17

#### Section 2: Technology Resources

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

(11) How important are Pioneer databases... (Choose one response for each question)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
To assist in answering faculty inquiries?	9 – 52.9%	4 – 23.5%	3 – 17.6%	1 – 5.8%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
To assist in answering student inquiries?	9 – 52.9%	2 – 11.7%	5 – 29.4%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 5.8%

Replies 17; Forms 17

(12) List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a. 3; 18.8% Culture grams  
3; 18.8% Ebsco  
3; 18.8% Sirs  
2; 12.5% eMedia  
2; 12.5% SIRS Issues Researcher  
1; 6.3% SIRS Knowledge Source  
1; 6.3% SIRS Pro-Con Knowledge Source  
1; 6.3% World Book Encyclopedia
- b. 4; 26.7% Ebsco  
3; 20.0% culture grams  
2; 13.3% eMedia  
2; 13.3% World Book

**FINAL Survey 1 for K-12 Libraries**

1 North Sanpete High School Library  
1 Dixie Sun Elementary  
1 North Summit Elementary  
1 Horizon Elementary  
1 North Summit High School  
1 Hurricane Middle School  
1 We work with close to 100 schools in the region  
1 Kings Peak Elementary  
1 Weber High School  
1 Layton High School  
*Replies 17; Forms 17*

**City where your Library is located:**

1 Cedar City  
1 Lehi, UT  
1 Roosevelt  
1 St. George  
1 Coalville  
1 Logan, Utah  
1 Sandy, Utah  
1 Washington  
1 Coalville, Utah  
1 Midvale  
1 South Jordan  
1 Hurricane, Utah  
1 Mount Pleasant  
1 Southwest Utah  
1 Layton, Utah  
1 Pleasant View, Utah  
1 St George  
*Replies 17; Forms 17*

**Section 5: Respondent Identification**

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (*Person completing the survey*) \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

**Annex 5-C****Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds**

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services?

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	2 – 66.7%
Interlibrary loan lending support	2 – 66.7%
Project Grants to Academic Libraries	2 – 66.7%
Mini Grants	1 – 33.3%
Blind and Disabled Services	0 – 0.0%
Senior Grant	0 – 0.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	0 – 0.0%
Bookmobile Services	0 – 0.0%
One time equipment purchases	0 – 0.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	0 – 0.0%
Downloadable Videos	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services, or increased circulation] (Choose one response)

Yes	No	Don't Know
2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%

Replies 3, Forms 3

- (3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated? (Choose one response for each statement.)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases) Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Interlibrary loan lending support Replies 2; Forms 3	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Project Grants to Academic Libraries Replies 2; Forms 3	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Mini Grants	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Blind and Disabled Services	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Senior Grant	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Bookmobile Services	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
One time equipment purchases	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%
Downloadable Videos	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 2; Forms 3

- (4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users.

1. Without the interlibrary loan assistance we receive from the State Library, we would likely have to charge our students for interlibrary loan services.
2. Our academic library patrons are avid users of Academic Pioneer databases.
3. Our library is a hub and participating partner in the Mountain West Digital Library, which receives support from the LSTA. The MWDL is a great resource for our library's users.
4. Interlibrary lending between libraries. Project Grants to academic libraries-EAD

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

(5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
The program guidelines are easy to follow	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 3; Forms 3*

(6) Clarify your responses to each of the above 3 statements here:

1. The grant application guidelines are pretty straightforward, and on the website there are good explanations for what is expected.
2. The guidelines for managing the grant funding and how to implement the program locally are made clear in the paperwork and on the website, and the expectations for measurable outputs are well defined.
3. Our institution has been able to maintain the upkeep and use of the equipment we purchased with the project grant money.

(7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in any of the above-listed USL programs? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Such USL program categories are too limited <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Such USL program categories do not meet my library's needs <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%

*Replies 3; Forms 3*

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library... (Choose one response for each question)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	0 – 0.0%	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	0 – 0.0%	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.33%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 3; Forms 3*

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

1. Our library can access usage statistics for most of the databases that we get through Academic Pioneer.
2. Library Instruction – Rubric Statistical Data

(10) Have any of the above-listed USL programs for technology funding... (Choose one response for each question.)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other campus departments or external organizations?	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Resulted in additional sources of funds?	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

**Section 2: Technology Resources**

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

(11) How important are Pioneer databases to answer inquiries from library users?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(12) List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

- a. Academic Search Premier – 3 – 100.0%
- b. Business Source Premier – 1 – 33.3%  
Proquest Newspapers – 1 – 33.3%
- c. Business Source Premier – 1 – 33.3%  
Psychology & Behavioral Sciences Collection – 1 – 33.3%
- ERIC – 1 – 33.3%
- Factiva – 1 – 33.3%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(13) Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(14) If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used?

