State of Michigan, Department of Education
Library of Michigan

Library of Michigan LSTA Five-Year Plan, 2017–2022: Evaluation Report

---

Evaluation commissioned by:

State of Michigan, Department of Education, Library of Michigan
Randy Riley, State Librarian
March 31, 2022

Evaluation prepared by:
Eric Craymer
Growth Management Consulting, Inc.
2536 Belknap Ave NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49505
www.GrowthManagementConsulting.com

GROWTH
MANAGEMENT
CONSULTING

STRATEGICALLY GUIDING ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH GROWTH AND CHANGE!

Evaluation Summary

This evaluation report's purpose is to determine how well the Library of Michigan succeeded in implementing and achieving the goals outlined in the Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan for Michigan October 2017 Through September 2022. The Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) is a federal grant program that is managed by the Institute of Library and Museum Services (IMLS) (https://www.imls.gov/) per the initial legislation for the LSTA.

The IMLS's authorizing legislation, Section 9134 (c), states specific grant requirements that must be met by State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs): "In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle, a State library administrative agency shall submit a plan to the Director." Further, each SLAA receiving a grant under this act shall "independently evaluate, and report to the IMLS Director regarding activities assisted under this subchapter, prior to the end of the 5-year plan."

This document evaluates the Library of Michigan's success in achieving the four goals set in its Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan for Michigan: October 2017 Through September 2022.

As with the world, the Library has weathered several turns of change due to the Covid-19 breakout. This makes a linear story of how things have been achieved. The Library has needed insights from Michigan libraries. They have also found new methods to support the libraries in doing so. The focus groups and a survey of more than three hundred library leaders have felt their esteem for the Library and its quick change-ups. It is likely that both the libraries and the Library will incorporate some of the learnings to assist the State of Michigan's residents further.

Below are the additional sources that have helped understand the extent of the Library's Five-Year Strategy progress.

Survey
A survey with more than three hundred Directors and Managers, from all types of libraries. Their responses of the questions that the Library needs to understand and assess the values for three different, but aligned, benefits. First, to assess the past five years. Second, to gain insights for the future. Finally, the survey also included a set of questions in gathering the important needs that are coming in the next Five-Year Strategic Plan

Focus Groups
The assessment gained significant insights through the use of four focus groups within each of the four regions. In addition, there was a strong effort to include varied sizes of libraries. All four groups identified that the Library of Michigan is doing an excellent job of working through the pandemic.

Library of Michigan Advisory Council
The Library has a Council is a group of outstanding librarians from different locations and aspects to focus on future and other issues to assist the Library in its work. The Council is a composed as multi-type/multi-size librarians. They all appear curious and deeply knowledge. The Council's focus session was primarily focused on the future .

Library Grants Coordinator
The Grants Coordinator was open for any information I needed, but also kept their distance. Any information needed to conduct the assessment was delivered and there was no attempt of the Coordinator to only with a single set of documents and thereafter only gathered information I required for the assessment.

About Outcomes
A common problem with an organization that uses outcomes is that many methods are more like "big" outputs rather than true outcomes. By incorporating a slightly restated statement of the outcomes, it is possible to gather insights about how high or low outcomes are achieved. Assessment of each of the outcomes concerning asking responders to weigh in about the extent to which those outcomes are the Library's outcomes. Making outcomes that have impact means that the method needs to be designed to outputs and outcomes that work together.

Huge Scale Creates Significant Value of Mel and MeLCat
More than a decade agone, the Library has used Mel and MeLCat to ratchet up great outcomes. It now has an extraordinarily strong benefit for libraries and residents are getting a level of value that, in single, or regional, access and intake that they could never reach without the Library, MeL and MelCat can deliver. The Library has scaled up because only they have the funding to build a statewide system within it, available only with the funds through IMLS. The leverage that these funds and at a large scale make amazing possibilities for Michigan's residents, libraries, and more. Only a large organization could achieve the strong benefit for Michiganders. The Library, with IMLS's help, has been an amazing benefit for all residents.

Insights from the Focus Groups
The assessment gained significant insights through the use of four focus groups within each of the four regions. In addition, there was a strong effort to include varied sizes of libraries. All four groups identified that the Library of Michigan is doing a great job of working through the pandemic. Some of the insights are:
- When, or will, patrons will be secure enough to bring them in again.
- The ongoing need for more digital bandwidth.
- Staff will need to be equipped for the new focus of patrons wanting multiple methods and more convenience.

Insights from the Library of Michigan Advisory Council
The council discussed the future. They see many exciting new things that have been forged because of the new possibilities of patrons. They have learned about different methods and channels that were developed (or simply not thought about them until the pandemic came). Some of the exciting, and challenging, are:
- How do smaller libraries find ways to find more resources given their limited staff, time, and funds?
- The schism among Red and Blue patrons cannot see each other's differences, even when in the neutral space of the library.
- Patrons will want more, faster.
- Staff will need training, skills, and customer service.

About the Method
This Five-Year Plan Assessment is different than the last. There is a major effort for including SPR, clear outputs, and a system that identifies measurable outcomes. The new format is hoped to measurable outcomes based on numerical goals that can be derived from the SPR's. Some of

the items in this Five-Year Assessment will be able to identify the outputs and outcomes. Others have outputs but with limited outcomes and others have not yet created true outputs or outcomes.

Summarize of Key Findings for Retrospective and Process Questions in the Evaluation Report

A-1 In the pandemic, the expectations for progress were challenged. In that context, the need for flexibility and built on what can be done, need to be done, is needed and accessible. In one way, the Five-Year Plan has seen amazing results within challenging situations. In another context, some results needed agility and hard work to make any results.

