

Georgia Public Library Service



Evaluation of the Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan 2013-2017

**Prepared by
Dr. Robert Burgin,
RB Software & Consulting, Inc.**

March 2017

Commissioned by the Georgia Public Library Service.

Table of Contents

Evaluation Summary	3
Evaluation Report	6
Appendix A, List of Acronyms	31
Appendix B, List of People Interviewed	32
Appendix C, Bibliography of All Documents Reviewed	35
Appendix D, Survey of Library Staff	53
Appendix E, Results of the Survey of Library Staff	69
Appendix F, Focus Group Questions and Input	129
Appendix G, Targets from LSTA Five-Year Plan vs Actual Performance	133
Appendix H, Recommendations	157

Evaluation Summary

The use of federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds by the Georgia Public Library Service (GPLS) during the past five years has been guided by the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan for 2013-2017. The intent of this evaluation is to examine the extent to which the GPLS has met the goals that are defined in its Five-Year Plan.

The specific evaluation questions addressed in the body of this evaluation include the following:

- To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities make progress towards each goal?
- To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?

The methodology employed in this evaluation included interviewing the individuals listed in Appendix B, examining the documents listed in Appendix C, conducting a Web-based survey of public library staff members in Georgia (Appendixes D and E), facilitating a focus group with Georgia public library directors (Appendix F), and comparing the targets for LSTA-funded activities in the LSTA Five-Year Plan with actual performance (Appendix G).

Based on the results of these evaluations, this report makes the following findings:

- Goal 1 (Providing and encouraging visionary leadership) has been achieved through the following projects: Communications; IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, and Services; PINES; Strategic Partnerships; WebJunction Georgia; and Library Research and Statistics Program.
- Goal 2 (Ensuring equal access to information and technology) has been achieved through the following projects: GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services); IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, and Services; PINES; and Strategic Partnerships.
- Goal 3 (Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning) has been achieved through the following programs: Youth Services; Prime Time; Summer Reading Program; Communications; and Library Research and Statistics Program.
- Goal 4 (Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community) has been achieved through the following programs: HomePLACE; Professional Library Services;

Resource Sharing; Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM; Communications; IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services; PINES; Strategic Partnerships; and GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services).

- The GPLS plan activities met the following national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents:
 - Lifelong Learning: Improve users' general knowledge and skills
 - Information Access: Improve users' ability to discover information resources
 - Information Access: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources
 - Institutional Capacity: Improve the library workforce
 - Institutional Capacity: Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure
 - Institutional Capacity: Improve library operations
 - Human Services: Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills
 - Civic Engagement: Improve users' ability to participate in their community
- Individuals with disabilities represented a substantial focus for the GPLS Five-Year activities. These individuals were the focus of the GPLS GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) project, which represented 21 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures by GPLS for the period of time under consideration.
- Three types of modification were made to the implementation of the Five-Year plan. In three cases, activities or projects that did not appear in the plan were funded through LSTA. In four cases, activities or projects that appeared in the plan were not funded during the period under consideration. In three cases, activities or projects that appeared in the plan were not funded by LSTA during the period under consideration but were funded in other ways.
- Four groups of stakeholders were involved in the Five-Year Plan Evaluation: 354 public library staff members throughout Georgia responded to an online survey in January 2017; 56 Georgia public library directors and administrators, who attended the GPLS Directors Meeting in Savannah on December 8, 2016, served as a focus group; 12 GPLS staff members were interviewed to gather information and thoughts regarding LSTA-funded projects and activities during the time period under consideration; and one member of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, of which GPLS is a unit, was interviewed.
- Simple descriptive statistics have been provided for the results of the January survey of library staff in Georgia by reporting the percentages of each category of answer provided by the respondents. Qualitative methods have included interviews, focus groups, open-ended

questions on the survey of public library staff members in Georgia, and reviews of documents, including the GPLS annual SPR reports to IMLS.

Based on the results of these evaluations, this report makes the following recommendations (Appendix H):

- **Awareness.** During the next LSTA planning effort, GPLS may want to promote better awareness of its use of LSTA funds so that public library staff members, library partners, policy makers, and other stakeholders understand the breadth and impact of LSTA-funded initiatives.
- **Evaluation.** The evaluation of LSTA-funded projects in Georgia could be improved in two ways: by improving some of the targets and objectives used in the Five-Year Plan; and by including more focus on outcomes-based evaluation.
- **Grants Process.** A few survey respondents noted some problems with the grants process, and GPLS staff should examine these concerns and adjust the grants process where possible.
- **Build on strengths.** GPLS staff are to be commended for their efforts in several areas – Strategic Partnerships, Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support, IT Tech Boot Camp, and PINES – and are encouraged to build on these strengths by continuing to support these projects.
- **Opportunities for improvement.** Lower satisfaction ratings were found for some projects – Youth Services, Professional Library Services, Communications, Prime Time, and GLASS – and GPLS staff are encouraged to further investigate why these projects received lower satisfaction ratings.
- **Next Five-Year Plan.** As the GPLS staff begin drafting their next LSTA Five-Year Plan, they are encouraged to involve as many stakeholders as possible and to consider the ideas that were shared on the survey of public library staff members, the focus groups, and the staff interviews.

Evaluation Report

This section of the evaluation addresses the key questions provided by the IMLS in its “Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation.”

A. Retrospective Questions:

A-1. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities make progress towards each goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

The GPLS plan had four goals, which sought to address the national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents. These four goals were:

1. Providing and encouraging visionary leadership;
2. Ensuring equal access to information and technology;
3. Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning; and
4. Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community.

Goal 1 – Providing and encouraging visionary leadership		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved

Goal 1 from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan is “Providing and encouraging visionary leadership.” The following projects were implemented to address this goal:

- Communications
- IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services
- PINES Project
- Strategic Partnerships
- WebJunction Georgia
- Library Research and Statistics Program
- LSTA Administration

Communications. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$484,163.41 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Communications project, which developed and implemented coordinated communications for public libraries and their users in Georgia and which sought to increase the capacity of Georgia's public libraries to develop and implement marketing strategies to increase both awareness and use of the state's public library resources. (This total represented 4 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by expanding the ability of GPLS and public libraries to reach library users with information about innovative and visionary programs and initiatives. The majority of targets listed for the coordinated communications aspect of this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through an increase in visits and hits to GPLS and hosted Websites, an increase in the number of Facebook followers, the establishment of a Twitter feed, increases in the subscription base for *GPLS News*, and the issuing of press releases to about 200 media outlets and national trade journals. Just over half the targets for the Marketing Boot Camp and the pilot program for selected public library systems to facilitate the development and implementation of effective marketing plans were met through marketing Webinars, the pilot program, and a commitment from two librarians to serve as "Master Marketers."¹ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 59 per cent (29 of 49) felt that the GPLS Communications project had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 39 per cent (19 of 49) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (1 of 49) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,943,334.80 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS IT project, which provided IT support for Georgia's public libraries through a wide range of services. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by making available the technologies needed to support visionary leadership. Most of the targets for IT in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by sponsoring an annual IT Boot Camp for public library staff members, supporting the Edge Initiative in Georgia, maintaining a statewide wide area network and then overseeing the migration of library systems to local bandwidth providers, providing centralized CIPA filtering and then ensuring that filtering was included in individual contracts for