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

(15) Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
2 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 2; Forms 3

(16) How important is it for your library to use any of the above-listed USL technology funding programs to maintain the stability and capacity of your library's technology base (bandwidth, routers, etc)?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(17) How important for users of your library are the following technology factors? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Access to Pioneer Databases	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Updated personal workstations available	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Speed (Bandwidth)	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Availability of staff with technology skills to assist users	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Degree of user technology skills	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(18) Does your library provide at least one workstation that is... (Choose one response for each question)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Accessible to persons with physical disabilities?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Accessible to persons with hearing disabilities?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Accessible to persons with vision disabilities?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(19) Does your library have unique special collection materials (for example, archives, photographic images, letters, or manuscripts) in digital format?

Yes	No	Don't Know
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

If yes, describe

1. Yes, all of the above.
2. We have several collections of digitized historic photographs, including The Wilson W. Sorenson Photograph
3. Collection and the Barry Maxfield Railroad Collection. We also have digitized student theses, library
4. Newsletters and campus journals.
5. Rare Books, Archives, Manuscripts, Photographs

FINAL of Survey 1 for Academic Libraries

(20) Are any of the digitized materials available over the web?

Yes	No	Don't Know
3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(21) What form of technology support does your library have? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Library's own technology support staff Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Campus-wide technology support staff Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Contract for external technology support Replies 3; Forms 3	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Other (specify below) Replies 1; Forms 3	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

(22) Is your library's technology support adequate? (Choose one response)

Yes	No	Don't Know
2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 3; Forms 3

(23) How important do you believe the following factors are in creating support for adequate technology infrastructure in your library? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Commitment from your institution's administrators Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of adequate financial resources Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of technology support Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Mission to integrate technology into the library Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Presence of a long-range plan for technology integration Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequacy of equipment Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Quality of computer technology available Replies 3; Forms 3	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequate staff technology skill Replies 3; Forms 3	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequately sized facilities Replies 3; Forms 3	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

## Question 23 continued

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Adequate time to train <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Adequate staffing <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Expectations of faculty <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Other <i>Replies 1; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%

Other: None

(24) Currently, how important are the following technology capability issues you face? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Cost of computer hardware <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Cost of computer software <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Lack of adequate funding <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Inadequacy of Internet speed <i>Replies 2; Forms 3</i>	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Cost of training and education <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Lack of management support <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Staff's limited time for using technology <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Students' lack of skills in using technology <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Physical space limitations <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Lack of training on how to use the Internet <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Faculty's lack of skills in using technology <i>Replies 2; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 50.0%	1 – 50.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Limited staff skills in using technology <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

## Question 24 continued

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Lack of in-house technology expertise <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Cost of phone charges <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Inadequacy of local telecommunications access <i>Replies 3; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Other <i>Replies 1; Forms 3</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%

**Section 3: Training Needs**

This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff.

- (25) How frequently do staff members help users to do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

	At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
Assist users to search commercial	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize the library's online	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to conduct general searching	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to search Pioneer databases	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Help users evaluate the quality and	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Assist users to utilize educational software	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize word processing	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Provide computer troubleshooting (printing, resetting of programs, etc.)	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users in downloading e-books, music, etc.	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize scanning equipment	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize spreadsheets	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize database programs	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to utilize presentation	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Advise users on Internet filters	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%
Assist visitors to check email while traveling	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%
Assist users to learn/apply basic personal computer skills (use of mouse, keyboard, etc.)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%
Assist users to check personal e-mail	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%
Assist users to set up free e-mail accounts	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%
Assist users to utilize gaming programs	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%

*Replies 3; Forms 3*

(26) Overall, how skilled is your staff in instructing users in the use of... (Choose one response for each question)

	Very Skilled	Somewhat Skilled	Skilled	Somewhat Unskilled	Very Unskilled	Don't Know
Pioneer databases?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Other commercial databases?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
The Internet?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
The library catalog?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Search engines?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Online resources?	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Basic computer functions?	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