Overall: both amazing and changing, the Library has done well. Their work never stopped, just changed to full distance methods. The libraries and patrons did have difficulties depending on the library and the community. This was stated by the focus groups

In each of the plans in the Five-Year Plan have successful for their work, though there were libraries who were not able to use the Library's is successful, but libraries and patrons have been less likely to have access or success in their library. The overall of each of the goals were delivered on its value, but it may have yielded lower value for patrons given the obstacles.

The four focuses are:
1. Equal Access To Information Resources: **ACHIEVED**
2. Access to Current Services and Training Support: **ACHIEVED**
3. Collective Impact Initiatives: **ACHIEVED**
4. Community Engagement and Use Historical and Cultural Collections: **ACHIEVED**

A-2 The Five-Year Plan did not address national priorities associated Measuring Success focal areas.

A-3 There are two items that are each more than 10% of funds: **MeLCat** and **Michigan eLibrary (MeL)**.

The process questions are:
1. State Program Reports (SPR) are used to guide activities included.
2. There were no modifications made to the Five-Year Plan except for the IMLS's additional fundings because of the COVID-19.
3. The assessment did not share data from the SPR or other evaluation resources except for the assessment itself.
4. The methodology was carefully handled. Growth Management Consulting, Inc. is an independent company. It has had several contracts with the Library but have always been what is ethically and in the organization's benefit.

C-1 As the Independent Evaluator, my role was to gather data from the client. Early in the process the client sent a large amount of data that were pertinent to the assessment. There was need to request more specific data only.

C-2 To conduct the Five-Year Evaluation there were several methods to gather insights and client raw data concerning any particular information to assess. Based on the data and the results, there were several methods to complete the assessment. In sequence:
- Four focus groups representing quadrants of the State. They were held at distance given the pandemic. There was a range of libraries that would create information at all levels and types of libraries.
- One focus group with the Library's Advisory Council.
- One survey based on general trends and needs as well as a set of specific outcomes that the client had designed in the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan.

C-3 Major stakeholders are the libraries in the state. They are one of the channels to deliver the goals and outcomes. Their input was purposely to get their insights and experience in the focus groups and the survey.

C-4 Sharing insights will primarily be accessible on the IMLS website as well as that of the Library's website. It will also inform the next Five-Year Strategic Plan.

The Objectives for the Five-Year Strategy for 2017-2022 are stated below.

They align with the assessment outcomes (seen on the previous page). These efforts are not an inclusive list of the Library's outreach and partnerships.

Focal Area Crosswalk:

Objective	Focal Area	Intent
Goal #1 "equal access to information resources"		
1. Objective 1: Residents will have access to physical materials in libraries across the state.	Information Access	Improve users' ability to discover information resources.
2. Objective 2: Residents will have access to digital materials at their time of need.	Information Access	Improve users' ability to discover information resources.
3. Objective 3: Underserved rural and urban communities will have equitable access to materials.	Institutional Capacity	Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure.
Goal #2 "access to current services and training support"		
4. Objective 1: Libraries will learn current trends and best practices to improve local services and programs for residents.	Institutional Capacity	Improve the library workforce.
5. Objective 2: Libraries will assist unemployed and underemployed residents and students to access vocational training, digital literacy training and educational and vocational tests.	Employment & Economic Development	Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support.
6. Objective 3: Libraries will work to promote emergent and family literacy skills in their communities.	Lifelong Learning	Improve users' general knowledge and skills.
7. Objective 4: Libraries will be able to develop new programs to support multiple literacies, specific demographic groups or access to technologies.	Lifelong Learning	Improve users' general knowledge and skills.
Goal #3 "collective impact initiatives and community engagement"		
8. Objective 1: Libraries will be able to participate in community engagement programs.	Civic Engagement	Improve users' ability to participate in their community.
9. Objective 2: Libraries will be able to develop collaborative relationships with community groups and agencies to improve community services, especially for underserved populations.	Lifelong Learning	Improve users' general knowledge and skills.
Goal #4 "use historical and cultural collections		
10. Objective 1: Residents will be able to discover and use digitized historical and special collections more readily.	Information Access	Improve users' ability to discover information resources.

Evaluation

This evaluation report's purpose is to determine how well the Library of Michigan succeeded in its outputs and outcomes based on the Five-Year Plan Strategy for 2017-2022.

NOTE: This format is stronger than previous methods but is also new to the Library
This format is a new method than have been used in the past. There will be challenges but this format should also benefit the Library's ability to facilitate outcomes as well as outputs. While the Library has been working towards outputs and outcomes this method should be stronger. It is more likely to result in a stronger delineation of what an output is, what an outcome is, and how staff can be understand and benefit from it.

GOAL 1: Equal Access to Information

Michigan eLibrary: Equitable Access to Information

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	$2,093,881.29	$1,111,118.50	$0	$3,204,999.79	**Intent**: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	**Michigan eLibrary Web & Maintenance** 224 Attending	Questions 1. A 1: %of Agree and Strongly Agree = 92% of 219 1.B 1: %of Agree and Strongly Agree = 92% of 219

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	1.**Michigan eLibrary Web & Maintenance** 224 Attending	1.A Question A: % of Agree and Strongly Agree = 92% (of 224) 1.B : % of Agree and Strongly Agree = 92% (of 224)
	2. **MeL Resources training** – Overall attendance – 470 / presentations 839	2.35 surveys – Agreed and Strongly Agree
	3. **MeL database support**	3. Overall attendance – 470 / presentations 839
	4. **MeL Resources training** Presentation = 128 and Attendance = 3470	4. 522 surveys – 99% Agree and Strongly Agree
	5. **MeL Training and Marketing** - 224 Attending	6.1 Question % of Agree and Strongly Agree = 92% (of 24) and 6.2 Attendance Agreed and Strongly Agree = 92% (of 224)

MeLCat ; The Michigan eLibrary Website Development and Maintenance (funding at) Michigan eLibrary

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	$1,084,208.41	$58,000.00	$1,029,428.42	$2,171,636.83	**Intent**: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	**MeLCat Software – Innovative Interfaces & Encore** Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources	The satisfaction with MeLCat for this. – 307 responses / 97% Agree and Strongly Agree

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	**MeLCat Consulting**, Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources – 3,229 MeLCat tickets	The satisfaction with MeLCat for this. – 307 responses / 97% Agree and Strongly Agree

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	**MelCat Training** Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources There were a total of 61 sessions and 310 attendees	No Data

Ploud Technology Support

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-83685 2019	46,994.25	9000.00		55,994.25	**Intent**: Improve library's physical and technology infrastructure

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	The Ploud project will provide small communities with modern library websites so residents of small and rural communities will have access to MeL databases, community information and government services as needed.	

