Executive Summary:

Staff of the Institute for Legal, Legislative and Policy Studies at the University of Illinois Springfield, evaluated the Illinois State Library’s (ISL) progress toward reaching its goals in their Long Range Plan for the Use of Library Services & Technology Act Funds (2008 – 2012).

The Illinois State Library advanced in the achievement of the goals while not completing all they had planned. The goal outcomes sought were substantial and the library addressed each of them in meaningful ways. As listed below, the goals addressed training, technology, reading and research.

1. Position Illinois libraries, as the educational anchor of the community by providing opportunities that support information fluency and lifelong learning to address the diverse needs of Illinois residents.
2. Position Illinois libraries to provide access to abundant resources and information, both virtual and tangible, to collaborate for resource sharing, develop ideas that embrace technology and extend library services for all Illinois citizens.
3. Position libraries to further a literate Illinois by creating a reading culture that encourages reading fluency for recreation or education.
4. Provide tools for the future to facilitate the ability of libraries to lead their communities through planning, research, innovation, partnerships, best practices, and discovery to improve the quality of life for Illinoisans.

Research questions were developed after reviewing the Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) through the Illinois State Library. The evaluation involved a review of the targeted outcomes from the ISL’s Long Range Plan. Research questions include: 1) Did the Illinois State Library meet the strategic goals as outlined in the plan 2) Were there processes in place to ensure the effectiveness of these goals, and 3) what needs to be done in the future to enhance library programs and services?

Initial evaluation activities included a review of approximately 500 subgrantee project reports for FY 2008, FY 2009 and FY 2010.

Subgrantee’s submitted project narratives telling tales of children’s lives that have been touched through the use of books, technology and exciting activities. Children and families experienced growth and gained confidence, which hopefully encouraged a lifelong commitment to literacy. Adults and seniors have gained access to the world beyond and are enjoying learning new skills that will provide intellectual stimulation and encourage social activities. Library staff received valuable technology and leadership training to enhance services to their patrons. Research is ongoing in an effort to better understand how libraries can do more for less in a struggling economy.

Overall, 500 projects serving 13,303,305 people were completed in FY 2008 – FY 2010. Outcomes of the activities for each goal area include:
Goal One: An average of 25% of the libraries developed partnerships to broaden educational opportunities for Illinois citizens in response to one of the key target outputs in Goal One.

Goal Two: Statistics reflect patron use of electronic resources almost doubled. 92% of public libraries provided statistical data documenting technology uses and trends in patron use of libraries in response to Key Outputs for Goal Two.

Targeted Outcomes for Goal Two were achieved in that:
- 99.2% of libraries have online licensed databases,
- 86.7% have online homework resources,
- 59.5% have online digital/virtual reference,
- 46.6% have e-books, and
- 63.7% have online social networking.

In FY 2011, 81.1% of Illinois libraries provided access to job databases and other job opportunity resources, 60.4% provided access to civil service exam materials, 74.6% helped patrons complete online job applications, and 70.2% offer software and other resources to helped patrons create resumes and other employment materials.

Goal Three: A total of 74 out of 246 partnerships were formed to provide reading programs addressing one of the Outputs for Goal Three.

Key Outcomes met by literacy projects included 98% of libraries reporting increased skills of learners who participated in programming, and adult reading time with children increased from 16 hours in FY 2010 to 22 hours FY 2011 after participating in library programs.

Goal Four: Key Outputs and Outcomes for Goal Four were not met however, substantial progress was made toward this goal.

Final Thoughts

Illinois libraries are unsung heroes. With their commitment to literacy, they have reached beyond the pages of the book to strengthen communities and share information with all people of all ages. People in impoverished and rural areas who don’t have access to technology are able to gain the skills and knowledge they need to compete in the larger community through the services offered at the local library. People with disabilities have been invited to participate in ways that weren’t previously available to them. People who would never dream they could read and comprehend the pages of a book are now reading and are able to share their knowledge and talents with family and community.
The Illinois State Library is a leader. They need to better tell their story though the voices of the overall community they serve. The voices of the partnerships that have been built and the services that connect seniors, improve the lives of adults, teens and children, are all part of the fabric of the Library and can be powerful documentation of the changes taking place due to the diligence and leadership of the libraries in Illinois.

The Illinois State Library can improve upon their effort to ensure that goals are reported accurately by subgrantees prior to submitting statewide data reports. They need to have processes in place for ISL staff to observe project programming, survey recipients of library services, and obtain evaluations of programming from subgrantees in order to better document successful activities. And finally, a revision in reporting requirements may improve the Library’s ability to efficiently collect data that chronicles progress toward achieving their goals.
**Background:**
The Illinois State Library (ISL) provides support to libraries around the state and encourages access to library services around the world. As stated on the Illinois State Library website, they are, “the computer-age doorway to worldwide information, providing patrons with an electronic bridge to the collections of universities, public and corporate libraries, and new information systems that will continue to develop into the 21st century and beyond.”

In preparing the Long Range Plan for the Use of Library Services & Technology Act Funds, the ISL began by creating a strategic plan. The individuals involved in the process represented ISL, additional staff from the Secretary of State’s Office, and an additional group of library stakeholders. They reviewed past programming current trends.

Next, the ISL conducted formal and informal evaluations; in-person and online meetings were held to solicit input into the planning process. Hundreds of library patrons, academic librarians, public librarians, school librarians, special librarians, regional library system staff, and leaders from Illinois library organizations and consortia were included in this process.

The ISL reviewed the findings of a previous evaluation of the Library Services and Technology Act Funds (FY2003- FY2007) and studied statistical data regarding emerging trends and descriptive demographics relevant to Illinois libraries from sources such as, the Library Research Center, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the Illinois Library Systems, to name a few.

At the conclusion of these efforts, the ISL developed four priority areas of need:
1. Positioning libraries to address the education needs of Illinois citizens
2. Technology and accessibility
3. Reading
4. Innovation

Finally, the ISL committed to an annual review of these needs and aligned the identified needs with the four goals of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA).