R<sub>plies 3; F</sub>orms 3

(27) How frequently do library staff members use online resources to help faculty do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

	At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
No time to practice	3 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Training needed is not offered	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%
Use or assist with classroom software such as Blackboard, e.college, WebCT, etc.	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Assist with digitizing course-related materials	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Create web-based courses or tutorials for students	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%
Create instructional materials/handouts	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	2 – 66.7%	1 – 33.3%	0 – 0.0%
Get images from the Internet for use in projects	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	2 – 66.7%	0 – 0.0%
Provide instruction on specific computer applications (spreadsheets, etc)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%	1 – 33.3%

R<sub>plies 3; F</sub>orms 3

## Annex 5-D

**Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds****This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.**

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services? (Choose all that apply.)

	Yes
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	1 – 100.0%
One time equipment purchases	1 – 100.0%
Project Grants to Special Libraries	1 – 100.0%
Interlibrary loan lending support	0 – 0.0%
Mini Grants	0 – 0.0%
Blind and Disabled Services	0 – 0.0%
Senior Grant	0 – 0.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	0 – 0.0%
Bookmobile Services	0 – 0.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	0 – 0.0%
Downloadable Videos	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services, expanded ability to offer desired and utilized services.]

Yes	No	Don't Know
0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 1, Forms 1*

If yes, explain: None

FINAL of Survey 1 for Special Libraries

(3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated?  
 (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Project Grants to Special Libraries	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
One time equipment purchases	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Mini Grants	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Blind and Physically Handicapped Services	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Senior Grant	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Bookmobile Services	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Interlibrary loan lending support	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Downloadable Videos	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 1; Forms 1

(4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Replies 1, Forms 1

If yes, give two real-life examples of ways LSTA grant funds have benefited your library's users. Grants to institutions have been very valuable in the past in accomplishing important one-time projects. However, these grants have been unavailable recently.

(5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The program guidelines are easy to follow	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

(6) Clarify your responses to each of the above three statements here: None

(7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in the above-listed USL programs? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Such USL program categories are too limited <i>Replies 1; Forms 1</i>	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Such USL program categories do not meet our user needs <i>Replies 1; Forms 1</i>	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work <i>Replies 1; Forms 1</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Other (Specify below) <i>Replies 0; Forms 1</i>	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%

Other: None

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library . . .

	Yes	No	Don't know
Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization?	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization?	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using.

We do not need to evaluate Pioneer database utilization; this seems to be a State Library need.

FINAL of Survey 1 for Special Libraries

(10) Have any of the above-listed USL programs for technology funding...

	Yes	No	Don't know
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%	0 – 0.0%
Resulted in additional sources of funds?	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	0 – 0.0%	1 – 100.0%	0 – 0.0%

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

**Section 2: Library Identification**

Library Name: Utah State Archives

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

City where your library is located: Salt Lake City

*Replies 1; Forms 1*

**Section 3: Respondent Identification**

***Respondent information in this section will be confidential and will not be reported with results***

Respondent's Name: (Person completing the survey) \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you  
for completing this survey!***

**Your responses are important to the LSTA planning and evaluation process.**

## Annex 6

### Combined Results of 4 Surveys

#### **Section 1: Impact of LSTA "Grants to States" Funds**

This section asks you about the impact of LSTA-funded programs on your library.

- (1) The Utah State Library established the programs and services listed below using LSTA "Grants to States" funds. In the past four years, has your library or have your patrons received services from any of these USL programs or services?

	<b>Yes</b>
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases)	33 – 92%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books)	18 – 50%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)	17 – 47%
Interlibrary loan lending support	16 – 44%
Mini Grants	15 – 42%
One time equipment purchases	15 – 42%
Project Grants to Public Libraries	13 – 36%
Blind and Disabled Services	10 – 28%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program)	10 – 28%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers	9 – 25%
Downloadable Videos	6 – 17%
Bookmobile Services	4 – 11%
Senior Grant	1 – 3%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers	0 – 0%
Other (Specify below)	0 – 0%

Total Responses 36

- (2) Has use of your library increased in the past four years in ways you can relate to your participation in these USL programs and services? [Examples: increased on-site visits or remote use of services; increased circulation; or more library cards issued without expanding the service area] (Choose one response.)