¹ See Table G-1 in Appendix G.

bandwidth provision, applying for E-rate discounts, providing Google Chrome Boxes to 42 systems, and supporting statewide email service for Georgia's public libraries.² Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 77 per cent (50 of 65) felt that the IT Boot Camp project had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 18 per cent (12 of 65) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 65) felt that the goal had not been achieved. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 76 per cent (48 of 63) felt that the IT Services project had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 22 per cent (14 of 63) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (1 of 63) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

PINES Project. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,995,121.00 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS PINES project, which provided a public library automation and lending network for 285 libraries with patrons in all 159 counties. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by providing an integrated ILS for nearly 300 public libraries, including hardware and software support, helpdesk, statewide courier service, overdue notice production, and system administration. Nearly all of the targets for the PINES Project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by providing training to library staff through PINES U and RDA courses, developing a mobile-friendly Website, completing a database clean-up project, and offering a courier service to transfer library materials among Georgia's public libraries.³ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 71 per cent (80 of 112) felt that the PINES project had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 27 per cent (30 of 112) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (2 of 112) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Strategic Partnerships. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$127,445.15 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project, which developed and implemented a coordinated program of strategic partnerships with local businesses and organizations to provide free materials and programming for public libraries. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by fostering the awareness of and promoting the delivery of innovative public library programs for Georgia residents. All of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met

² See Table G-6 in Appendix G.

³ See Table G-8 in Appendix G.

through the nurturing and expansion of current programs, the pursuit of additional partnership opportunities, and the brief partnership with VSA Arts of Georgia.⁴ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 67 per cent (75 of 112) felt that the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 30 per cent (34 of 112) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 3 per cent (3 of 112) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

WebJunction Georgia. WebJunction was canceled following FY2013 and eventually replaced with the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded. In FY2013, a total of \$34,000 in LSTA funding was allocated to the WebJunction Georgia project, which provided online continuing education through a program licensed from OCLC. (This total represented less than 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by making available cost-effective training and staff development programs. Because the program was canceled following FY2013 and because comparable data were not available for FY2012, the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan cannot be evaluated.⁵ However, in FY2013, there were 3,714 member affiliations with WebJunction and 581 active users per month.

Library Research and Statistics Program. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$162,195.45 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program, which collected, analyzed, and published data for the public libraries of Georgia. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by making available public library statistics and statistical reports to market and support visionary programs at local and state levels and providing training for public library staff members in the collection and use of statistics to market and support such initiatives. Evidence supports the fact that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through a reduction in the number of edits in annual reports, an increase in the number of library systems using statistical data with local stakeholders, and an increase in the statistical reports delivered for various projects throughout Georgia.⁶ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 76 per cent (42 of 55) felt that the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program had achieved the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, and another 20 per cent (11 of 55) felt that the goal had been partially achieved.

⁴ See Table G-13 in Appendix G.

⁵ See Table G-15 in Appendix G.

⁶ See Table G-3 in Appendix G.

Only 4 per cent (2 of 55) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

LSTA Administration. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$224,742.87 in LSTA funding was allocated to the administrative support and oversight for all aspects of LSTA projects in the state of Georgia. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership by the monitoring of all LSTA operating grants, the submission of all LSTA annual reports, and the provision of administrative assistance to all LSTA project directors. It appears that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the completion and submission of annual State Program Reports and Financial Status Reports, the use of statistics to determine if the LSTA funding has helped program administrators to increase the use of their services, and surveys of community stakeholders to determine improvements in the LSTA program.⁷

Goal 2 – Ensuring equal access to information and technology		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved

Goal 2 from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan is “Ensuring equal access to information and technology.” The following projects were implemented to address this goal:

- GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) including AMLAS, Distribution Center, Outreach
- IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services
- PINES Project
- Strategic Partnerships

GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) including AMLAS, Distribution Center, Outreach. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$2,810,731.47 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS GLASS project, which provided library services for the blind and those with print impairments. (This total represented 21 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology by providing assistive technologies to public libraries for use by

⁷ See Table G-7 in Appendix G.

people with disabilities, maintaining a program for the statewide distribution of talking books, supporting active patrons through direct service and outreach activities, and providing programs for children through AMLAS (now GLASS Atlanta). Evidence shows that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the purchase of several kinds of assistive technology for use in public libraries in Georgia, a 3-day Accessibility Conference, outreach visits and presentations, posts to social media and the publication of a newsletter, service to walk-in customers, readers' advisory, the provision of downloadable and physical materials, and programs for children provided by AMLAS (now GLASS Atlanta).⁸ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 65 per cent (84 of 129) felt that the GPLS GLASS project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, and another 34 per cent (44 of 129) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent (1 of 129) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,943,334.80 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS IT project, which provided IT support for Georgia's public libraries through a wide range of services. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology by making the technology itself available and by training library staff to implement the technology. Most of the targets for IT in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by sponsoring an annual IT Boot Camp for public library staff members, supporting the Edge Initiative in Georgia, maintaining a statewide wide area network and then overseeing the migration of library systems to local bandwidth providers, providing centralized CIPA filtering and then ensuring that filtering was included in individual contracts for bandwidth provision, applying for E-rate discounts, providing Google Chrome Boxes to 42 systems, and supporting statewide email service for Georgia's public libraries.⁹ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 85 per cent (50 of 59) felt that the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, and another 15 per cent (9 of 59) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 76 per cent (51 of 67) felt that the IT Boot Camp project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, and another 22 per cent (15 of 67) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent

⁸ See Table G-4 in Appendix G.

⁹ See Table G-6 in Appendix G.

(1 of 67) felt that the goal had not been achieved. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 81 per cent (55 of 68) felt that the IT Services project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, and another 19 per cent (13 of 68) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved.

PINES Project. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,995,121.00 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS PINES project, which provided a public library automation and lending network for 285 libraries with patrons in all 159 counties. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology by providing an integrated ILS for nearly 300 public libraries and their users, including hardware and software support, helpdesk, statewide courier service, overdue notice production, and system administration. Nearly all of the targets for the PINES Project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by providing training to library staff through PINES U and RDA courses, developing a mobile-friendly Website, completing a database clean-up project, and offering a courier service to transfer library materials among Georgia's public libraries.¹⁰ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 82 per cent (103 of 126) felt that the PINES project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, and another 18 per cent (23 of 126) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Strategic Partnerships. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$127,445.15 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project, which developed and implemented a coordinated program of strategic partnerships with local businesses and organizations to provide free materials and programming for public libraries. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology by fostering the awareness of and promoting the delivery of public library programs for Georgia residents. All of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the nurturing and expansion of current programs, the pursuit of additional partnership opportunities, and the brief partnership with VSA Arts of Georgia.¹¹ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 74 per cent (101 of 137) felt that the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project had achieved the goal of ensuring equal access to information

¹⁰ See Table G-8 in Appendix G.