GRANTS:

Herrick District Library

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	30,128.42			30,128.42	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

Wayne State University

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	48,520.63			48,520.63	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

GOAL 2: Current Services & Support
State Goal: Current Services & Support

Library Staff Training: Improving Library Capacity

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	296,717.50			309,178.40	**Intent:** Improve the library workforce: Library Infrastructure & Capacity // Continuing Education and Staff Development

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs Library Continuing Education	"Outcomes" Success at or above

2019	1. Sponsored Workshops & Conferences
	    workshops for librarians; 845 attended
	2. Staff travel and training for professional development
	    12 conferences/workshops on staff
	3. Continuing Educ. Staff
	    5,512 persons
	4. LM supports provided webinars
	    55 staff education
	5. Community engage continuing event training
	    210 staff attending education
	6. Next-Level Leadership for Small and Rural Libraries
	Loleta Fyan Small and Rural Libraries online
	
	7. Community engagement video series
	    Short video tutorials
		1. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		2. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		3. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		4. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		5. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		6. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)
		
		7. Improve the library workforce (No Outcomes)

Library Science & Programming Resources Collections

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	60,741.19	366.98			**Intent:** Improve the library operations

Intent: Improve the library operations

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs Library Science & Programming Resource Coll.	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Build library science training for staff capacity and skills	Q1: %of Agree and Strongly Agree = 85% of 20 Q2: %of Agree and Strongly Agree = 85% of 20

Public Library Data Collection

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-836922019	24,700.00			24,700.00	**Intent:** Improve Infrastructure &Capacity / Research & Statistics

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Public library data collection software	52 responses / 94% Agree and Strongly

GRANTS:

Public Library Programming Support - Increasing Children and Teen Programming in Michigan Communities

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-83693 2019	78,690.34			78,690.34	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Small programming grants, especially for Small and rural libraries	No Data

Public Library Programming Support - Increasing Literacy Programming in Michigan Communities

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-83693 2019	25.459.63			25.459.63	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Small programming grants, especially for Small and rural libraries	No Data

Narrative: The Library of Michigan receives state funds to distribute to eligible public libraries throughout the state. The Library statewide services staff also supports LSTA priorities through consulting and projects that meet LSTA priorities to libraries.

Public Library Programming Support - Increasing Technology Programming in Michigan Communities

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	31,658.42			31,658.42	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Small programming grants, especially for Small and rural libraries	No Data

GOAL 3: Community Engagement

GRANTS:

Niles District Library Grant

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	78,563.86	0	0	78,563.86	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Social Work Services in Public Libraries	No Data

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	1) improve library staff's familiarity with and understanding of the social services that are available to patrons;	No Data
	2) facilitate patrons' effective use of these social services;	No Data
	3) develop collaborative relationships and programming with social service agencies and	No Data
	4) discover, develop, test, and disseminate promising and best practices for social workers and social work interns in small and rural libraries.	No Data

Fennville District Library grant

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-84127 2019	38,026.92			38,026.92	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Literacy for migrant farm workers.	No Data

Muskegon Area District Library grant

	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-84129 2019	31,800.00			31,800.00	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Training library staff to train parents in helping their young children develop learning skills.	No Data

Ypsilanti District Library grant

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-84130 2019	29,218.34			29,218.34	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Low-income parents will have the ability to learn to their early children using Text to Talk	No Data

Goal 4: Historical and Cultural Collections

Paths to Michigan History

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019	135,049.58	75,000.00		210,049.58	**Intent:** Improve users' formal education

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Supporting digitization and preservation of historical collections in libraries across the state	Not yet completed at this time, is many years process No Data

GRANTS:

Howell District Library grant

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-84111 2019	22,067.75			22,067.75	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	634 pictures digitized	No Data

Western Michigan University grant

FISCAL YEAR	LSTA	STATE	OTHER	TOTAL	DETAILS
2019-MI-84114 2019	23,741.94			23,741.94	**Intent:** Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

FISCAL YEAR	Outputs	"Outcomes" Success at or above
2019	Ability to build a regional digital collection model	No Data

Focus Groups Outcomes

Four regions across the entire Michigan were gathered with a group of librarians of type and size to consider the past. Their work was focused primarily what is happening with the State based on their lived experience. Focus items were used to further understand interest or curious issues that arose from the Survey. Each of the four groups were within one of the State's four regions. It allowed to follow up on things that were interesting and potentially necessary to understand the past as well of the future. Some things that the Focus Group suggested:

- Challenges for small libraries; limited staff and funds.
- Virtual programming with libraries was great! Keep it going, then other things could be done in person.
- Hots spots often do not help much; patrons do not have the knowledge to use it and may not have the bandwidth needed.
- Patrons are asking for delivery to be quick, accurate, quick, and 24 hours.
- Post Covid-19 will require a new boot
- Assistance with library staff tools and training (reboot, and a new expectation for their work)
- Harwood was great for larger libraries that can do it all, others may have a smaller scale.
- Impact of pandemic is uncertain.
- Many find it hard to please both the Red Team and the Blue Team. It is so polarized that we do not know how to make it work.