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
28 – 78%	2 – 6%	6 – 17%

Total Responses 36

FINAL of Survey for Total Responses

(3) Of these USL programs and services, how important was each during the time your library participated?  
*(Choose one response for each statement)*

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Pioneer: Utah's Online Library (access to databases) <i>Total Responses 36</i>	25 – 69%	7 – 19%	3 – 8%	1 – 3%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Project Grants to Public Libraries <i>Total Responses 30</i>	19 – 63%	3 – 10%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	1 – 3%	7 – 23%
One time equipment purchases <i>Total Responses 30</i>	17 – 57%	4 – 13%	2 – 6%	2 – 6%	0 – 0%	5 – 16%
Overdrive; OneClickDigital; or NetLibrary (e-audio books and/or e-books) <i>Total Responses 26</i>	13 – 50%	2 – 8%	2 – 8%	3 – 12%	3 – 12%	3 – 12%
Mini Grants <i>Total Responses 29</i>	14 – 48%	8 – 28%	0 – 0%	1 – 3%	1 – 3%	5 – 17%
Interlibrary loan lending support <i>Total Responses 28</i>	13 – 46%	2 – 7%	3 – 11%	0 – 0%	3 – 11%	7 – 25%
Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) <i>Total Responses 26</i>	9 – 35%	2 – 8%	1 – 4%	1 – 4%	5 – 19%	8 – 31%
Utah Kids Ready to Read (early literacy program) <i>Total Responses 26</i>	7 – 27%	0 – 0%	5 – 19%	1 – 4 %	4 – 15%	9 – 35%
Library Services for Spanish Speakers <i>Total Responses 26</i>	6 – 23%	2 – 8%	5 – 19%	3 – 12%	4 – 15%	6 – 23%
Downloadable Videos <i>Total Responses 25</i>	5 – 20%	7 – 28%	4 – 16%	2 – 8%	1 – 4 %	6 – 24%
Blind and Disabled Services <i>Total Responses 27</i>	4 – 15%	2 – 7%	7 – 30%	0 – 0%	4 – 15%	10 – 37%
Bookmobile Services <i>Total Responses 26</i>	3 – 11%	1 – 4%	3 – 11%	1 – 4%	8 – 31%	10 – 38%
Library Services for Navajo Speakers <i>Total Responses 25</i>	0 – 0%	1 – 4%	1 – 4%	1 – 4%	7 – 28%	15 – 60%
Senior Grant <i>Total Responses 26</i>	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	5 – 19%	0 – 0%	5 – 19%	16 – 62%

(4) Have any of the above-listed USL programs and services had a positive impact on the users of your library?

Yes	No	Don't Know
34 – 94%	1 – 3%	1 – 3%

*Total Responses 36*

*FINAL of Survey for Total Responses*

(5) To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Local funds have continued projects that were begun with such USL funding	14 – 39%	3 – 8%	12 – 33%	3 – 8%	0 – 0%	4 – 11%
The instructions for managing these programs are clear	11 – 31%	8 – 22%	14 – 39%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	3 – 8%
The program guidelines are easy to follow	9 – 25%	11 – 31%	12 – 33%	1 – 3%	0 – 0%	3 – 8%

*Total Responses 36*

(6) Clarify your responses to each of the above three statements here [See four type-of-library response sets, Annex 2]

(7) Have any of the following posed barriers to your library's participation in such USL programs? (*Choose one response for each statement*)

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Lack of staff to carry out program-related work <i>Total Responses 35</i>	4 – 11%	6 – 17%	6 – 17%	6 – 17%	7 – 20%	6 – 17%
Such USL program categories do not meet local library needs <i>Total Responses 35</i>	1 – 3%	4 – 11%	2 – 6%	12 – 34%	12 – 34%	4 – 11%
Such USL program categories are too limited <i>Total Responses 35</i>	1 – 3%	2 – 6%	3 – 9%	14 – 40%	11 – 31%	4 – 11%

(8) LSTA "Grants to States" guidelines require evaluation measures be used to assess the impact of the Pioneer database program. Is your library...? (*Choose one response for each question.*)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Not using measures; needs help to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Total Responses 33</i>	20 – 61%	12 – 36%	1 – 3%
Starting to develop measures to evaluate the impact of Pioneer database utilization? <i>Total Responses 33</i>	7 – 21%	24 – 73%	2 – 6%
Already using measures your library developed to evaluate Pioneer database utilization? <i>Total Responses 35</i>	6 – 17%	27 – 77%	2 – 6%

(9) If you are using evaluation measures, specify the measures you are using. [See four type-of-library response sets, Annex 2]

FINAL of Survey for Total Responses

(10) Have such USL programs for technology funding...