**Methodology:**
Dr. David Racine, director of the Institute for Legal, Legislative and Policy Studies at the University of Illinois Springfield, was contacted by the Illinois State Library based on prior evaluation activities performed by the Institute staff. After completion of contract review and negotiations, Jeri Frederick of the Institute was assigned to review the materials provided by the library and write the evaluation report.

The scope of work developed by the Institute outlined the following services:
1. Review the grant reports that ISL has compiled on the grants it has given in 2008, 2009, and 2010 to address the goals in its Long Range Plan for the use of LSTA Funds. *July-September 2011*

2. Within each of the four goals of the LSTA Plan, group projects by common methods/activities and common outputs/results and summarize impact. *October 2011*

3. Interview State Library grant/project monitors as necessary to fill in gaps in grant reports. *October-November 2011*

4. Produce a draft evaluation report and meet with State Library grant/project monitors to review accuracy and adequacy of the report and suggest revisions as appropriate. *January 2011*

**Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>$8,815.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Copying</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>$909.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research questions were developed after reviewing the Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) through the Illinois State Library.

1. Has the Illinois State Library met its strategic goals?
   a. To what extent were these results due to choices made in the selection of strategies?
   b. To what extent did programs and services benefit targeted individuals and groups?

2. Are processes in place to ensure the effectiveness of ISL’s goals?
   a. What is the selection process for libraries who receive grants and is the process effective and inclusive?
   b. How has past performance been used to guide decisions affecting supported programs?
   c. What have been important challenges to using outcome-based data to guide policy decisions over the course of the grant?

3. What quality improvements are needed to enhance programs and services?

Dr. Racine met with library staff and was provided with project reports submitted by library subgrantees for FY 2008, FY 2009, FY 2010, and documentation from the Institute for Museum and Library Science. The project reports were categorized by the primary goal addressed by the project. Additional materials were provided by ISL staff as requested however, it was initially difficult to pin down exactly what information was available for the evaluation. Several emails were exchanged between library staff and Ms. Frederick and one in-person meeting was held to obtain additional information and answer questions.

The evaluation was initiated by reading approximately, 500 subgrantee project reports for FY 2008, FY 2009 and FY 2010. Using a spreadsheet, the projects were categorized by goal addressed, money awarded number of people served and population type. The population categories the Institute created were as follows:

- Library Staff Development
Evaluation Findings:
Before proceeding with findings, it is important to discuss the data available for evaluation and the types of analysis these data permit.

Following the review of project reports, the Institute looked back to the Long Range Plan, Target Outputs and Outcomes to determine if there was evidence that they had been achieved by the activities completed. The data are limited for this purpose.

For example, the Long Range Plan stipulates the following outcome under its first goal:

- 75% of the people taking advantage of programs at the library, including people of all ages and of diverse multicultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, will demonstrate improved knowledge, skills or their ability to access or use information when evaluated at the end of the workshops.

The Plan indicates that data to assess achievement of this outcome will be obtained through workshop evaluations, surveys, interviews, and reports from subgrantees. However, because of resource limits brought on by the economic downturn, most of these data collection methods were not used. Data were collected only through subgrantee reports. And even with the reports, the ISL was limited in how much staff time and effort it could devote to extracting the data contained in the reports. During the grant period, ISL outlined the state’s fiscal crisis in a document sent to IMLS.

Additionally, several reports from subgrantees were not aligned with the correct goal. For example, they reported addressing goal 1, but the project activity actually addressed another goal, usually goal 2 or 3. These errors in individual reports skew the numbers under goal outputs in statewide data collection.

For reasons beyond either our or ISL’s control, the data available are too limited to support firm conclusions about the success of the Library’s implementation of its long range plans using LSTA funding. Instead, what we are able to do is to characterize the impact of LSTA funding by describing examples of the kinds of programs and activities it supported.
There is evidence that suggests the citizens of Illinois, especially youth and families are better served due to the efforts of local libraries. With the help of community partners, libraries have taught families the value of reading and spending time together, they have assisted the unemployed and under employed with finding jobs, and they give teens a safe environment to develop technology skills and social skills. Libraries continue to bring enjoyment to seniors and low-vision patrons by providing large print materials, Talking Books and Playaways.

Grant Awards

The Illinois State Library employs a competitive grant application and review process, using outside, peer reviewers and ISL staff to examine grant applications, and to make recommendations for the distribution of grant money. The reviewers analyze applications using a rubric (see Annexes), and assigning a score between 0 – 100, in addition to making funding recommendations. The group of reviewers meets to discuss all applications, bowing out of the process when a conflict of interest arises.

At the end of the discussion, a vote is taken and the majority vote becomes the recommendation. The final decision lies in the hands of the ISL Director and the Secretary of State.

The following is a breakdown of the grant awards from FY 2008 – FY 2010:

**FY 2008: 118 libraries awarded a total of $6,116,082.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,052,869.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Libraries</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>971,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Libraries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,215,395.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Type Libraries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,892,321.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Libraries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>825,932.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2009: 225 libraries awarded a total of $6,376,914.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3,567,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Libraries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>453,394.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Type Libraries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,396,629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Libraries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>870,646.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2010: 87 libraries awarded a total of $6,500,334.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2,987,791.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>751,304.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Type Libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>829,762.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Goals**

Although libraries selected one main goal on which to focus their project, many of the library projects addressed more than one goal. The creativity with which they approached these goals was inspiring. We have included examples of programs that were offered using LSTA funds below each goal heading.

**LSTA Goal One**

*Position Illinois libraries, as the educational anchor of the community by providing opportunities that support information fluency and lifelong learning to address the diverse needs of Illinois residents.*

**Outputs Goal One**

From FY 2008 – FY 2010 a total of 65 projects, serving 182,487 people were implemented using a total of $1,710,824.00 in LSTA funding.