¹¹ See Table G-13 in Appendix G.

and technology, and another 25 per cent (34 of 137) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent (2 of 137) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Goal 3 – Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved

Goal 3 from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan is “Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning.” The following projects were implemented to address this goal:

- Youth Services, including the Clifford Tour
- Prime Time
- Summer Reading Program
- Communications
- Library Research and Statistics Program
- LSTA Administration

Youth Services, including the Clifford Tour. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$219,900.50 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Youth Services Project, which provided a comprehensive array of services for children’s and teen services practitioners in Georgia, including continuing education. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning by maintaining a listserv for over 400 children’s services library employees, maintaining a listserv for 100 teen services library employees, providing training workshops in four geographic regions throughout the state, and in 2013 and 2014, hosting a tour of public libraries and other locations by Clifford the Big Red Dog. Evidence shows that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through participation in the two listservs, attendance at continuing education opportunities, and attendance at the Clifford Tour sites.¹² Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 61 per cent (35 of 57) felt that the GPLS Youth Services project had achieved the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, and another 39 per cent (22 of 57) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the

¹² See Table G-16 in Appendix G.

respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Two of the activities listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were not implemented as planned. In one case (the B4 [Birth-to-four] Early Literacy Initiative), the activity was sponsored through an IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA. In the other case (Storytime Outreach to Children in Out-of-Home Care), changes in GPLS personnel prevented the project from being implemented.

Prime Time. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$230,583.17 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Prime Time project, which helped economically and educationally vulnerable families with children ages 6 to 10 bond around the act of reading and talking about books. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning by providing a six-week book discussion program during which parents and the children read two books each week and discuss the books with humanities scholars and storytellers. There is ample evidence that the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the number of families participating in the project, the number of new library cards issued, the number of books discussed, family attitudes toward the library as a positive community resource and toward reading and learning, and an increased level of family interactions.¹³ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 71 per cent (36 of 51) felt that the GPLS Prime Time project had achieved the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, and another 25 per cent (13 of 51) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 4 per cent (2 of 51) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Summer Reading Program. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$311,245.27 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Summer Reading Program, which brings children and families into local public libraries for reading and other activities. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning by encouraging children to read during the out-of-school time to help prevent summer slide. While all of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were not met, program attendance did increase slightly from FY2011 through FY2014 and the program clearly supported the GPLS goal.¹⁴ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 73 per cent (117 of 160) felt that the GPLS Summer Reading Program had achieved the goal of

¹³ See Table G-9 in Appendix G.

¹⁴ See Table G-14 in Appendix G.

promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, and another 26 per cent (41 of 160) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent (2 of 160) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Communications. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$484,163.41 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Communications project, which developed and implemented coordinated communications for public libraries and their users in Georgia and which sought to increase the capacity of Georgia's public libraries to develop and implement marketing strategies to increase both awareness and use of the state's public library resources. (This total represented 4 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning by expanding the ability of GPLS and public libraries to reach library users with information about programs related to life long reading and learning. The majority of targets listed for the coordinated communications aspect of this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through an increase in visits to GPLS and hosted Websites, an increase in the number of Facebook followers, the establishment of a Twitter feed, increases in the subscription base for *GPLS News*, and the issuing of press releases to about 200 media outlets and national trade journals. Just over half the targets for the Marketing Boot Camp and the pilot program for selected public library systems to facilitate the development and implementation of effective marketing plans were met through marketing Webinars, the pilot program, and a commitment from two librarians to serve as "Master Marketers."¹⁵ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 67 per cent (38 of 57) felt that the GPLS Communications project had achieved the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, and another 28 per cent (16 of 57) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 57) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Library Research and Statistics Program. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$162,195.45 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program, which collected, analyzed, and published data for the public libraries of Georgia. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning by providing public library statistics and statistical reports to market and support programs related to life long reading and learning at local and state levels and providing training for public library staff members in the collection and use of statistics to market and support such initiatives. Evidence

¹⁵ See Table G-1 in Appendix G.

supports the fact that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through a reduction in the number of edits in annual reports, an increase in the number of library systems using statistical data with local stakeholders, and an increase in the statistical reports delivered for various projects throughout Georgia.¹⁶

LSTA Administration. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$224,742.87 in LSTA funding was allocated to the administrative support and oversight for all aspects of LSTA projects in the state of Georgia. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning through the monitoring of all LSTA operating grants, the submission of all LSTA annual reports, and the provision of grant guidance to all LSTA project directors. It appears that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the completion and submission of annual State Program Reports and Financial Status Reports, the use of statistics to determine if the LSTA funding has helped program administrators to increase the use of their services, and surveys of community stakeholders to determine improvements in the LSTA program.¹⁷

Goal 4 – Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved

Goal 4 from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan is “Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community.” The following projects were implemented to address this goal:

- HomePLACE
- Professional Library Services
- Resource Sharing
- Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM
- Communications
- IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services
- PINES Project
- Strategic Partnerships

¹⁶ See Table G-3 in Appendix G.

¹⁷ See Table G-7 in Appendix G.

- GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) including AMLAS, Distribution Center, Outreach
- Library Research and Statistics Program
- LSTA Administration

HomePLACE. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$196,404.00 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS HomePLACE project, which provided a collaborative model for digitizing primary source collections on local history from public libraries and related institutions. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by encouraging public libraries to collaborate with local institutions on the digitization of primary source collections and to use innovative methods to make such collections accessible. Most of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the new Digital Public Library of America Website, staff presentations, and newspaper digitization projects.¹⁸

Professional Library Services. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$277,345.59 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Professional Library Services project, which made accessible a professional collection of materials pertinent to library and information services providers in Georgia. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by providing information on collaborative and innovative practices to library staff members in Georgia. While neither of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met, over 10,000 items were loaned and over 4,800 reference questions were answered in FY2012, FY2013, and FY2014.¹⁹ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 78 per cent (46 of 59) felt that the GPLS Professional Library Services project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 17 per cent (10 of 59) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 59) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Resource Sharing. In FY2014 and FY2015, a total of \$2,932,099.49 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Resource Sharing project, which provided enhanced resource sharing among public libraries through access to online databases, interlibrary loan, and

¹⁸ See Table G-5 in Appendix G.

¹⁹ See Table G-10 in Appendix G.

cataloging support. (This total represented 22 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for the period of time under consideration.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by directly supporting collaboration via innovative methods of resource sharing. Most of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through increased use of GALILEO databases, increased interlibrary loans through the GOLD project, and improved cataloging access through OCLC Group Services.²⁰ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 73 per cent (79 of 108) felt that the GPLS Resource Sharing project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 25 per cent (27 of 108) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (2 of 108) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM. In FY2014 and FY2015, a total of \$1,197,253.83 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM project, which provided funding to public library systems in Georgia to enhance their STEM materials collections and to support STEM programming. (This total represented 9 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for the period of time under consideration.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by funding innovative STEM projects and collections in Georgia’s public libraries. No targets were listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan, but in FY2014, 3,000 print materials, 225 pieces of hardware, 20 software, 7500 print materials, and 275 electronic materials were acquired.²¹

Communications. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$484,163.41 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Communications project, which developed and implemented coordinated communications for public libraries and their users in Georgia and which sought to increase the capacity of Georgia’s public libraries to develop and implement marketing strategies to increase both awareness and use of the state’s public library resources. (This total represented 4 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by expanding the ability of GPLS and public libraries to collaborate with a variety of organizations and to reach library users with information about innovative programs and initiatives. The majority of targets listed for the coordinated communications aspect of this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through an increase in visits and hits to

²⁰ See Table G-11 in Appendix G.

²¹ See Table G-12 in Appendix G.