	Yes	No	Don't know
Resulted in additional sources of local funds, other than from grant sources?	16 – 44%	18 – 50%	2 – 6%
Assisted your library to develop partnerships with other institutions in your community?	13 – 36%	19 – 53%	4 – 11%
Helped in obtaining grants from other sources?	7 – 19%	26 – 72%	3 – 8%

Total Responses 36

**Section 2: Technology Resources**

This section asks you about your library's current technology environment.

(11) How important are Pioneer databases to answer inquiries from library users?

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
31 – 60%	7 – 13%	12 – 23%	1 – 2%	0 – 0%	1 – 2%

Total Responses 52

List the three Pioneer databases most used by your library users

a.

Auto Repair  
 Overdrive  
 I don't know how to find this data.  
 Genealogy  
 Ebsco  
 Ebsco  
 pioneer  
 Oneclickdigital  
 Ebsco Host  
 Home work help  
 Summer Reading Program  
 Overdrive  
 Ebsco  
 Overdrive  
 OverDrive

b.

Genealogy/Family History  
 Utah Futures  
 Auto Repair  
 Overdrive  
 Overdrive  
 overdrive  
 Overdrive  
 Auto Repair  
 OverDrive and OneClick Digital  
 Overdrive  
 Learning Express  
 Newsbank  
 Learning Express  
 Ebsco

c.

Current events  
 Homework helps  
 Sirs

*FINAL of Survey for Total Responses*

Learning Express  
 Heritage Quest  
 netlibrary  
 Auto repair  
 Overdrive  
 Preschool Pioneer  
 Inter Library Loan  
 Ebsco  
 Factiva  
 Learning Express

(12) Does your library subscribe to other commercial online resources to assist library users?

Yes	No	Don't Know
17 – 49%	17 – 49%	1 – 2%

*Total Responses 35*

If yes, how frequently are these commercial online resources used?

At least 2-3 times per day	Daily	2-3 times per week	1-2 times per month	Never
7 – 35%	4 – 20%	2 – 10%	4 – 20%	3 – 15%

*Total Responses 20*

(13) Is your bandwidth speed currently adequate?

Yes	No	Don't Know
25 – 76%	5 – 15%	3 – 9%

*Total Responses 33*

(14) How important for users of your library are the following technology factors? (Choose one response for each statement)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Updated personal workstations available	14 – 78%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%
Access to Pioneer Databases	14 – 78%	1 – 6%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Speed (Bandwidth)	13 – 72%	4 – 22%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%
Availability of staff with technology skills to assist users	11 – 61%	4 – 22%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%
Degree of user technology skills	3 – 17%	9 – 50%	5 – 28%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%

*Total Responses 18*

*FINAL of Survey for Total Responses*

(15) Does your library provide at least one workstation that is... (*Choose one response for each question*)

	Yes	No	Don't know
Accessible to persons with physical disabilities?	14 – 78%	3 – 17%	1 – 6%
Accessible to persons with hearing disabilities?	8 – 44%	10 – 56%	0 – 0%
Accessible to persons with vision disabilities?	8 – 44%	10 – 56%	0 – 0%

*Total Responses 18*

(16) Does your library have unique special collection materials (for example, archives, photographic images, letters, or manuscripts) in digital format?

Yes	No	Don't Know
7 – 39%	11 – 61%	0 – 0%

*Total Responses 18*

(17) Are any of the digitized materials available over the web?

Yes	No	Don't Know
5 – 38%	7 – 54%	1 – 8%

*Total Responses 13*

(18) Other than in the library, are there places in your community where the public can gain access to the Internet at no charge?