**Targeted Outputs stated in the Long Range Plan:**

- Each fiscal year, libraries from 90% of the regional library systems will offer patron based programs based on the diverse learning needs of their audience. *Timeframe FY2008 - 2012.*

- 20% of the applying libraries will consider the diverse geographic, cultural, socioeconomic backgrounds, disabilities, or limited literacy and information skills of their community as they develop library programs and services. *Timeframe FY2008 - 2012.*

- 10% (estimated at 9,000) of currently unserved Illinois citizens will have library services by 2012. *Timeframe FY2008 - 2012.*

- 25% of the participating libraries will successfully identify and implement a partnership to broaden educational opportunities for Illinois citizens. *Timeframe FY2008 - 2012.*

**Output Findings**

Using figures from FY 2008 – FY 2010, an average of 25% of the libraries developed partnerships to broaden educational opportunities for Illinois citizens in response to one of the key target outputs.

**Outcomes Goal One**

**Targeted Outcomes stated in the Long Range Plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>special libraries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>100,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLAA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,831,477.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
➢ 75% of the people taking advantage of programs at the library, including people of all ages and of diverse multicultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, will demonstrate improved knowledge, skills or their ability to access or use information when evaluated at the end of the workshops.

➢ By 2012, patrons will value the knowledge, experience and skill base of the library staff based on the quality of the library services and accurate answers to their questions 75% of the time as documented by patron surveys or during interviews conducted by participating libraries.

➢ By 2012, at least 70% of library users will indicate that they trust the information from Illinois libraries as documented by random surveys of Illinois library users.

➢ By 2012, Illinois citizens will demonstrate improved attitudes on the value of access to public libraries as documented on LSTA reports.

Outcome Findings

Data is not available to document targeted outcomes.

Activities in pursuit of Goal One

The majority of programs, served school children of all ages, including children of diverse geographic, cultural, socioeconomic backgrounds, disabilities, or limited literacy. Additionally, many libraries worked in partnership with outside entities to broaden the educational opportunities for these children and their parents.

Project Next Generation (PGN) “was initiated in 2000 to encourage students to become technology-savvy by providing the opportunity for hands-on experience with the latest technology tools”. These programs were innovative, exciting and most importantly they inspired many children, grades 2 through 12 to become engaged in learning through the use of technology and their own creativity.

The Kankakee Public Library has been providing PGN programming since 2006, serving over 300 students. Seven out of eleven schools in the Kankakee school district are on Academic Early Warning Status or Academic Watch Status. Clearly, children in this public library district can benefit from opportunities to learn new skills and develop socially.

In FY 2010, with a combination of LSTA funds and In Kind Contributions totaling $33, 531.00, the Kankakee Public Library offered three PNG sessions (fall, winter and summer) consisting of 48 class days, serving a total of 75 students. The key activity of the fall and winter sessions was the creation of a movie project in which the students wrote the script, acted out the parts and filmed the performance. At the end of the program the students entered their video in a national contest, the American Library Association’s “Why I Need My Library” and won third place and $1000.00 for their library.
Summer session projects included creating a digital scrapbook, learning how to use digital cameras, creating short videos, creating a website, learning to play the guitar, performing a song and completing academic enrichment exercises in the areas of reading, writing and math. Additionally, students participated in field trips including the DuSable Museum of African-American History in Chicago featuring the exhibit “The African Presence in Mexico”, the performance of “Drum Line” at the Center for Performing Arts at Governor’s State University, the performance of “The Trinity River Plays” at the Goodman Theater in Chicago and the Chicago Comic & Entertainment Expo at McCormick Place in Chicago.

Kankakee Public Library reports that for some students who have attended the PNG programs for several years, there is a visible change in their level of confidence and maturity. Some of the former PNG students have assisted the PNG program as assistant mentors and five former students have been employed to shelve books at the library and one was recently promoted to Youth Services Clerk.

The Century Community School District designed a project for 4th – 8th graders to enhance their research skills. Students learned how to use the library’s reference collection, and various Internet resources to solve research questions. The teacher’s confidence in the quality of the school library’s resources and the student’s ability to use the library for research increased and opened the door for more collaboration among teachers and library staff.

The Glen Carbon Centennial Library created a Community Learning Center to provide literacy and training sessions and a Video Gaming Center open for people of all ages and abilities. In FY 2009, two hundred sixty seniors attended computer classes, one hundred sixty-nine teens attended computer programming classes and a number of seniors and youth attended gaming events. Involving people of all ages, cultures and abilities in community programming secures the library’s position as the educational anchor of their diverse community.

Beardstown Houston Memorial Public Library’s project combined the use of digital photography, data collection, scanning and uploading information to document local history for use through the Internet site, www.findagrave.com. These classes, offered to youth ages 11-13 were held on Friday evenings from 5 – 7 p.m. which provided a safe environment for children whose parents and guardians work second shift and aren’t available to the children after school. Additionally, it piqued the children’s interest in the cultural background of local families and inspired research into the origin of surnames.

Professional Development of library staff and volunteers must continue in an effort to support the library and the community. Leadership skills, programming methods and an understanding of current technologies are necessary if libraries are to support lifelong learning for the diverse needs of their communities.

Programs offered to improve knowledge and skills of library staff, included:

- Linking, Learning and Libraries: The Institute for School & Public Librarians
Focused on developing programs, delivering library services, forming partnerships between public and school libraries, and using technology to access information and educational resources.

- Serving Your Public – SPLMI
  - Included ideas to create new patron based library programs or enhance existing ones, and the value of partnerships with community organizations and networking with other libraries.

- Synergy: The Illinois Library Leadership Initiative
  - Objectives of this program included self-assessment, discovering and developing personal values, fostering and expanding skills and tools for personal, professional and positional leadership, and identifying the local, state and global environment.

- On the Front Lines
  - Topics addressed included, serving diverse populations, improving customer service, library confidentiality, and using technology to reach Illinois’ citizens.

- Copyright Education and Consultation Program
  - Provided authoritative copyright information directly to university instructors, researchers and faculty in order for them to make the most effective use of information resources in student learning and knowledge creation activities and allow them to more effectively control their own intellectual property.

One participant commented that, “SPLMI is an excellent experience for any director. I came away with information, knowledge, confidence and courage to tackle my new job as director of my public library.”