"Libraries found new paths to patrons…"

Focus Group With Council

Four regions across the entire Michigan were gathered with a group of librarians of type and size to consider the past. Their work was focused primarily what is happening with the State based on their lived experience. Focus items were used to further understand interest or curious issues that arose from the Survey. Each of the four groups were within one of the State's four regions. It allowed to follow up on things that were interesting and potentially necessary to understand the past as well of the future. Some things that the Focus Group suggested:

- Love Directors meetings: save directors time and focus on priorities
- Like to have LM help with marketing, especially for smalls?
- Concern for many libraries who have lost many of their staff; how will they build them?
- Rural may have limited knowledge and time.
- Continue and continue and further help libraries get leverage
- Rural libraries need internet connection, maybe a satellite
- What more could CoOps do to help
- LM was amazing to pull up after Covid and switch distance

"Love directors meetings; save directors time and focus on priorities…"

Survey Outcomes

The Survey was the first work to begin and complete. It was important to assess the further assessment. It built the foundation for the focus groups, and Council. It was the information that allowed to assess and conclude based on the information that the survey provided.

The survey was used in three ways.

- First, learning more about a few answers that were not clear. Many of the individuals in all four focus groups believed that the question did not a topic for them and so did not address the items. That was why many did not respond.
- Second, we developed a set of the Five-Year Strategy elements that were based on the actual outcomes. The meaning was the same, but it was necessary to change the actual statements because that was for all, and the survey item was in a personal wording. These were very useful and confirmed that the Library is doing a great job and delivering the needs that libraries and their patrons need.
- Third was a small number of questions concerning the past five years. The questions were set to determine how strongly the librarians thought to identify the success for the latest Five-Year Strategy. They were asked to assess whether the Library had achieved the goals defined. For most of the responders decide them as a 4-5 on a scale of 1-5 scale. Thirteen of nineteen were within the 4-5 numbers. This seems to see that the time outcomes for nearly 13 were strongly achieved and that 6 were somewhere below 4-5.

Validating the Five-Year Assessment Outcomes

In order to identify Five-Year Outcomes, the Survey included a complete set of the current outcomes for this Five-Year Plan To come closer to the broadest outcomes for the Five-Year the Survey included a complete set of the current outcomes within the Survey. Using the Five-Year Outcomes with a slightly tense (single person).

By having that slight change of language (to single person rather than all persons), it was possible to estimate the success of the outcomes for each of the responders. The results should be aligned with the outcomes.

Each of those outcomes were assessed by the three hundred plus respondents from different library types and locations. This should help the Library to understand and assess how beneficial and necessary are their Five-Year Outcomes as a whole.

The Survey allowed us to assess the validation of the Outcomes. Based on the five tiers in the survey, we determined that a response of 1 or 2 were not inside of acceptability. The response of 3 was determined to be somewhat partially

By slightly changing the language (but without changing the intent or results) we believe that the stated Outcomes are valuable and acceptable. These are indicated as Success. The lower tier (3-5 rather than 4-5) is useful and positive but is only partially success.

On the next page you will see the results. The level of achievement was considered target of success of a 4 or 5 result overall. The other results that are close, just one tier further the target (see the yellow column, adjacent to 4 or 5). The columns of 1 and 2 columns are outside the boundaries of success (full or partial). One level below full success is still strong partial Outcomes. In fact, given the three library types, the lower numbers may be due to the reality of three different library types. See the table below.

Five-Year Questions Only those who identified 1-2-3-4-5: target is 4-5	# of Respo	%4 + 5 Out of 1-5	% 4 + 5 Out of 1-5	% 4 + 5 Out of 1-5

		n-dents	FAILED <50%	PARTIALLY >50%	ACHIEVED >75%
Q1	Did your users have access to materials that they need through MeLCat?	218			93%
Q2	Did your users receive materials at their time of need?	211			87%
Q3	Your residents were able to identify and locate library materials in their area simply and quickly at their time of need.	215			82%
Q4	Students and lifelong learners were able to access needed materials at their time of need?	233			85%
Q5	Users were successful in finding and accessing the databases and eResources.	227		74%	
Q6	Residents of small and rural communities were able to access MeL databases, community information and government services that they needed through their library Ploud web site.	71			82%
Q7	Underserved rural and urban libraries knew their options for accessing internet and technology infrastructure.	107		62%	
Q8	Your Library was able to provide appropriate services for users lifelong learning and use of community services because of this training.	159			75%
Q9	Your Library was better able to develop high quality programs in their local communities because of this training.	151		74%	
Q10	Your Librarians learned how to provide new services and programming to their community through training at Rural Libraries Conference.	97			84%
Q11	Your Librarians were able to learn about new services or new methods for current services by attending workshops.	166			77%
Q12	Your Trustees and board members were better prepared to assist library staff in serving their communities because of access to training.	126		63%	
Q13	Job seekers and students built technical and educational skills at your Library.	156		59%	
Q14	Participating teens and children had access to a range of summer literacy programs.	171			87%
Q15	Participating parents and caregivers were able to gain information on emergent literacy and understand the importance of reading to their children.	166			81%
Q16	Participating users had improved access to lifelong learning programs because of an LM grant to your library.	123			87%
Q17	Your Library participated in the broader community in your service areas because of your participation in Community Engagement training.	98			
Q18	Your Residents have access to programming that focuses on local community needs with broad community support because of an LM grant to your library.	95			77%
Q19	Michigan residents were able to identify and locate digitized historical or special materials because of a grant to your library or your use of statewide digitized resources.	91		63%	

Note: # of Respondents varies for each question. Only respondents that entered a number for that question were counted. Respondents that left that question blank or selected NA were excluded.

Assessor Insights

Highlights of Effective Past Practices
- Staff has gotten better to identify a method to show that the SPR's have a measure rather than a process or story. There is one set of assessments that have very limited measure/data. Instead of focusing on outputs and outcomes they use the process.
- Similarly, SPR's are getting even better to include all necessary information.
- Data locations and names appear to be cleaner and are using the data appears to be more accessible.