GPLS and hosted Websites, an increase in the number of Facebook followers, the establishment of a Twitter feed, increases in the subscription base for *GPLS News*, and the issuing of press releases to about 200 media outlets and national trade journals. Just over half the targets for the Marketing Boot Camp and the pilot program for selected public library systems to facilitate the development and implementation of effective marketing plans were met through marketing Webinars, the pilot program, and a commitment from two librarians to serve as “Master Marketers.”²² Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 63 per cent (35 of 56) felt that the GPLS Communications project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 32 per cent (18 of 56) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 56) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,943,334.80 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS IT project, which provided IT support for Georgia’s public libraries through a wide range of services. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by making available the technology needed to support collaboration and innovation by Georgia’s public libraries. Most of the targets for IT in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by sponsoring an annual IT Boot Camp for public library staff members, supporting the Edge Initiative in Georgia, maintaining a statewide wide area network and then overseeing the migration of library systems to local bandwidth providers, providing centralized CIPA filtering and then ensuring that filtering was included in individual contracts for bandwidth provision, applying for E-rate discounts, providing Google Chrome Boxes to 42 systems, and supporting statewide email service for Georgia’s public libraries.²³ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 78 per cent (51 of 65) felt that the IT Boot Camp project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 17 per cent (11 of 65) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 65) felt that the goal had not been achieved. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 82 per cent (51 of 62) felt that the IT Services project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 16 per cent (10 of 62) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (1 of 62) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

²² See Table G-1 in Appendix G.

²³ See Table G-6 in Appendix G.

PINES Project. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$1,995,121.00 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS PINES project, which provided a public library automation and lending network for 285 libraries with patrons in all 159 counties. (This total represented 15 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by providing an integrated ILS for nearly 300 public libraries, including hardware and software support, helpdesk, statewide courier service, overdue notice production, and system administration. Nearly all of the targets for the PINES Project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met by providing training to library staff through PINES U and RDA courses, developing a mobile-friendly Website, completing a database clean-up project, and offering a courier service to transfer library materials among Georgia's public libraries.²⁴ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 80 per cent (97 of 121) felt that the PINES project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 18 per cent (22 of 121) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (2 of 121) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Strategic Partnerships. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$127,445.15 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project, which developed and implemented a coordinated program of strategic partnerships with local businesses and organizations to provide free materials and programming for public libraries. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by using collaboration with partners to foster the awareness of and promote the delivery of innovative public library programs for Georgia residents. All of the targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the nurturing and expansion of current programs, the pursuit of additional partnership opportunities, and the brief partnership with VSA Arts of Georgia.²⁵ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 74 per cent (99 of 134) felt that the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 24 per cent (32 of 134) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (3 of 134) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) including AMLAS, Distribution Center, Outreach. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$2,810,731.47 in

²⁴ See Table G-8 in Appendix G.

²⁵ See Table G-13 in Appendix G.

LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS GLASS Project, which provided library services for the blind and those with print impairments. (This total represented 21 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by providing innovative assistive technologies to public libraries for use by people with disabilities and encouraging their use, maintaining an innovative program for the statewide distribution of talking books (including the use of digital materials), supporting active patrons through direct service and outreach activities, and developing existing and building new partnerships with key stakeholder service providers. Evidence shows that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the purchase of several kinds of assistive technology for use in public libraries in Georgia, a 3-day Accessibility Conference, outreach visits and presentations, posts to social media and the publication of a newsletter, service to walk-in customers, readers' advisory, the provision of downloadable and physical materials, and programs for children provided by AMLAS (now GLASS Atlanta).²⁶

Library Research and Statistics Program. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$162,195.45 in LSTA funding was allocated to the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program, which collected, analyzed, and published data for the public libraries of Georgia. (This total represented 1 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community by providing public library statistics and statistical reports to support collaboration and innovation at local and state levels and providing training for public library staff members in the collection and use of statistics to market and support such initiatives. Evidence supports the fact that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through a reduction in the number of edits in annual reports, an increase in the number of library systems using statistical data with local stakeholders, and an increase in the statistical reports delivered for various projects throughout Georgia.²⁷ Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 76 per cent (44 of 58) felt that the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program had achieved the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, and another 19 per cent (11 of 58) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 58) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

LSTA Administration. In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a total of \$224,742.87 in LSTA funding was allocated to the administrative support and oversight for all aspects of LSTA

²⁶ See Table G-4 in Appendix G.

²⁷ See Table G-3 in Appendix G.

projects in the state of Georgia. (This total represented 2 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for this period of time.) This project supported the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community through the monitoring of all LSTA operating grants, the submission of all LSTA annual reports, and the provision of administrative assistance to all LSTA project directors. It appears that the majority of targets listed for this project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan were met through the completion and submission of annual State Program Reports and Financial Status Reports, the use of statistics to determine if the LSTA funding has helped program administrators to increase the use of their services, and surveys of community stakeholders to determine improvements in the LSTA program.²⁸

A-2. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?

The GPLS plan activities addressed the following national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents.²⁹

Lifelong Learning: Improve users' general knowledge and skills. The GPLS Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM project sought to address the goal of improving users' general knowledge and skills by improving their knowledge and skills in STEAM and STEM content areas by funding innovative STEAM and STEM projects and collections in Georgia's public libraries. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 77 per cent (88 of 114) felt that the GPLS Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM project had achieved the goal of improving users' general knowledge and skills, and another 20 per cent (23 of 114) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 3 per cent (3 of 114) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Information Access: Improve users' ability to discover information resources. The GPLS Communications project sought to address the goal of improving users' ability to discover information resources by expanding the ability of GPLS and public libraries to reach library users with information about programs and initiatives to help users discover GALILEO and other

²⁸ See Table G-7 in Appendix G.

²⁹ The national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents are taken from Appendix 1 of "Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation," from the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

information resources. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 57 per cent (31 of 54) felt that the GPLS Communications project had achieved the goal of improving users' ability to discover information resources, and another 37 per cent (20 of 54) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 6 per cent (3 of 54) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS PINES project sought to address the goal of improving users' ability to discover information resources by providing an integrated ILS, including an online catalog, for nearly 300 public libraries in Georgia. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 81 per cent (101 of 125) felt that the GPLS PINES project had achieved the goal of improving users' ability to discover information resources, and another 17 per cent (21 of 125) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (3 of 125) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Information Access: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