Yes	No	Don't Know
4 – 27%	10 – 67%	1 – 7%

*Total Responses 15*

(19) How important do you believe the following factors are in creating support for adequate technology infrastructure in your library? (*Choose one response for each statement*) **This question was asked of Public and Academic Libraries only.**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant	Don't Know
Adequacy of equipment	16 – 89%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Presence of adequate financial resources	16 – 89%	1 – 6%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Adequate staffing	15 – 83%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Adequately trained staff	14 – 78%	4 – 22%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Adequate time to train	14 – 78%	3 – 17%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Presence of technology support	14 – 78%	3 – 17%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Commitment from city/county or higher administrators	14 – 78%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Adequately sized facilities	12 – 67%	5 – 28%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Mission to integrate technology into the library	8 – 44%	3 – 17%	7 – 39%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Presence of a long-range plan for technology integration	8 – 44%	3 – 17%	5 – 28%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%

*Total Responses 18*

**Section 3: Training Needs****This section asks you about training needs of your users and staff.**

(20) How frequently do staff members help library users do the following? (Choose one response for each statement)

**This question was asked of Public and Academic Libraries only.**

	At least 2-3 times per day 5	Daily 4	2-3 times per week 3	1-2 times per month 2	Never 1	Don't Know 9
Assist users to utilize the library's online catalog	13 – 72%	3 – 17%	1 – 6%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Provide computer troubleshooting (printing, resetting of programs, etc.)	11 – 61%	5 – 28%	0 – 0%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users to conduct general searching on the Internet	6 – 33%	8 – 44%	3 – 17%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users to utilize word processing programs	6 – 33%	6 – 33%	2 – 11%	4 – 22%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users to check personal e-mail accounts	5 – 28%	8 – 44%	1 – 6%	2 – 11%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%
Assist users to search Pioneer databases	5 – 28%	7 – 39%	4 – 22%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users in downloading e-books, music, etc.	5 – 28%	7 – 39%	3 – 17%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users to search other commercial databases	5 – 28%	5 – 28%	3 – 17%	4 – 22%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%
Assist users to learn/apply basic personal computer skills (use of mouse, keyboard, etc.)	4 – 22%	3 – 17%	3 – 17%	7 – 39%	1 – 6%	0 – 0%
Help users evaluate the quality and reliability of online resources	4 – 22%	1 – 6%	6 – 33%	4 – 22%	2 – 11%	1 – 6%
Assist visitors to check email while traveling	3 – 17%	3 – 17%	6 – 33%	5 – 28%	1 – 6%	1 – 6.7%
Assist users to set up free e-mail accounts	2 – 11%	3 – 17%	5 – 28%	6 – 33%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%
Assist users to utilize spreadsheet programs	1 – 6%	4 – 22%	9 – 50%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	1 – 6%
Assist users to utilize gaming programs	1 – 6%	4 – 22%	3 – 17%	5 – 28%	6 – 33%	0 – 0%
Assist users to utilize educational programs	1 – 6%	3 – 17%	9 – 50%	5 – 28%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Assist users to utilize database programs	1 – 6%	3 – 17%	6 – 33%	6 – 33%	1 – 6%	1 – 6%
Advise users on Internet filters	1 – 6%	3 – 17%	5 – 28%	7 – 39%	2 – 11%	0 – 0%
Assist users to utilize scanning equipment	1 – 6%	3 – 17%	4 – 22%	4 – 22%	4 – 22%	2 – 11%
Assist users to utilize presentation programs	1 – 6%	1 – 6%	6 – 33%	8 – 44%	1 – 6%	1 – 6%

**Total Responses 18**

(21) Overall, how skilled is your staff in instructing users... (Choose one response for each statement)

FINAL of Survey for Total Responses

	Very Skilled	Somewhat Skilled	Skilled	Somewhat Unskilled	Very Unskilled	Don't Know
Pioneer Databases <i>Total Responses 3</i>	3 – 100%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
Other commercial databases <i>Total Responses 3</i>	3 – 100%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In the use of the library catalog <i>Total Responses 35</i>	25 – 71%	6 – 17%	4 – 11%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In the use of the Internet <i>Total Responses 35</i>	22 – 63%	8 – 23%	5 – 14%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In the use of online resources <i>Total Responses 35</i>	20 – 57%	5 – 14%	8 – 23%	2 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In the use of search engines <i>Total Responses 35</i>	18 – 51%	5 – 14%	10 – 29%	2 – 6%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In the use of basic computer functions <i>Total Responses 18</i>	4 – 22%	11 – 61%	3 – 17%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In locating genealogical sources on the Internet <i>Total Responses 15</i>	2 – 13%	4 – 27%	5 – 33%	4 – 27%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In accessing legal resources on the Internet <i>Total Responses 15</i>	1 – 7%	5 – 33%	2 – 13%	5 – 33%	2 – 13%	0 – 0%
In finding financial information on the Internet <i>Total Responses 15</i>	1 – 7%	4 – 27%	6 – 40%	4 – 26%	0 – 0%	0 – 0%
In searching for medical/health resources on the Internet <i>Total Responses 15</i>	1 – 7%	4 – 27%	5 – 33%	4 – 27%	1 – 7%	0 – 0%