Assess efficacy in implementation of actives used in advancing State goals
- The pandemic was a drastic sea-change. The Library was able to do most of the needs that the libraries required. For example, legality of certain decisions that the libraries need to determine for their library and patrons. The Library was able to set up legal assistant within the Library and help libraries weather the storm.
- Comparing the last Five-Year Assessment and the current one, there appears to be stronger data with-which to maximize the value of the libraries.
- In brief time after the pandemic, the Library was moving quickly to go from programs and support digitally.
- A number of focus groups suggested that the were amazed with the Library's fast changes and flexibility.
- To ensure libraries success, the Library was creative in finding solutions, methods, and assistance.

Develop key findings and recommendations from evaluating the past five years for use in organizing the next Five-Year Plan
- The Library has taken on the challenge of creating a new method for the assessment of their work.
- To build on this year's new method, the Library will need all staff to practice and excel to the Output/Outcome.
- Staff who are involved with the SPR would benefit from a quarterly meeting to discuss what is on track, what is off the track, and the way to further build on the system.
- It will be important for all staff working on the SPR need to understand the expectations and the agreed methods.

Suggestions from multiple Libraries
- Help with marketing: how can LM help them (templates, training, formats, sessions online
- A few (mostly Council) recommended either take the Rural Libraries could become a branch, to have a larger organization director can help them, have LM focus on them in-person and limit or not stop in-person for other libraries.
- Online meetings and training are a huge fan ("This is one of the most positive things that came out of the pandemic.)
- The need for getting bandwidth, especially for rural and small libraries. Rural, in special, need it for the patrons. Hot spots do not help without bandwidth

Potential Issues for the New Frontier of Libraries in Michigan Given Survey and Focus Groups

High Value Benefit
- Managing division between people based on Red and Blue (and how it is impacting staff and library in general).
- How to recruit staff; hard to do so given low pay, part-time job, this likely means limited numbers for finding staff.
- Make the monthly director virtual meetings and regular meetings with needed information and learning.
- Challenge of staying relevant
- LM conducting virtual training, meetings, etc. Many focus groups thought that in-person should be used for incredibly challenging topics or libraries who may need more help

Some Benefit
- Need to get help with rebuilding programs
- Changing behaviors for staff, things are changing, and patrons now will except all modals, options, and the library
- Libraries behaviors; have to change to address the current issues

Retrospective Report

A-1 Five-Year Plan Progress

Beginning in late 2019 the Library was facing a new challenge, the Pandemic. While they were able to provide access through the MeL and MeLCat. Because of LM's digital products, the Library's work could be working. Many of their in-person training session with libraries were not possible. A substantial number of the libraries were closing down.

After a brief time to access the situation, the Library began to develop distance methods to help libraries. They shifted to online, video, and other tech options to deliver the needs that the libraries need now.

In library focus groups, it was clear that the Library was indeed meeting library needs without coming to the library. The Library of Michigan became even more important for local libraries in a time of challenge.

A-2 Five-Year Plan Achieved Results that Address National Priorities

The Library has determined that the best way to provide equitable access to resources and knowledge is through programs that are statewide and that can be accessed inside or outside of a physical library. It is also the best way to provide equitable help to libraries, by providing statewide programs that the libraries can use to expand their collection (virtually or physically) and provide more service and value to patrons.

The bulk of LSTA monies are spent on the two flagship programs, Michigan eLibrary and MeLCat. They are the only two programs that come even close to meeting 10% of funding. These are statewide programs, and so do not have a number of specific audiences; everyone is part of the targeted audience. Because they are universal programs that any resident can access either at their library or on any device with Internet access, it could possibly be said that the programs serve every one of the groups listed in Question A.3.

A chart on the next page illustrates the areas that address national priorities can be seen on the next page.

Addressing national priorities (Question A.2)

As can be seen in the chart below, there was a strong focus on Information Access and Institutional Capacity and a moderate focus on Lifelong Learning. These findings make sense given the Library's focus on its statewide resource programs and its effort to bolster and enhance the effectiveness of libraries and library staff.

Five-Year Plan Activities and Outcomes (see numbered list below table)	Lifelong Learning		Information Access		Institutional Capacity			Economic & Employment		Human Services			Civic Engagement	
	's formal education	's general knowledge and skills	's ability to discover information resources	's ability to obtain and/or use information resources	e. Improve library work force	f. Improve library's physical and technological infrastructure	g. Improve library operations	's ability to use resources and apply information for employment support	's ability to use and apply business resources	improve user's ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family or household finances	's ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family health and wellness	l. Improve user's ability to apply information that furthers their parenting & family skills	m. Improve user's ability to participate in their community	's ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern
1.					☐									
2.					☐									
3.						☐								
4.						☐								
5.		☐												
6.					☐									
7.				☐										
8.						☐								
9.						☐								
10.	☐													
11.	☐													
12.													☐	
13.								☐						
14.							☐							
15.				☐										
16.				☐										
17.				☐										
18.				☐										
19.					☐									
20.					☐									
21.					☐									
22.					☐									
23.					☐	☐								
24.				☐										
25.				☐										
26.				☐										
27.				☐										
28.				☐										
29.				☐										
30.		☐												