The GPLS Resource Sharing project sought to address the goal of improving users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources by providing access to online databases through GALILEO, interlibrary loan through the GOLD project, and cataloging support through OCLC Group Services. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 78 per cent (89 of 114) felt that the GPLS Resource Sharing project had achieved the goal of improving users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources, and another 21 per cent (24 of 114) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent (1 of 114) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Institutional Capacity: Improve the library workforce. The GPLS Youth Services project sought to address the goal of improving the library workforce by maintaining a listserv for over 400 children's services library employees, maintaining a listserv for 100 teen services library employees, and providing training workshops in four geographic regions throughout the state. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 51 per cent (25 of 49) felt that the GPLS Youth Services project had achieved the goal of improving the library workforce, and another 37 per cent (18 of 49) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 12 per cent (6 of 49) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS Professional Library Services project sought to address the goal of improving the library workforce by making accessible a professional collection of materials pertinent to library and information services providers in Georgia. Of those who expressed an opinion on the

survey of Georgia public library staff members, 70 per cent (45 of 64) felt that the GPLS Professional Library Services project had achieved the goal of improving the library workforce, and another 22 per cent (14 of 64) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 8 per cent (5 of 64) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Institutional Capacity: Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure. The GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support project sought to address the goal of improving the library's physical and technological infrastructure by maintaining a statewide wide area network and then overseeing the migration of library systems to local bandwidth providers and applying for E-rate discounts for Georgia's public libraries. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 84 per cent (49 of 58) felt that the Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support project had achieved the goal of improving the library's physical and technological infrastructure, and another 16 per cent (9 of 58) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS IT Services project sought to address the goal of improving the library's physical and technological infrastructure by providing centralized CIPA filtering and then ensuring that filtering was included in individual contracts for bandwidth provision, providing Google Chrome Boxes to 42 systems, and supporting statewide email service for Georgia's public libraries. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 79 per cent (50 of 63) felt that the GPLS IT Services project had achieved the goal of improving the library's physical and technological infrastructure, and another 19 per cent (12 of 63) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 2 per cent (1 of 63) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Institutional Capacity: Improve library operations. The GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program sought to address the goal of improving library operations by providing public library statistics and statistical reports to help library staff members improve the operations of their libraries. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 74 per cent (43 of 58) felt that the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program had achieved the goal of improving library operations, and another 26 per cent (15 of 58) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. None of the respondents felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS IT Boot Camp project sought to address the goal of improving library

operations by providing training to Georgia’s public library staff members in a wide range of technologies. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 71 per cent (46 of 65) felt that the GPLS IT Boot Camp project had achieved the goal of improving library operations, and another 25 per cent (16 of 65) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (3 of 65) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Human Services: Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills. The GPLS Youth Services project sought to address the goal of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills by providing a comprehensive array of services for children’s and teen services practitioners in Georgia as they support the development of parenting and family skills among library users. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 54 per cent (28 of 52) felt that the GPLS Youth Services project had achieved the goal of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills, and another 40 per cent (21 of 52) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 6 per cent (3 of 52) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS Prime Time project sought to address the goal of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills by helping economically and educationally vulnerable families with children ages 6 to 10 bond around the act of reading and talking about books. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 72 per cent (38 of 53) felt that the GPLS Prime Time project had achieved the goal of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills, and another 25 per cent (13 of 53) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 4 per cent (2 of 53) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

Civic Engagement: Improve users’ ability to participate in their community. The GPLS Youth Services project sought to address the goal of improving users’ ability to participate in their community by providing a comprehensive array of services for children’s and teen services practitioners in Georgia as they encourage civic engagement among their users. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 51 per cent (27 of 53) felt that the GPLS Youth Services project had achieved the goal of improving users’ ability to participate in their community, and another 45 per cent (24 of 53) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 4 per cent (2 of 53) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS Summer Reading Program sought to address the goal of improving users’

ability to participate in their community by encouraging children to read during the out-of-school time to help prevent “summer slide.” Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 60 per cent (77 of 129) felt that the GPLS Summer Reading Program had achieved the goal of improving users’ ability to participate in their community, and another 36 per cent (46 of 129) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 5 per cent (6 of 129) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

The GPLS Strategic Partnerships project sought to address the goal of improving users’ ability to participate in their community by developing and implementing a coordinated program of strategic partnerships with local businesses and organizations to provide free materials and programming for public libraries. Of those who expressed an opinion on the survey of Georgia public library staff members, 78 per cent (104 of 133) felt that the GPLS Strategic Partnerships project had achieved the goal of improving users’ ability to participate in their community, and another 21 per cent (28 of 133) felt that the goal had been partially achieved. Only 1 per cent (1 of 133) felt that the goal had not been achieved.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities: library workforce (current and future); individuals living below the poverty line; individuals that are unemployed/underemployed; ethnic or minority populations; immigrants/refugees; individuals with disabilities; individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills; families; children (aged 0-5); and school-aged youth (aged 6-17)? (For the purposes of this question, a substantial focus would represent at least ten percent of the total amount of resources committed by the overall plan across multiple years.)

Of the groups listed, only individuals with disabilities represented a substantial focus for the GPLS Five-Year activities. These individuals were the focus of the GPLS GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services) project, which represented 21 per cent of the total LSTA expenditures for the period of time under consideration. As its mission statement notes, “GLASS supports accessible library services in Georgia by promoting the use of assistive technology and by providing accessible reading materials to those who, due to a disability, are unable to read standard print.” The extent to which individuals with disabilities have been reached is reflected in the number of active readers (15,388 in FY2014), the number of BARD registered users (1,857 in FY2014), the number of physical items circulated (360,783 in FY2014), and the number of downloadable items circulated through BARD (109,407 in FY2014). In addition, in FY2014 alone, staff contacted 5,181 persons through outreach visits,

made 304 outreach presentations, circulated 22,268 copies of the GLASS newsletter, sponsored a 3-day Accessibility Conference, served 512 walk-in customers, and purchased the following items for use in public libraries throughout Georgia: 63 video magnifiers, 126 handheld video magnifiers, 63 text-to-speech readers, and 5 audio amplifier systems.

B. Process Questions

B-1. How have you used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan?

Data from the State Program Reports are regularly monitored to ensure that the activities in the Five-Year Plan are making progress towards the goals of the plan and achieving results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas. Statistics have been shared with GPLS leadership and directors of programs in order to help guide planning and to evaluate the success of our programs. Data from the old and new SPR have been used to help plan budgets. In addition, a wide range of feedback channels have been used to guide the activities in the Five-Year Plan:

- Data from the 2012 LSTA Five-Year Evaluation Report
- Feedback from focus groups with public libraries and other partner organizations
- Data gathered from surveys conducted for GALILEO, GLASS, HomePlace, IT Services, PINES, Prime Time, STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing
- Feedback from in-depth conversations with stakeholders, including key public library personnel around the state
- Systematic and regular collection, review, and analysis of data about library services, expenditures, facilities, staff in Georgia
- Attendance at regular meetings of the Georgia public library directors
- Discussions with elected officials and their staff at municipal, county and state government levels

B-2. Specify any changes you made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred.

Three types of modification were made to the implementation of the Five-Year plan.

In three cases, activities or projects that did not appear in the plan were funded through

LSTA. These included the Edge Initiative (under IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services); the Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM project; and the Clifford Tour (under Youth Services). In each case, the activity or project funded was consistent with at least one of the goals of the Five-Year Plan and the funds were available.

In four cases, activities or projects that appeared in the plan were not funded during the period under consideration. These included the Marketing Boot Camp (under Communications); the Leadership Institute –the Virtual Library Staff Development Day (under Continuing Education); the Geek Squad (under IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services); and the Storytime Outreach to Children in Out-of-Home Care (under Youth Services). In each case, the activity or project was not implemented due to a lack of funding, a lack of staff, or changes in staff. In addition, all but one of these – the Storytime Outreach to Children in Out-of-Home Care – have been implemented since the FY2013-FY2015 period.

In three cases, activities or projects that appeared in the plan were not funded by LSTA during the period under consideration but were funded in other ways. These included the WebJunction Georgia project, which was eventually replaced with online training through the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded; the PINNACLE Program, which was state funded; and the B4 (Birth-to-four) Early Literacy Initiative (under Youth Services), which was implemented as an IMLS National Leadership Grant, not through LSTA.