Impact of activities

This goal was addressed by many types of training activities that reached beyond traditional methods to engage and excite the participants. Building robots and geocaching (high-tech outdoor scavenger hunts) are examples of activities offered around the state by school and public libraries. Youth who have little or no access to technology learned the skills needed to pursue educational goals and to plan for their future. Communities benefit from the opportunity to share their history, locally and globally through the use of new technology that expands access through the use of digitization and the Internet.

LSTA Goal Two

Position Illinois libraries to provide access to abundant resources and information, both virtual and tangible, to collaborate for resource sharing, develop ideas that embrace technology and extend library services for all Illinois citizens.
Outputs Goal Two

From FY 2008 – FY 2010 a total of 153 projects, serving 8,472,387 people were implemented using a total of $7,582,988.00 in LSTA funding.

Targeted Outputs stated in the Long Range Plan:

➢ 100% of the libraries participating in digital imaging projects will prepare audio descriptions of at least 5 digital images for access by people with print disabilities or audio preference. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ 75% of the participating libraries will demonstrate increases in circulation or usage statistics due to the availability of new library resources, virtual or tangible. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ 25% of all libraries will successfully work together to extend networking opportunities for the benefit of staff and patrons. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ Five hundred individuals will be trained on the use of databases or new technologies to access information. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ Statistics reflecting patron use of electronic resources will increase by 10%. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ 100% of Illinois libraries will have their library’s contact information readily available online in a single source to make finding facts on all Illinois libraries more accessible to Illinois citizens. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012.*

➢ 90% of public libraries and 75% of school libraries will provide statistical data documenting technology uses and trends in patron use of libraries. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*

Output Findings

According to data provided for FY 2009 – FY 2010, libraries offering IT training to patrons was at 83.7%, and statistics reflecting patron use of electronic resources increased as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,669,199</td>
<td>1,767,437</td>
<td>378,470</td>
<td>94,594</td>
<td>4,909,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,290,501</td>
<td>1,473,669</td>
<td>290,606</td>
<td>117,368</td>
<td>7,172,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% of Illinois libraries contact information is available at: [http://www.librarylearning.info/libraries/](http://www.librarylearning.info/libraries/)
According to the Illinois Public Library Annual Report for FY 2011, 92% of public libraries provide statistical data documenting technology uses and trends in patron use of libraries.

Outcomes Goal Two

Targeted Outcomes stated in the Long Range Plan:

- Illinois citizens will demonstrate their perceived value of digital library resources as documented by a 50% increase in the usage (measured by hits) of the Illinois Digital Archives by 2012.

- Each year, 2008 – 2012, library staff from 25% of the participating libraries will report an improved ability to meet the programming and information needs of technologically savvy and technology challenged patrons as documented by reports and surveys.

- By 2012, the end user will have improved success finding information relevant to their needs as 25% of Illinois libraries make electronic resources available online to those who might have difficulty using or choose not to use the physical library as documented by reports.

- By 2012, all people with Internet access will have improved access to the current contact information for 100% of the Illinois libraries that are members of regional library systems, as documented by reports and an online customer satisfaction survey.

Outcome Findings

According to the data collected by the Public Libraries and the Internet (http://www.plinternetsurvey.org/) website, in Illinois FY 2011, 99.2% of libraries have online licensed databases, 86.7% have online homework resources, 59.5% have online digital/virtual reference, 46.6% have e-books, and 63.7% have online social networking.

Additional data from that site reports that in FY 2011, 81.1% of Illinois libraries provided access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources, 60.4% provided access to civil service exam materials, 74.6% helped patrons complete online job applications, and 70.2% offered software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials.

Activities in pursuit of Goal Two

The activities implemented under goal two served people of all ages and reached beyond the state of Illinois. The majority of these projects included the digitization of documents, updating databases and obtaining software licenses to benefit regional library systems.

Voices of the Holocaust (http://voices.iit.edu) is an online collection of interviews with Holocaust survivors and other displaced persons conducted by Dr. David Boder in Europe in 1946. Taken in the immediate aftermath of World War II, these interviews represent the earliest known oral histories of the
Holocaust. This challenging project required the use of data modeling (development of data-oriented structures) in order to support the dynamic searching and browsing features of the site, encoding in XML format, data entry and text coding, authoring of critical content, site architecture and graphic design and web coding.

The result is an incredible site where users can access interview texts, audio recordings, interactive maps, glossaries and an extensive biography of Dr. Boder and scholarly materials to assist students in a greater understanding of the content.

“There are numerous archives of Holocaust survivor testimony in existence today, but very few collections are available online and even fewer use standards-based text-encoding and markup practices, resulting in ineffective online dissemination and diminished prospects for preservation.”

The **Illinois State Geological Survey Library** digitized, expanded an established archive and provided Internet access for almost 10,000 of the oldest aerial photographs obtained by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

The **University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign** holds one of the preeminent research collections in the world, including more than 10 million volumes and 23 million items in the collection. The grant award provided the library the opportunity to add 133,904 library holdings records to OCLC and replace 238,288 library holdings records. Overall this project provides greater access to materials in a timely manner.

**ILEAD U: Illinois Libraries Explore, Apply and Discover** funding was supplemented by this grant. The purpose of the project was to expand librarian’s leadership abilities to use participatory technology to effectively engage their library constituents. In partnership with the University of Illinois Springfield, the ISL created a series of three, three-day workshops covering Web 2.0 technologies and training 40 library staff members in the use of the technology and the value of working in partnership with their community.

One participant commented, “Personally I think this is a good learning experience. I can use what I’ve learned and it teaches people how to work in teams. My team members didn’t know one another and it is satisfying to see them come together to work toward a common goal.”

**Impact of activities**

This goal was addressed by increasing availability and access to technology, individually and globally. The Illinois Digital Archives (IDA - [http://www.idaillinois.org/cdm/](http://www.idaillinois.org/cdm/) ) is just one example of the impact of using new technology to share information. IDA is a repository for the digital collections of libraries, museums, historical societies and other cultural institutions in Illinois, *providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries* and global access to information via the Internet.
**LSTA Goal Three**

Position libraries to further a literate Illinois by creating a reading culture that encourages reading fluency for recreation or education.