Numbered List of Five-Year Plan Activities and Outcomes (2019)
Public Trustee Training (Goal 2)
  1. FOML Trustee Workshops
  2. United Libraries Subscription
Technology Training for Libraries; E-Rate Application Support (Goal 2)
  3. E-Rate Central Training
  4. Library Consulting – Ed Tech
  (23.) Loleta Fyan Small & Rural Libraries Conference (primarily Library Services Staff Training)
Summer Reading (Goal 2)
  5. Summer Reading manuals and shipping
STEM Programming Support for Public Libraries (Goal 2)
  6. STEM workshops
Community Cultural and Education Resources: the Michigan Activity Pass Program (Goal 3)
  7. Michigan Activity Card software and support
Public Libraries in the Cloud (Ploud) – Websites for Small and Rural Libraries (Goal 1)
  8. Ploud services and support
  9. Ploud training
Early Literacy for Young Children (Goal 2)
  10. Michigan Reads author presentations
  11. Every Child Ready to Read training
Libraries Engaging in Their Communities (Goal 3)
  12. Community Engagement training
MeL eLibrary: Providing Workforce Development Resources (Goal 1)
  13. LearningExpress Library subscription
Evaluation of LSTA programs (Goal 1)
  14. LSTA survey research
MeLCat Software – Innovative Interfaces
  15. MeLCat Software – Innovative Interfaces
  16. MCLS MeLCat Consulting support
  17. MCLS MeLCat Training
  18. MeLCat Linked Data – Zepheira
Public Library Services Staff Training (Goal 2)
  19. Webjunction
  20. Sponsored Workshops and Conferences
  21. Staff travel and training for professional development
  22. Continuing Education support for library staff
  23. Loleta Fyan Small & Rural Libraries Conference
Michigan eLibrary: Equitable Access to Information (Goal 1)
  24. Michigan eLibrary Site Development
  25. MeL Database Subscriptions
  26. Link Resolver -– Serials Solution
  27. MCLS database support
  28. MCLS database training
  29. MeL training materials
Use historical and cultural collections (Goal 4)
  30. Improve users' general knowledge and skills.
Match Only – State Support (Goals 1-4)
State Match Support

A.3 Focus on Targeted Groups

The Library has determined that the best way to provide equitable access to resources and knowledge is through programs that are statewide and that can be accessed inside or outside of a physical library. It is also the best way to provide equitable help to libraries, by providing statewide programs that the libraries can use to expand their collection (virtually or physically) and provide more service and value to patrons.

The bulk of LSTA monies are spent on the two flagship programs, Michigan eLibrary and MeLCat. They are the only two programs that come even close to meeting 10% of funding. These are statewide programs, and so do not have a number of specific audiences; everyone is part of the targeted audience. Because they are universal programs that any resident can access either at their library or on any device with Internet access, it could possibly be said that the programs serve every one of the groups listed in Question A.3.

Process Questions

B.1 How State Progress Reports were used
The Michigan State Reports are shared with Michigan libraries. They also are used as a resource for a required annual report on LSTA to the governor of Michigan and for the annual report to the legislature. Much of the information for the Michigan is within specific data gathered from the Sate Progress Reports.

Currently, this Assessor has seen more of the SPR's information in the annual reports to the State of Michigan. The Library has been more likely to have Info-Graphics with data. Because of the timing of SPR's and that of Michigan annual reports, data may be dated. The Library of Michigan does share select parts of the report with library staff and others at public meetings, workshops, and presentations.

Changes made in the Five-Year Plan for the State of Michigan (Question B.2)
Changes were more-so for the libraries during the pandemic rather than the Library's. The Library's focus of work is the same as planned. The changes were based on methods of delivering libraries Michiganders. The plane stated mostly intact. How they did it, though, required diverse ways to deliver the needs of the libraries and Michigan's patrons.

In the beginning of the pandemic the Library had to re-imagine their process for delivering the needs of the libraries. The State's Five-Year Plan was valid (even in the pandemic), but the Library needed to help libraries through the difficulty of Covid-16. The most significantly change for the Library was redesigning the method for helping libraries remain useful to Michigan people. Library staff provided distance support (more than usual).

Data sharing (Question B.3)
The data gathered for the LSTA-funded activities is shared with Michigan libraries and used for background for the annual report to the governor and the annual report to the legislature as well as for information shared in library and public forums, marketing, and presentations.

Evaluation Methodology

Background and Purpose
The LSTA Five-Year Plan for Michigan October 2017 Through September 2022 was funded by both a grant from the IMLS and matching funds from the Michigan Legislature. The LSTA Grant was provided to the Library of Michigan through the IMLS and as outlined in the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996 passed by the 104th Congress of the United States.

The Library Services Act requires that each state library shall provide a five-year plan outlining its goals and priorities. In addition, it also requires that every state library receiving grants will also submit an independent evaluation report evaluating the activities assisted under this act to determine the effectiveness in the plan for achieving the purposes found in the Library Services Act prior to the end of each Five-Year Plan. This Evaluation Report is that independent evaluation.

The Library of Michigan will use the information from this report for two purposes:
1. To evaluate the five-year plan's level of success and to report the same to the IMLS as required.
2. To inform the upcoming five-year plan in terms of new needs and initiatives as well as decisions concerning existing initiatives.

Selection of Evaluator (Question C.1)
To ensure an independent evaluation the Library of Michigan created an RFP outlining the criteria, requirements, and expectations of this report as well as the required expertise of the candidates. This was posted on the State of Michigan "Buy 4 Michigan" web site in order to identify prospects. Library management reviewed the proposals and selected Growth Management Consulting, Inc. as the overall evaluator.

The Library contracted with Growth Management Consulting. Growth Management Consulting is not affiliated with the Library of Michigan. While information was, in some cases, gathered through Library of Michigan staff. They did not directly participate in the data gathering of in the evaluation. For the overall evaluation, the Library of Michigan provided reports either from administration or already posted information from its website. In addition, the evaluator sought background and confirming documents when appropriate.

Evaluation data collection (Questions C.2 and C.3)
Data was collected in multiple manners and through the work of Growth Management Consulting. While information was gathered through Library of Michigan staff, they did not directly participate in the data gathering of in the evaluation.

Growth Management Consulting gathered information from a review of internal documents and several means of primary research. This primary research included several different methods.