B-3. How and with whom have you shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources?

Data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources have been made available on the GPLS Website, through its electronic newsletter (Georgia Public Library Service News), through email lists to various stakeholders, through presentations at meetings of the Georgia public library directors, through presentations at the annual Georgia Library Association COMO Conference, and through presentations at meetings of the Regents Public Library Advisory Committee, which represents the state public library systems on behalf of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. GPLS's *Current Look* publication is widely shared with stakeholders from directors to funders.

C. Methodology Questions

C-1. Identify how you implemented an independent Five-Year Evaluation using the criteria

described in the section of this guidance document called Selection of Evaluators.

Hiring an outside evaluator allowed GPLS to acquire a more objective perspective, to take advantage of outside expertise, and to garner an independent, unbiased evaluation for stakeholders.

Dr. Robert Burgin of RB Software & Consulting, Inc. was contracted to conduct the evaluation of the GPLS Five-Year LSTA Plan. Dr. Burgin has provided consulting on strategic planning and technology planning to libraries since 1986, has 10 years of experience in public library administration, has 2 years of State Library experience in North Carolina, and taught for 25 years in the School of Library and Information Science at North Carolina Central University, where he also served as Associate Dean of the School. In addition, Dr. Burgin has published over 50 articles on library management, information retrieval, and library automation and conducted the 2012 evaluation of the Mississippi Library Commission's Five-Year LSTA Plan as well as the 2016 evaluation of the South Carolina State Library's Five-Year LSTA Plan.

C-2. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation. Assess their validity and reliability.

Simple descriptive statistics have been provided for the results of the January survey of library staff in Georgia by reporting the percentages of each category of answer provided by the respondents.

Qualitative methods have included interviews, focus groups, open-ended questions on the survey of Georgia library staff members, and reviews of documents.

The documents examined are valid and reliable.³⁰ The GPLS annual SPR reports to IMLS have been reviewed and accepted by IMLS. The GPLS annual reports and other documents, created for other agency purposes, are both valid and reliable.

The focus group's input is valid, particularly as no GPLS staff were present, allowing participants to speak freely and provide honest feedback. In combination with the survey results, the validity and reliability of both tools were increased.

Survey results have high reliability as all respondents answered the same questions and each response was consistently analyzed.

³⁰ A bibliography of all documents reviewed is provided as Appendix C.

C-3. Describe the stakeholders involved in the various stages of the Five-Year Evaluation and how you engaged them.

Four groups of stakeholders were involved in the Five-Year Plan Evaluation. First, 354 public library staff members throughout Georgia responded to an online survey in January 2017 and provided a rich set of evaluative feedback; the survey instrument is provided in Appendix D, and the survey results are provided in Appendix E. Second, 56 Georgia public library directors and administrators, who attended the GPLS Directors Meeting in Savannah on December 8, 2016, served as a focus group, providing the input and feedback shown in Appendix F. Third, 12 GPLS staff members were interviewed to gather information and thoughts regarding LSTA-funded projects and activities during the time period under consideration. Finally, one member of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, of which GPLS is a unit, was interviewed, specifically about the GLASS project. The individuals involved in providing evaluation data via the focus group and the interviews are listed in Appendix B. Survey respondents were anonymous.

C-4. Discuss how you will share the key findings and recommendations with others.

The key findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be made available on the GPLS Website, through its electronic newsletter (*Georgia Public Library Service News*), through email lists to various stakeholders, through presentations at meetings of the Georgia public library directors, through presentations at the annual Georgia Library Association COMO Conference, and through presentations at meetings of the Regents Public Library Advisory Committee, which represents the state public library systems on behalf of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Key findings will also be shared at GPLS staff meetings and at LSTA advisory committee meetings.

Appendix A
List of Acronyms

AMLAS	Atlanta Metro Library for Accessible Services
BARD	Braille & Reading Audio Download
B4	Birth-to-Four
CIPA	Children's Internet Protection Act
GLASS	Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services
GOLD	Georgia Online Database
GPLS	Georgia Public Library Service
HomePLACE	Providing Library and Archives Collections Electronically
ILL	Interlibrary Loan
ILS	Integrated Library System
IMLS	Institute of Museum and Library Services
IT	Information Technology
LSTA	Library Services and Technology Act
OBE	Outcomes-Based Evaluation
OCLC	Online Computer Library Center
PINES	Public Information Network for Electronic Services
PINNACLE	Public Library Institute for New and Creative Leadership Education
RDA	Resource Description and Access
SPR	State Program Report
STEAM	Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math

Appendix B

List of People Interviewed

Focus Group Participants Savannah, December 8, 2016

Gabriel Morley, Atlanta-Fulton Public Library System

Mashell Fashion, Augusta-Richmond County Library System

Lillie Crowe, Bartram Trail Regional Library

Scott Routsong, Brooks County Public Library

Alan Harkness, Chattahoochee Valley Libraries

Angela Finley, Chattoga County Library System

Misty Reyes, Cherokee Regional Library

Chelsea Kovalevsky, Cherokee Regional Library

Leslie Clark, Chestatee Regional Library System

Rosalind Lett, Clayton County Library System

Kathy Griffis, Coastal Plain Regional Library

Helen Poyer, Cobb County Public Library System

Stacy Brown, Conyers-Rockdale Library System

Jimmy Bass, Coweta County Public Library

Alison Weissinger, DeKalb County Public Library

Lisa Rigsby, Desoto Trail Regional Library

Pauline Abidde, Dougherty County Public Library

Janet Burroughs, Elbert County Public Library

Martha Powers-Jones, Fitzgerald-Ben Hill County Library

Natalie Marshall, Flint River Regional Library

Anna Lyle, Forsyth County Public Library

Mary Lin Maner, Greater Clarks Hill Regional Libraries

Charles Pace, Gwinnett County Public Library

Casey Wallace, Gwinnett County Public Library

Lisa MacKinney, Hall County Library System

Richard Sanders, Hart County Library System

Focus Group Participants
Savannah, December 8, 2016
(Continued)

Carolyn T. Fuller, Henry County Library System
Carol Taylor, Jefferson County Library
Gary McNeely, Kinchafoonee Regional Library
Anne Isbell, Lake Blackshear Regional Library
Jason Broughton, Live Oak Public Libraries
Geri Mullis, Marshes of Glynn Libraries
Jennifer Lautzenheiser, Middle Georgia Regional Library
Holly Phillips, Moultrie-Colquitt County Library
Vince Stone, Mountain Regional Library System
Lace Keaton, Newton County Library System
Delana Knight, Northeast Georgia Regional Library
Darla Chambliss, Northwest Georgia Regional Library
Anne Bowen, Ocmulgee Regional Library System
Cameron Asbell, Ochoopee Regional Library
Trent Reynolds, Okefenokee Regional Library System
Beth McIntyre, Piedmont Regional Library System
Cynthia Kilby, Pine Mountain Regional Library System
Pam Grigg, Roddenberry Memorial Library
Delana Hickman, Sara Hightower Regional Library
Kathryn Youles, Screven-Jenkins Regional Library
Anita Summers, Sequoyah Regional Library
Miguel Vicente, South Georgia Regional Library
Susan Whittle, Southwest Georgia Regional Library
Jennifer Durham, Statesboro Regional Public Libraries
Diana Very, Three Rivers Regional Library System
Keith Schuermann, Troup-Harris Regional Library
Stephen Houser, Twin Lakes Library System
Ben Carter, Uncle Remus Regional Library System
Roni Tewksbury, West Georgia Regional Library
Leigh Wiley, Worth County Library System