**Outputs Goal Three**

From FY 2008 – FY 2010 a total of 264 projects, serving 4,456,714 people were implemented using a total of $7,744,347.00 in LSTA funding.

**Targeted Outputs stated in Long Range Plan:**

- During the five-year cycle, at least 800 LSTA grants will be awarded to support proactive reading programs. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*
- Participation in reading or literature based programs will involve patrons from three out of four types of libraries in Illinois: public, school and academic. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*
- By 2012, libraries will report that 25% of the reading programs offered demonstrate active collaboration as documented on reports.

**Output Findings**

A total of 74 out of 246 partnerships were formed to provide reading programs.

**Outcomes Goal Three**

**Targeted Outcomes stated in the Long Range Plan:**

- Libraries involved in reading activities will report increases in program attendance or circulation by 10% or more as library patrons are challenged, inspired and motivated to read. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*
- By 2012, 50% of a sampling of Illinois residents will indicate that their child’s reading or literacy skills have improved after participating in library sponsored reading programs as documented on reports and in surveys.
- Adult caregivers attending programs will increase their time reading with children by 25% as families develop an increased awareness of the benefits of reading together. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*
Outcome Findings

Based on figures from the ISL, 98% of libraries reported increased skills of learners who participated in programming, and adult reading time with children increased from 16 hours FY 2010 to 22 hours FY 2011 after participating in library programs.

Activities in Pursuit of Goal Three

The majority of projects served people of all ages, focusing specifically on low literate and non-English speaking families. Many summer reading and literacy programs were offered serving a wide-range of socioeconomic backgrounds. Most of the literacy projects worked in partnership with agencies and schools to help identify and instruct the participants. Parent and Child Together (PACT) activities are extremely popular programs dedicated to helping parents become partners in their child’s educational success.

Clay City Community School District used the Rebecca Caudill Young Reader’s books to engage children in 4th through 8th grades in reading and blogging activities in an effort to develop a “culture of readers”. One-hundred twenty-six students participated in the program and 72% completed at least one book. All of the students reported that they wouldn’t have tried reading books of this length if it hadn’t been for the program. The blog resulted in over 560 student comments and 150 adult comments. Finally, the best bloggers were sent to the Tech 2009 event at the Illinois State Capital to present on the project. One of the students with “considerable emotional difficulties” excelled at the online discussion, due to the anonymity, and was well received by others in the online environment.

The Chicago Public Library Talking Book Center offers discussion groups on a monthly basis for its patrons who cannot read standard print comfortably due to visual or physical limitations. This lively group’s stimulating discussions of interesting, provocative selections range from contemporary, popular and classic literature. Resource fairs, adult and children focused reading programs are also held annually. The library’s circulation was nearly 134,000 items, including over 8,500 books and 1,000 magazines being downloaded.

The Joliet Public Library partnered with the Joliet Junior College and Joliet Community Even Start to provide enrichment activities to support literacy development. Presentations modeled and explained pre-reading behaviors to the parents in two languages at each of the 32 sessions. 418 low literate participants, including 152 adults and 266 children, representing 126 families benefitted from the program. An additional 325 limited English proficient participants were also served and 615 books were distributed to the participants.

The Waukegan Public Library serves a diverse urban community with a population of 89,000 representing 45% Hispanic, 31% African American and 20% Caucasian individuals. Working in partnership with the community college and other libraries, the Waukegan Public Library provides programming for adults and their children ages 6 weeks to 6 years. The programs help parents achieve
their educational goals and develop skills to prepare their children for pre-school and kindergarten. All participants benefited from their involvement in the program; many of the parents read an entire book for the first time in their lives. Pre and Post-testing showed an improvement in the children’s cognitive, social and pre-literacy skills.

*Welcome to America*, is the title of the *Aurora Public Library*’s literacy program. Working in partnership with the World Relief program, the program provides adult ESL, child education, library services and Parent and Child Together (PACT) activities for refugee and immigrant children ages 0 – 6 years. During parenting classes, adults learned about health care, nutrition, discipline, safety, etc. Families were taught how to use books and puzzles, rhymes and music to encourage their children. One family who had moved from Burma attended regularly despite the long bus ride with five children because of the value the programming offered to them.

**Impact of activities**

This goal brought out creativity and commitment, not only in the actions of the librarians, but the community partners and the patrons who benefitted from the literacy programs offered through many libraries throughout the state. These *programs expanded services for learning and access to information and educational resources for all ages and targeted services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills*. Partnerships were created and underserved populations received valuable services not otherwise found in small communities. Summer reading programs proved to be popular and entertaining as well as providing social integration for students who have difficulty making friends.

**LSTA Goal Four**

*Provide tools for the future to facilitate the ability of libraries to lead their communities through planning, research, innovation, partnerships, best practices, and discovery to improve the quality of life for Illinoisans.*

**Outputs Goal Four**

From FY 2008 – FY 2010 a total of 18 projects, serving 191,717 people were implemented using a total of $2,130,399.00 in LSTA funding.

**Targeted Outputs stated in the Long Range Plan**

- At least 10% of Illinois libraries will use LSTA funds to plan and implement a service that is new to their community. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*

- 100 libraries will identify and publish an article on best practices or identify and share at least one best practice in an online community where library staff will meet to share ideas for better serving the citizens of Illinois. *Timeframe 2008 – 2012*
80% of libraries of all types, which have completed a formal planning process or conducted research, will make changes or revisions to their services to be more responsive to their patrons as a result of the process. Timeframe 2008 – 2012

Output Findings

56 libraries published information about their projects on WebJunction Illinois, an online community. [http://il.webjunction.org/lsta/~resources/bparticles](http://il.webjunction.org/lsta/~resources/bparticles)

The Illinois Library Association and a group of 5 academic libraries have completed a formal planning process/research and will be changing their services to be more responsive to their underserved patrons.

Outcomes Goal Four

Targeted Outcomes stated in the Long Range Plan

- By 2012, library patrons will report increased satisfaction with new library services as libraries demonstrate new models to address user expectations based on research and testing of new ideas as documented by reports.

- By 2012, collaboration between libraries and community-based organizations will increase as 10% of the participating libraries demonstrate the value of the library and foster a positive influence as a leader within their community as documented by reports and interviews.