The information from the key stakeholder interviews was used to gather insights for their lived experience, both before and after the pandemic. Their insights allow a more interactive experience of their views of the five-year plan's level of success. A set of focus questions based on the survey responses. Participants include representatives from multiple library professional areas our representing Public, Academic, and School libraries. There were four sessions, each with one of four spaces in the state.

Ethical consent and participation

Growth Management Consulting was cautious to ensure that any information received or developed would be held in secure confidence. In sources, which included live conversations with individuals or groups each was made aware of the purpose of the conversation, its intended results, and their right to anonymity. In live group conversations, each session began with an overview of the intent, an agreement to allow the session to be recorded and transcribed and their right to anonymity and their right to not participate in all or some of the conversation. No Library of Michigan staff were present at any of the in-person meetings in order to ensure anonymity and a willingness to speak honestly.

Sharing of information (Question C.4)

This report documents the processes and the findings. The report will be shared online with libraries, residents, and other interested parties. Libraries will be alerted to its presence via established list servers. In addition, Library of Michigan staff will present at statewide conferences and workshops in which data, findings and recommendations will be shared as appropriate. And a primary benefit of the research is to provide insights into the needs which might influence the development of the next Five-Year Plan.

Appendix A: Acronyms

CSLP – Collaborative Summer Library Program: The Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) is a grassroots consortium of states working together to provide high-quality summer reading program materials for children at the lowest cost possible for their public libraries. See http://www.cslpreads.org.

E-Rate – Universal Service Administrative Co. Schools and Libraries Discount Mechanism: E-Rate, an adjunct to the Internet/Telecommunications Project, ensures that all eligible libraries and schools have affordable telecommunications access. See http://www.usac.org/sl.

FTE – Full Time Equivalent: Student enrollment data of Michigan academic institutions. Data is used to calculate the number of possible borrowers using academic libraries to initiate loans in the MeLCat system.

IMLS – Institute of Museum and Library Services: Independent agency of the U.S. federal government providing federal funding to libraries and museums. See http://www.imls.gov.

LSTA – Library Services and Technology Act: A federal grant program of the U.S. government providing support for libraries of all types.

MCLS – Midwest Collaborative for Library Services: Library membership organization serving libraries in Michigan and Indiana. MCLS is contracted with by the Library of Michigan to provide services for the MeL and MeLCat programs. See https://www.mcls.org.

MeL – Michigan eLibrary: A project of the Library of Michigan providing Michigan residents with high-quality information subscription commercial databases, librarianrecommended websites, digitized historical documents, and images. MeL is also the host for MeLCat, a statewide borrowing system that allows users to place their own interlibrary loan requests if they belong to a participating library. See http://www.mel.org.

MeLCat – Michigan eLibrary Catalog: A component of the Michigan eLibrary that provides a statewide borrowing system, allowing users to place their own interlibrary loan requests if they belong to the community of a participating library. Users can search the catalog through MeL or directly through their own local library catalog and then initiate loans for material to be delivered to their home library for pick-up. See http://elibrary.mel.org/search.

MeL Michigana – Digitized local historical resources from Michigan libraries available through the Michigan eLibrary program. See http://www.mel.org.

Michigan Department of Education (MDE) – MDE is the state agency of Michigan that oversees public school districts in the state. It is governed by the Michigan State Board of Education. See http://www.michigan.gov/mde.

Michigan Online Resources for Educators (M.O.R.E.) –: A project that was administered through the Library of Michigan and hosted in the Michigan eLibrary. It provided tens of thousands of quality educational web-based materials aligned with the state's current curriculum standards. It was superseded by "MeL for Teachers"

QSAC – Quality Services Audit Checklist: A voluntary management standards program that assists public libraries by setting benchmarks for Governance & Administration, Human Resources, Services, Collection Development, Technology, Facilities & Equipment, and Public Relations. The Library of Michigan recognizes public libraries as they achieve each level. Libraries can be certified at the Essential, Enhanced, and Excellent levels. See http://www.michigan.gov/qsac

SL 21 – a.k.a. School Libraries 21 (SL 21): School Libraries 21 is a tool for measuring the quality of school library programs within individual school buildings in Michigan. It is based on a set of benchmarks for the 21st century. Schools submit completed benchmark measurement evaluations to the Library of Michigan, and successful evaluations receive Qualified Exemplary Status for their school library. See http://www.michigan.gov/libraryofmichigan/0,2351,7-160-18668_51980_77755--,00.html

SLAA – State Library Administrative Agency

SPR – State Program Report

APPENDIX B: Focus Questions

FOCUS SESSION'S QUESTIONS

PAST
Community Engagement

This question was one of those that were left blank by many (no response) "Your Library participated in the broader community in your service areas because of your participation in Community Engagement training."

1. What are your thoughts on reasons for that relatively low rating?

2. What improvements might you suggest for the future?

3. How will you engage with your community after the pandemic?

Equitable Access

More than 1 in 3 respondents selected lower response for, "Your library's community, as a whole, has equitable access to materials regardless of if they are in an urban or rural as a most important outcome from the past 5 years to keep going forward".

1. Do you agree? If not, why not?

2. What tools and support helped your library in the past 5 years?

3. What tools and support are needed for the next 5 years?

Virtual Programming

Virtual programming, digital services was mentioned in the comments as "3 of the most important new changes that you believe will strongly impact the library" for roughly 1 in 3 respondents that responded to that question.
1. What specific virtual programming would you say will be important for the next 5 years?
2. What digital services would you say is important for your library for the next 5 years?
3. How will you use virtual programing post Covid?

1= Library Michigan of Overall

Overall, what rating would you give LM for its overall work for libraries. The scale is from 0 (none) – 10 (amazing).
1. Why did you rate it as you did?
2. Was their approach to Covid successful for your library?
3. Why or why not.