**GPLS Staff Members Interviewed
November-December 2016**

Emily Almond, Director of Information Technology
Elaine Black, Director of Youth Services
David Baker, Director of Communications and Strategic Partnerships
Peggy Chambliss, Library Services Manager
Wendy Cornelisen, Assistant State Librarian for Library Innovation and Collaboration
Jessica Everingham, Assistant State Librarian for Library Development and Support
Elaine Hardy, PINES & Collaborative Projects Manager
Pat Herndon, Director of GLASS (Georgia Libraries for Accessible Statewide Services)
Elizabeth McKinney, PINES Program Director
Whitney Payne, Director of Research and Statistics
Angela Stanley, Director of Georgia HomePlace
Julie Walker, State Librarian

**Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Member Interviews
January 2017**

Doreen Poitevint, Regent

Appendix C

Bibliography of All Documents Reviewed

A Current Look

“A Current Look at Georgia’s Public Libraries and GPLS,” April 2012.

“A Current Look at Georgia’s Public Libraries and GPLS,” January 2013.

“A Current Look at Georgia’s Public Libraries and GPLS,” February 2014.

“A Current Look at Georgia’s Public Libraries and GPLS,” January 2015.

“A Current Look at Georgia’s Public Libraries and GPLS,” February 2016.

Communication Training Days

“10 tips for working with Reporters,” August 2015.

“Attendees,” August 2015.

“Communications Training Day Agenda for Southwestern Georgia Libraries,” August 2015.

“Partnership Presentation,” August 2015.

“Pursuing Strategic Local Partnerships for Your Library,” August 2015 [PowerPoint].

“Telling Your Library’s Story Through Photography,” August 2015 [PowerPoint].

GALILEO

“Public Libraries, FY11 GALILEO Institution Usage Summary,” July 2010-June 2011
[spreadsheet].

“Public Libraries, FY12 GALILEO Institution Usage Summary,” July 2011-June 2012
[spreadsheet].

“Public Libraries, FY13 GALILEO Database Usage Summary,” July 2012-June 2013
[spreadsheet].

“Public Libraries, FY15 GALILEO Database Usage Summary,” July 2014-June 2015
[spreadsheet].

“Public Libraries, FY16 GALILEO Database Usage Summary,” July 2015-June 2016
[spreadsheet].

GLASS: Accessibility Conferences 2015-6

“Agenda, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 23-25, 2015.

“Program, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 23-25, 2015.

“Agenda, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 21-23, 2016.

“Program, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 21-23, 2016.

GLASS: Consolidation 2013-2015

“Goals for Further Consolidation of GLASS Services,” December 2013.

“Goals Set in July 2014,” July 2015.

“History of GLASS Consolidation: Georgia Library for Statewide Accessible Services,” July 2016.

“Talking Points for the Project Independence Contractors Meeting,” September 2014.

GLASS: Flyers

“Bookshare Flyer,” [no date].

“GLASS Children’s Flyer,” [no date].

“GLASS Flyer,” June 2015.

“GLASS Outreach Map,” July 2015.

“Veterans Flyer,” [no date].

GLASS: LSTA Reports

“GLASS Accessible Services – GPLS LSTA Program Tags,” [no date].

“GLASS Accessible Services – GPLS LSTA Project and Activity,” [no date].

“GLASS – GPLS LSTA program tags,” [no date].

“GLASS – GPLS LSTA Project and Activity, FFY2014,” [no date].

“GLASS Outreach – GPLS LSTA Program tags,” [no date].

“GLASS Outreach – GPLS LSTA Project and Activity, FFY2014,” [no date].

“GLASS Percentage of Time, FFY2015,” [no date].

“GLASS – Programs Within GLASS,” November 2015.

“LSTA-FY13 Program Report – Atlanta Metro Library for Accessible Services,” October 2013.

“LSTA-FY14 Program Report – Atlanta Metro Library for Accessible Services,” October 2014.

“LSTA-FY13 Program Report – GLASS Distribution Center,” October 2013.

“LSTA-FY14 Program Report – GLASS Distribution Center,” October 2014.

“LSTA-FY14 Program Report – GLASS Outreach,” October 2014.

GLASS: Miscellaneous

“Building Accessible Services,” GPLS Technology Boot Camp,” April 2016 [PowerPoint].

“GLASS-Atlanta Programs for Children and Youth,” [no date].

“GLASS Community Conversations 2016,” March 2016.

“GLASS Mission Statement 2016,” [no date].

“GLASS – Programs within GLASS,” [no date].

GLASS: Newsletters

“HourGLASS,” Volume 3, Issue 1, Fall 2015.

“HourGLASS,” Volume 3, Issue 2, Winter 2015.

“HourGLASS,” Volume 3, Issue 3, Spring 2016.

“HourGLASS,” Volume 3, Issue 4, Summer 2016.

“HourGLASS,” Volume 4, Issue 4, Fall 2016.

“HourGLASS,” Volume 5, Issue 1, Winter 2016.

GLASS: NLS Surveys

“Georgia DRAFT REPORT RL Review 2013,” July 2013.

“Georgia Report Draft RL Review 2015 Visit,” July 2015.

“Strategic Plan Worksheet – Revised Responses,” July 2013.

“Summary of Recommendations – Response to 2013 Survey,” July 2013.

GLASS: Program Evaluation Surveys

“2015 – Evaluation, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 2015.

“2016 – Evaluation, Georgia Accessibility Conference,” March 2016.

“GLASS Assistive Tech Kits,” [no date].

“GLASS Customer Satisfaction 2014,” [no date].

“GLASS Customer Satisfaction 2016,” [no date].

“GLASS Outreach to Public Libraries 2016,” [no date].

GLASS: Recording Studio Program

“Recording Studio – Collection Development Policy,” August 2013.

GLASS: Statistics

- “201312 December 2013 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201401 January 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201402 February 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201403 March 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201404 April 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201405 May 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201406 June 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201407 July 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201408 August 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201409 September 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201410 October 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201411 November 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201412 December 2014 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201501 January 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201502 February 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201503 March 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201504 April 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201505 May 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201506 June 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201507 July 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201508 August 2015 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201509 September 2015 with charts.xls,” [spreadsheet].
- “201510 October 2015 with charts.xls,” [spreadsheet].
- “201511 November 2015 with charts.xls,” [spreadsheet].
- “201512 December 2015 with charts.xls,” [spreadsheet].
- “201601 January 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201602 February 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201603 March 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201604 April 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201605 May 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “201606 June 2016 with charts,” [spreadsheet].
- “0000 2106Federal FY Glass Statistical Summary,” [spreadsheet].
- “BARD Downloads Calendar 2013,” [spreadsheet].