- By 2012, libraries will report that 25% of library patrons indicate an increase in their ability to make informed decisions as their information and programming needs are met in new and innovative ways as documented by user surveys and reports.

- By 2012, 25 libraries will use LSTA funds to increase the number of services offered at multiple points of access convenient to patrons, based on patrons’ preferences as documented by surveys, interviews and reports.

Outcome Findings

Data is not available to document targeted outcomes.

Activities in pursuit of Goal Four

Goal activities involved extensive research activities to improve library services, acquisition of software to benefit library services and additional projects to improve library services.
“Librarians and teaching faculty often think they know how students conduct their research and many have specific ideas on how students ought to conduct their research. However, with the increased ability to access information online and the corresponding changes in libraries, the question of what actually happens between the time a student receives a class assignment and when he or she turns in the final product to a professor is especially compelling, and one that is not as straightforward as it first appears.

Two years ago, five Illinois institutions (Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU), DePaul University, Illinois Wesleyan University (IWU), University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), and University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS)), began working together to investigate this issue. The Ethnographic Research in Illinois Academic Libraries (ERIAL) Project (http://www.erialproject.org/) was organized around the following research question:

> What do students actually do when they are assigned a research project for a class assignment and what are the expectations of students, faculty and librarians of each other with regard to these assignments?

The primary goal of this study is to trigger reforms in library services to better meet students' needs. Traditionally, academic libraries have designed library services and facilities based on information gleaned from user surveys, usage data, focus groups, and librarians’ informal observations. While such tools are valuable, this project employed more user-centered methods to form holistic portraits of student behavior and needs, directly resulting in changes to library services and resources.”

“Summit on the Future of Illinois Library Cooperation addresses the need for Illinois to develop a new model of library cooperation that relies on providing shared services through the Illinois State Library and eliminates many of the redundancies that can no longer be sustained in individual library systems. The combined effects of the changing environment for both library services and funding prompted this exploration of how library cooperation might be redesigned to result in greater benefits to the residents of Illinois. A joint effort of the Illinois Library Association (ILA) and the Illinois State Library, this one-day plenary session launched a process that could lead to what one participant described as “quantum” or breakthrough change.” (http://www ila.org/pdf/FILC_2010_w.pdf)

WebJunction Illinois provides a single resource for Illinois libraries to access information, social tools, helpful content and online courses to share ideas, solve problems, network, develop skills and keep informed about state resources and programs for libraries. (http://il.webjunction.org/lsta) Registrations to the site exceeded 3000 in the first year. One user commented, “Training opportunities are very good. Plus, the continuing education workshops don’t require me to leave my library.”

**Impact of Activities**

The impact of the activities under goal four are ongoing. The Summit on the Future of Illinois Library Cooperation is a work in progress and has received additional funding in an effort to share services in the areas of: 1) delivery of services, 2) shared catalogs, 3) group purchasing, 4) library and professional
development, and 5) advocacy and marketing. The academic libraries’ study is significant prompting a statewide conference and the American Library Association published a book focused on the results of the project. Additional activities reported have focused on library and professional development to improve library services across the state.

Final Thoughts and Recommendations:

The Illinois State Library should ensure that goals are reported accurately by subgrantees prior to submitting statewide data reports. Grant applicants and application reviewers should receive clear guidelines for identification of appropriate goals that correlate with the intended activities to support those goals. Reporting errors are visible in project reports for goals one, two and three. This may be due in part to activities that address more than one goal. In reading the reports, it was sometimes difficult to determine the primary goal. However, in many cases it was clear that the activity did not correlate with the stated goal.

Processes should be in place for the ISL staff to observe project programming and survey audiences of project activities. Additionally, the ISL should request evaluation summaries from each project to assist in documentation of successful activities. Local libraries are working hard to benefit communities. Feedback from those community members would go far to describe the richness of services that are being delivered.

Effectively evaluating goal outcomes will require a greater effort on behalf of the ISL to collect Outcome Indicators/Source Materials from the local libraries. Although the subgrantee’s project reports frequently include data on numbers of individuals served, the diversity of the audience, socioeconomic information and special populations served, this is not quantified statewide. Gathering statistics from project reports to gauge project success will assist in determining if outcomes are being met in each goal area. This information will also assist in gauging the level of performance of individual libraries for future grant awards. It is unclear if the implementation of the Single Unified Source of Information, (SUSI) will assist in this effort.

Therefore, the ISL may want to consider revising the application and reporting format to include a recitation of targeted outputs and/or outcomes addressed through their project. This information could possibly replace the IMLS Primary and Secondary Performance Category in the project report as these IMLS categories don’t appear to be addressed in data collection/reporting.
Annexes
LSTA REVIEW PROCESS
This is a competitive grant application and review process. Each LSTA grant application must stand on its own merit.

The staff of the Illinois State Library and teams or reviewers will evaluate all applications using the Review Rubric. Final recommendations for funding are made by the Illinois State Library with the grant awards subject to approval by the Secretary of State and State Librarian.

Only the awarded grant applications shall be considered public information. Working papers, individual reviewer’s comments, notes, and scores are not public information. Lists of awarded grants are announced in a Press Release on the Secretary of State’s web site at: http://www.cyberdriveillinois.com/press/home.html

Obligations of the Illinois State Library to fund this grant program will cease immediately without penalty or further payment being required if the Institute of Museum & Library Services or the US Congress fails to appropriate or otherwise make available sufficient funds. Award notification will be released when legislative and gubernatorial approval of an FY2010 appropriation is made.

FINAL SELECTION PROCESS
Applications will be funded that best meet the purpose of the grant offering and address one or more of the goals in the Illinois State Library’s Long Range Plan for the Use of LSTA Funds FY2008 – 2012.