2 = LM Overall
If you had to assess the success of LM, what number rating would you place on their success overall (scale = 0 [not helpful] to 10 [amazing]).
1. Why did you use the number that you did?

2. What could have been better?

3. How?

FUTURE
Literacy Skills
What critical needs for literacy training (such as digital literacy, financial, health, early literacy, and information literacy) are needed post Covid and into 2025?

1. Why do you think so?

2. What venues or methods do you think you will use to do so?

New Methods
Many surveys mention that some of the changes caused because of Covid, that patrons will want to keep them after Covid (e.g., Curbside/Drive-up Window and more online assistance rather than the desk), The Survey seems to show that the Patrons will not want to let them go away.
1. Do you believe this is true?

2. If it happens, what changes will be the most likely to be continued.

3. What other insights you may consider?

Training Staff for new methods and skills
Do you believe that staff will need new methods, skills, processes, etc.?
1. Which ones are most likely to change/add?

2. Who will it impact (LM training, in-house, etc)?

Balancing Virtual and In-Person
How well has your library balanced the need for virtual and in-person needs?
1. What is the reason for that response?

2. What training/skills/resources would help libraries balance the need for both virtual and in-person programming?

Going Out to the Community

Some survey respondents mentioned that people may not come into the library (some stated that many patrons still avoid the library even though they have been vaccinated).

1. How will you address this if it is true to your library?

2. How long do you believe this will be the case?

3. How will you bring them back?

Digital Inclusion and Connectivity

Several surveys talk about the need for 24/7 internet for all members of the community. How, or should, libraries assist patrons with internet connectivity in home through hotspots or other homebased ways.

1. Is that possible in your library?

2. If so, how will you make that happen?

Multiple user methods

I assume that you are already using differing modes (e.g., paper, and print, digital, etc.).

1. Do you believe that the library will need to prepare for differing modes for different patrons.

2. How are you balancing the modes now.

3. How would you like to balance the modes in the future.

QUESTIONS? THANK YOU FOR YOUR INSIGHTS AND TIME!

ANNEX C: Bibliography

Annual Reports for each year

Assessment of the 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016. 2017

GUIDELINES FOR IMLS GRANTS TO STATES FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION (IMLS)

MeL Annual Reports of 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020

SPR Michigan Files 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020

Library of Michigan LSTA Five-Year Plan 2007-2012: Evaluation Report

Library of Michigan Annual Reports 2015-2021

ANNEX D: Survey of Library of Michigan Libraries and Managers (1)

	Survey Template
Q1	Did your users have access to materials that they need through MeLCat?
Q2	Did your users receive materials at their time of need?
Q3	Your residents were able to identify and locate library materials in their area simply and quickly at their time of need.
Q4	Students and lifelong learners were able to access needed materials at their time of need?
Q5	Users were successful in finding and accessing the databases and eResources.
Q6	Residents of small and rural communities were able to access MeL databases, community information and government services that they needed through their library Ploud web site.
Q7	Underserved rural and urban libraries knew their options for accessing internet and technology infrastructure.
Q8	Your Library was able to provide appropriate services for users lifelong learning and use of community services because of this training.
Q9	Your Library was better able to develop high quality programs in their local communities because of this training.
Q10	Your Librarians learned how to provide new services and programming to their community through training at Rural Libraries Conference.
Q11	Your Librarians were able to learn about new services or new methods for current services by attending workshops.
Q12	Your Trustees and board members were better prepared to assist library staff in serving their communities because of access to training.
Q13	Job seekers and students built technical and educational skills at your Library.
Q14	Participating teens and children had access to a range of summer literacy programs.
Q15	Participating parents and caregivers were able to gain information on emergent literacy and understand the importance of reading to their children.
Q16	Participating users had improved access to lifelong learning programs because of an LM grant to your library.
Q17	Your Library participated in the broader community in your service areas because of your participation in Community Engagement training.
Q18	Your Residents have access to programming that focuses on local community needs with broad community support because of an LM grant to your library.
Q19	Michigan residents were able to identify and locate digitized historical or special materials because of a grant to your library or your use of statewide digitized resources.

See Further Next Page

ANNEX D: Survey of Library of Michigan Libraries and Managers (2)

Open Responses

Q20 Please write down up to 3 of the most important new changes that you believe will strongly impact your library.

Q21 Please write down up to 3 of the most challenging post Covid-19 changes that your library will face.

Q22 What other comments do you have about the focus of future outcomes for the libraries? Please write in the below box.

ANNEX E: People Interviewed

Allison Arnold	Saint Clair County Library
Alycia McKowen	Saint Ignace Public Library
Amber Alexander	Presque Isle District Library
Amy Hermon	Royal Oak Schools
Carolyn Stacey	Escanaba Public Library
Cindi Place	Bellaire Public Library
Cindy Mack	Brighton District Library
Colleen Leddy	Stair District Library
Crystal Cizmar	Benton Harbor Public Schools
David Scott	Ferris State University
Dillon Geshel	Superiorland Library Cooperative
E. Tamara Sochacka	Hamtramck Public Library
Eric Magness-Eubank	Alpena County Library
Ingrid Steen Boyer	Saugatuck-Douglas District Library
Jill Sodt	Mott Community College
Kelly Jacobsma	Hope College
Kristin Fontichiaro	University of Michigan
Leslie Warren	Northern Michigan University, Lydia Olson Library
Mary Hook	Manistique School Public
Matt Willis	Willard Public Library
Megan Buck	Dickinson County Library
Megan Farrell	Central Michigan University
Monica Peck	Boyne District Library
Ryan Wieber	Kalamazoo Public Library
Sara Tackett	Jackson District Library
Scott Duimstra	Capital Area District Library
Stacy Nowicki	Kalamazoo College
Stephanie Luyt	Traverse City Area Public Schools
Teresa Kline	Fennville District Library
Val Meyerson	Petoskey District Library