## Annex 7

### **Bibliography of all Documents Reviewed**

#### Institute of Museum and Library Services Documents

- Five-Year State Plan Guidelines for State Administrative Agencies 2013-17 (OMB No. 3137-0029; Expiration Date 8/31/2013)
- Grant Applicants Outcome Based Evaluation Definitions
- Grants to State Library Administrative Agencies Program Five-Year Evaluation
- Grants to States Program Site Visit Checklist
- Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation (also contains guiding Principles for Evaluators by the American Evaluation Association)
- LSTA Purposes – 2003 Reauthorization
- Outcomes Based Evaluation
- Outcomes Based Evaluation PowerPoint Presentation

#### Utah State Library Division Documents

- 201109IRSTATS.xlsx (Information Resources Statistics, September 2011 worksheet)
- BlindLibraryLib-QuarterlyStats2011.xls (FY2010-2011: Quarterly Report Stats)
- Eval Data – New Grantees – OBE – Match LSTA grants.xlsx (spreadsheet)
- Grant Administration Manual
- Grant State Goals and Priorities
- Intent to Apply Form – Fall 2009
- Lenders Summary – Full Funding Spreadsheet 2008-2009
- Lenders Summary – Full funding Spreadsheet 2010-2011
- Librarian III Job Description
- Library Services and Technology Act Five Year Plan, 2003-2007 Evaluation Report
- Library Trustee Chairs 3-2-11
- LSTA 2009 Administrative Expense Reimbursement Analysis
- LSTA Advisory Council
- LSTA digitization project list (worksheet)
- LSTA Five-Year Plan 2008-2012, August 9, 2007
- LSTA Final Expenditure Report – Attachment E (form)
- LSTA Grant Administration Manual
- LSTA Grant Application Form
- LSTA Grant Budgets 2008-2011
- LSTA Grants 2008-2011
- LSTA Projects and Directed Sub-Grants with Outcomes 2008
- LSTA Projects and Directed Sub-Grants with Outcomes 2009
- LSTA Projects and Directed Sub-Grants with Outcomes 2010
- LSTA Projects and Directed Sub-Grants with Outcomes 2011
- LSTA Maintenance of Effort Category Analysis for 2009
- LSTA Mini Grant Application Guidelines
- LSTA Projects 3PLSTA2010 (Expenditures October 1, 2009 – October 21, 2011)
- LSTA Regular Grant Application Guidelines
- LSTA Retreat Invitation List
- LSTA Study Contacts

- Mobile Libraries Registered Users 2008-current Spreadsheet
- PPSurveyResults89787 (Public Pioneer survey worksheet)
- Public Library Funding and Technology Access Survey: Survey Findings and Results for Utah 2010-2011
- Public Pioneer Evaluation survey instrument <http://library.utah.gov/surveys/index.php>
- Public Pioneer Evaluation survey results
- Retreat Attendees List
- State Library Division Workload/Performance Indicators for the years 2006-2011
- Utah Library for the Blind consumer Advisory Committee Members
- Utah LSTA Five Year Plan 2008-2012
- Utah Native American Tribes
- Utah Staff Phone & Email
- Utah State Library Board Meeting Minutes (October 14, 2009)
- Utah State Library Grant Eligibility Guidelines
- Utah State Library Evaluation Data – New Grantees, Outcomes Based Evaluation, Match LSTA Spreadsheet 2008-2011
- Utah State Library Evaluation Measures Five-Year Plan 2008-2012
- Utah State Library Organizational Chart
- Utah State Library Staff Director
- Utah State Library LSTA Grant Program Fall, 2009 Grant Round Timetable
- Utah State Library Study Contacts
- Utah State Program Report Summary Fiscal Year 2007
- Utah State Program Report Summary Fiscal Year 2010