Selection factors that will be taken into account include:
★ Availability of LSTA funds.
★ Submission of a complete application prior to the deadline.
★ Extent to which the proposed grant activities represent an allowable, allocable and reasonable use of the funds.
★ Reviewers’ working papers.
★ Geographic distribution of the grant awards.
★ Applicant’s past grant performance.
★ Possible duplication with other state funded initiatives.
★ Earliest date and time of receipt of the complete application.
★ Pre-contract negotiations between the Illinois State Library and the grant applicant will clarify any issues raised during the review process. Not all applicants contacted during the pre-contract negotiations will receive an award. ISL reserves the right to change the grant amount as appropriate.
★ A minimum of 40% of the total funding for competitive Library Services & Technology Act grants will be allocated for projects that address the Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY10 and lead to models that can be replicated in other locales.
# LSTA Grant Review Rubric

Applications will be evaluated based on the following guidelines.

## COVER SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application will move forward for review.</td>
<td>Identifiable <strong>original</strong> signatures of the project director and authorized person are on at least one copy of the application. Photocopied signatures are acceptable on all of the other copies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application will be returned as incomplete.</td>
<td>No signatures. The signatures verify that the application is an authorized submission from the agency. Lack of signatures indicates the application is not authorized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPLYING AGENCY - 10 Points

Briefly profile the applying library. Include location, conditions and demographics of the general population served on a daily basis. Explain the agency’s internal capacity to manage this project. For example, how will grant funds be managed? Will bids be let? Confirm authorization to begin activities after October 1, 2009 and use local funds to subsidize grant activities until an award check arrives in January or February 2010. If purchasing computers and/or connecting to the Internet, confirm that the applicant will comply with the Children’s Internet Protection Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Applicant clearly profiles the applying library and parent agency including demographics that give context to the proposal. Even if the reviewer is not familiar with this library or community, there is a clear portrayal of the people who live, work or go to school here and the library that serves them. The stage is set for the proposal with, for example, the community’s location, urban vs. rural, background history, economic climate or lack thereof, key businesses and industry focus, educational levels and/or curriculum strengths. The applicant’s capacities to manage and financially support this project are clearly evident. Addresses CIPA if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The applicant demonstrates their capacity to manage the project before the check arrives. Demographics and details are provided giving reviewers solid background information. Sufficient details are provided to describe the community, the library and the people served in whole. Addresses CIPA if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Descriptions including location and a few statistics give a general impression of the community, library and service area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The community and library not clearly identified. The total service area of the library is vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Applying Agency section is included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION - 20 Points

Describe the project in detail. Provide an inclusive explanation of programming, services or activities to be implemented for the end user. Include methods to be employed and the overall objectives of the project. Keep the project manageable and focused. Tie the project to at least one purpose of LSTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The application enthusiastically describes the intent of the project with an overview of activities and the results expected. The project is exciting and has great potential. High expectations are evident and there is obvious value in this project idea. Conclusions are compelling. Meets one clearly identified LSTA goal. Activities justify the Items budgeted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>An overview of the project is provided, and the project sound promising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS ARE WELL GROUNDED. MEETS ONE IDENTIFIED LSTA GOAL. BUDGETED ITEMS ARE DESCRIBED.

8 Adequate

Some details are provided but the project concept is uninteresting. Not all budgeted items are fully explained. Links to one LSTA purpose.

2 Poor

Minimal information is provided. The project is not clearly defined.

0 No project description is included.

TARGET AUDIENCE AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT - 10 Points

Clearly identify the end users that will directly benefit from this project. Convince the grant readers of the target audience’s need for this project using appropriate demographics, current statistics, credible reports and compelling stories. Explain why this project is the best solution to address the needs of the target audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The application thoughtfully defines the target audience. The applicant includes facts, statistics and demographics specific to this target audience, with sources cited, to corroborate statements. The reviewers have a clear impression of the people this project will target, an awareness of their needs and how the needs were determined. Explanations are compelling as to why this project is the best method to address these needs. There is compelling evidence presented that this project will indeed make a difference in the lives of the target audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Applicant describes the target audience, and the needs of the audience, how the need was determined, ways the project is designed to meet that need and how the library will address that need. Statistics and data are included that support need and define the target audience. Conclusions are solid and appropriate to show that this project will address the needs of the target audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>The target audience is described and there is some supporting information about the needs and how the needs were determined. There is a link between the project and the target audience needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The target audience is not clearly identified and the needs are weak. No statistics are provided. There is little connection between the target audience needs and the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No information is provided about the target audience or needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION - 10 Points

Set three achievable, measurable outcomes based on changes in knowledge, behavior, skills or attitudes of the target audience. Explain how the project will be evaluated by proposing a reasonable method to measure the effectiveness or success of the activities and determine if the outcomes were met. Address potential problems or challenges that might occur and how they will be resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Three outcomes are listed. They are well defined, appropriate and demonstrate changes in knowledge, skills, behavior and/or condition. There is an unmistakable correlation between the activities proposed and the outcomes expected. The outcomes indicate this project could truly make a difference for the target audience. The evaluation methods are suitable to the project with practical strategies proposed. Statistics and data will be collected to validate the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Three outcomes are listed. They are appropriate and demonstrate changes in knowledge, skills, behavior or condition. Based on the activities proposed, the outcomes are realistic. A credible sequence of evaluation strategies is proposed. Data collection is solid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outcomes are anticipated with some base in the activities. Evaluation is described.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TIMETABLE - 10 Points**

Present a schedule for project activities within the grant cycle (list of actions with a date by which they will be accomplished). Confirm that grant funds will be obligated October 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010 with grant funds expended no later than August 15, 2010. Verify that equipment and programs will be delivered within the timeframe for the grant cycle. Address potential problems or challenges and how they will be resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The timeline is specific with actions listed per a combination of days and months. It is evident that the action and dates have been thoughtfully considered with attention to the details. It is clear what activities must occur from start to finish. Clearly indicates all funds will be encumbered by June 30. The project is reasonable and can obviously be accomplished within the grant timeline. Candid consideration has been given to identify potential problems with feasible solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>A timetable with actions, steps and dates for completion is competently presented. May include action per month. The project will be accomplished within the grant timeline. Potential problems are identified with solutions suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Some details are provided with a very broad timeline, but it lacks specifics and may overlook key details. Some dates may be included but the overall timeline is too vague. On the other hand the project might be unrealistically attempting to accomplish too much in too little time. At least one possible obstacle is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>There is insufficient information describing the process. The timeline is missing or inappropriate and action steps don't make sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No timetable is included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONNEL - 10 Points**

Identify the key library positions or staff to be involved with this project and their responsibilities to ensure the success of this project. For staff, indicate the percentage of time they will be assigned to the project. Confirm that salary and LSTA grant funds will not be earned at the same time.

- Identify who will administer the grant funds and his or her qualifications or job title.
- If contracting with an individual or agency, identify them and their role in the project. Please validate their expertise with an explanation of why they are the most appropriate for their role.
- Include the names of other agencies including libraries or other groups that will be involved as contributors to or partners in the project. Explain their role and contributions to the project.
- In Sync with Technology - Give higher points to ISWT applications that show they have leveraged community support for this project. Leveraging will correlate with the Local Contribution/Match.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Key personnel are identified and roles defined. If personnel are paid with LSTA funds, statements clearly indicate no double dipping. The person administering the grant funds is clearly qualified. The qualifications for all contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds clearly demonstrate that these are the best qualified agencies or staff for this project. If appropriate, agencies contributing to the project are identified with roles and contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Staff and personnel are identified. If personnel are paid with grant funds, statements clearly indicate there will be no overlapping payments of LSTA and local funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funds. The qualifications and expertise for all contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds justify the hiring of these agencies or individuals for this project. If appropriate, other agencies contributing to the project are identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Some details are provided about plans for persons involved with the project but it is either incomplete or lacks important components. Some qualifications for the contractual arrangements and staff paid with grant funds are provided. If personnel are paid with grant funds, statements indicate there will be no overlapping payments of LSTA and local funds. If appropriate, outside agencies contributing to the project are listed but letters may or may not be attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Personnel are mentioned. There is insufficient information to grasp responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>The personnel section is missing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT PROMOTION - 10 points**

Explain strategies to involve the target audience. Elaborate on methods that will be used to communicate successful outcomes of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>It is apparent that the target audience will want to be involved. Appropriate media outlets and methods are outlined for communicating the purpose and intended outcomes of the project. A plan or schedule of when the communications and promotion will occur, and the message(s) that will be given to the targeted audience is clearly included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Sufficient details are provided to justify that promotion to the target audience and others will be accomplished. Indicators showing when the communications and promotion will occur are evident. The message is obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Some details are provided about plans for promotion but it is either incomplete or lacks important components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Promotion is mentioned, but there is insufficient information describing the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No project plan for promotion is included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY - 10 points**

Explain how the activities implemented, products produced or items purchased during this project will be supported and maintained after the project ends/August 16, 2009 and beyond. Note that equipment purchased with LSTA funds must be maintained for five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>There is a convincing plan showing the project's activities will be supported after the grant ends, with documentation of how this will occur. If equipment is purchased, maintenance for five years is addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Details demonstrate that efforts will be made to support grant activities after the grant ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Some details are provided about plans for supporting grant activities but it is either incomplete or lacks important components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Statements of sustainability are mentioned, but there is insufficient information describing the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No project plan for sustainability is included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIC PLAN FOR TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS (SPT&T)

Does this project address the Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY10? If yes, please indicate which action plan is addressed and how this project furthers this Action Plan. What percentage of the LSTA funding specifically addresses the Action Plan? If the application does not address the Strategic Plan for Technology and Telecommunications: Action Plan for FY10, please indicate not applicable.

Yes - What percent of the total funding addresses the SPT&T? ____________
No

BUDGETS AND EXPLANATIONS - 10 points

The budget and explanations can determine the outcome of the application. Are items budgeted allowable, allocable and reasonable?

1. LSTA Budget Chart
2. LSTA Budget Explanation
3. Local Contribution/Match Budget Chart
4. Local Contribution/Match Explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Review Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 - 10 points | The four budget components are included. Budgeted items clearly relate to the proposed activities and are allowable, allocable and reasonable. The explanation shows how the budget figures were determined. The Local Contribution has a strong match that is appropriate and significant. Everything is calculated correctly.  
* In Sync with Technology reflects leveraging community support (cash and/or in-kind) on the Local Contribution/Match Budget and Explanation.  
* Dreamcatcher: A maximum of 50% of LSTA is for library materials |
| 3 - 7 points | Budgeted items are allowable, allocable and reasonable. The explanation provides good justification. The Local Contribution match is good. Budget is understandable. The explanation includes descriptions of items for purchase. Adding is accurate  
* In Sync with Technology reflects leveraging some community support (cash and/or in-kind) on the Local Contribution/Match Budget and Explanation.  
* Dreamcatcher: A maximum of 50% of LSTA is for library materials |
| 0 - 2 points | Not all four of the budget components are included. Significant information is missing.  
* In Sync with Technology reflects no community support was leveraged. |
## REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Applicable for this project</th>
<th>Meets Requirement</th>
<th>Partially Meets this Requirement</th>
<th>Does not meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### READ: Reading for Education & Development

- If there are donations, MOU from partnering agencies providing funds or in-kind contributions.

### Dreamcatcher:

- Public libraries, public schools, and consortia including public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification.
- If there are donations, MOU from partnering agencies providing funds or in-kind contributions.

### Digital Imaging:

- Copyright Ownership statement
- 3 Sample Dublin Core metadata records
- Non-binding quote from a vendor for outsourcing the digitization (if appropriate) and/or for the equipment prices posted by an online vendor.
- CIPA certification from public libraries, public schools, and consortia that include public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification.
- If there are donations, MOU from partnering agencies providing funds or in-kind contributions.

### In Sync with Technology:

- Specifications and non-binding quotes for capital outlay/equipment costing $500 or more.
- Public libraries, public schools, and consortia including public libraries and public schools must attach the signed CIPA certification.
- If there are donations, MOU from partnering agencies providing funds or in-kind contributions.
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**Required Supporting Documentation**
- _______ Acceptable
- _______ Not Acceptable

**Does this project address the SPT&T?**
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- ☐ Do Not Fund
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