GPLS Newsletters

- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 9, Issue 2, October 2011.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 9, Issue 4, February 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 9, Issue 5, April 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 9, Issue 6, June 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 1, August 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 2, October 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 3, December 2012.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 4, February 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 5, April 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 10, Issue 6, June 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 1, August 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 2, October 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 3, December 2013.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 4, February 2014.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 5, April 2014.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 11, Issue 6, June 2014.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 12, Issue 1, August 2014.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 12, Issue 2, October 2014.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 12, Issue 4, February 2015.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 12, Issue 5, April 2015.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 12, Issue 6, June 2015.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 13, Issue 2, October 2015.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 13, Issue 3, December 2015.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 13, Issue 4, February 2016.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 13, Issue 5, April 2016.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 13, Issue 6, June 2016.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 14, Issue 1, August 2016.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 14, Issue 2, October 2016.
- “Georgia Public Library Service News,” Volume 14, Issue 3, December 2016.

GPLS Structure

- “Georgia Public Library Service Organizational Chart,” September 2016.

IT – Broadband Upgrade & Support – Broadband Consortium Planning

“Beyond Branches: Re-Architecting Georgia’s Public Library Network, Executive Summary and Initial Approach,” [no date].

“GTAG – Get to a Gig – High-Level Approach to Building a Broadband Consortium in GA,” [no date].

“GTAG – Get to a Gig Project Timeline,” [no date].

IT – Broadband Upgrade & Support – Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support

“Barebones Information About E-rate and Libraries,” [no date].

“Broadband Network / Infrastructure for Information Technology,” January 20, 2015.

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: All Systems,” December 18, 2015.

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: Decision Matrix, version 2,” January 15, 2016.

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: Decision Matrix, version 3,” January 28, 2016.

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: E-Rate Action Item List Roadmap,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: E-Rate by System,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: GPLS Carrier,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: GPLS System Addresses,” July 1, 2010.

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: Internet Service Providers,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: ISP Requirements,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: GPLS Carrier,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: Project Roadmap,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: TCO All Systems,” [no date].

“Broadband Statewide Upgrade & Support – Status Reports & Planning Documents: Where We Are, Where We Are Going,” [no date].

“Can the FCC Create Public ‘Super WiFi Networks’?,” [no date].

“COSLA Planning Guide for Library Broadband Connectivity,” October 2014.

“Digital Literacy Fact Sheet,” June 2013.

“Exploiting the Next Generation of Broadband for Your Library for Your Library and Community,” June 1, 2011.

“Exploring the Digital Nation – Computer and Internet Use at Home,” November 8, 2011.

“FCC & ‘Connect to Compete’ Tackle Barriers to Broadband Adoption,” [no date].

“The Future of Libraries,” January 28, 2013.

“Georgia LATA Needs Assessment,” [no date].

“GPLS Internet Localization Project,” [no date].

“GPLS Network Numbers 2011,” [no date].

Individual public library systems, bandwidth usage reports, early 2011 to early 2012, [no date].

“Joint OITP/COL Subcommittee on Telecommunications, ALA Annual Conference 2013,” June 30, 2013.

“Myths About the Digital Divide,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 1. Early Approach Document,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 2. Georgia LATA Needs Assessment,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 3. GPLS Cost Proposal Renewal 2011,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 4. Intranet v Commodity,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 5. Georgia – National Broadband Map,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 6. Zoned Model,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 7. Georgia-CAI,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: 8. Wireless and Traffic Study 2011,” [no date].

“Network – Evolution of Models, 2011-2013: Evolution of Hybrid Network Model,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: Beyond Branches – Early Summary,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: Bridging the Digital Divide,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: Evolution of Hybrid Network Model,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: GPLS Broadband Network Proposal,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: ISP Requirements,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: Network Re-Architecture in Georgia’s Libraries,” [no date].

“Network – Top Level One Sheets: Project Roadmap,” [no date].

“The New Digital Divide,” December 4, 2011.

“NTIA Broadband Adoption Toolkit,” May 2013.

“Opportunity for All: How Library Policies and Practices Impact Public Library Internet Access,” June 2011.

“Policy Revolution! Executive Summary,” June 2013.

“Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study 2009–2010: Executive Summary,” Summer 2010.

“Starting with What’s Missing,” [no date].

“Talking Points and Presentations: Georgia Public Libraries – Impact Stories,” July 12, 2013.

“Talking Points and Presentations: State of the Broadband Network,” February 15, 2012.

“Talking Points and Presentations: State of the Network,” January 2012.

“Talking Points and Presentations: SHLB Webinar,” [no date].

“Talking Points and Presentations: Short Case for Broadband,” [no date].

“U.S. Public Libraries: A Snapshot of Priorities & Perspectives,” 2012.

“U.S. Public Libraries and the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP),” [no date].

IT – Broadband Upgrade & Support – E-Rate Workshops

“E-Rate 2.0: Summary of E-Rate Modernization,” [no date].

“E-Rate Productivity Center (EPC) Applicant User Guide – Getting Started,” June 2015.

“E-Rate Productivity Center (EPC) Applicant User Guide – Managing Users,” June 2015.

“E-Rate Productivity Center (EPC) Applicant User Guide – Navigating EPC,” June 2015.

“E-Rate Productivity Center (EPC) – Update on User Email Addresses,” [no date].

“E-Rate Support FY 2017,” [no date].

“Georgia Technology Authority Proposal,” November 21, 2013.

“Summary: Fall 2013 E-Rate Application Workshops,” [no date].

IT – Outreach & Education – Presentations, Workshops and Staff Days – Directors IT Boot Camp

“Checklist,” [no date].

“LEAD-Certified Technology,” 2015.

“LEAD-Certified Technology: Glossary,” 2015.

“LEAD-Certified Technology: IT Environmental Scan,” 2015.

“LEAD-Certified Technology: Spin Your Own Web,” 2015.

IT – Outreach & Education – Presentations, Workshops and Staff Days – Other

“ALA Annual – Project Management 101,” 2012.

“ARSL: Broadband Planning 101,” [no date].

“Atlanta Emerging Librarians – The Future of Librarianship: A Librarian by Any Other Name,”
April 19, 2014.

“Atlanta-Fulton Public Library System – Tech Trends in Libraries: What Do We Adopt? How Do
We Adapt?” 2016.

“Chattahoochee Valley Libraries: IT Environmental Scan,” November 21, 2013.

“Chrome OS for Libraries,” August 30, 2016.

“Dialogue in the Dark – Bridging the Digital Divide for Blind and Physically Handicapped
Patrons,” September 21-22, 2012.

“GA Network Upgrade,” [no date].

“GPLS IT Overview – New Director Orientation,” April 15, 2014.

“GPLS Network Upgrade,” April 22, 2014.

“LEAP Matrix Wireframe,” April 11, 2016.

“LEAP State and LEAP Advisory Joint Planning Meeting, ALA Midwinter,” January 10, 2016.

“Library E-Rate Assessment and Planning (LEAP) Project: Developing Strategies and Best
Practices to Empower Libraries,” June 27, 2015.

“Loblolly Pines Open Source Talking Book Library: ILS Software for the Present and Next
Generation of NLS Users?” [no date].

“Net Neutrality Breakdown,” July 30, 2014.

“Northeast Georgia Regional Commission: Project Management 101,” [no date].

“PLA: Broadband Planning 101,” [no date].

“Project Management 101,” 2012.

“(Re) Discovering Genealogy in GALILEO,” October 7, 2016.

“Retooling Tech: Screen Sharing & Virtualized Workplaces,” 2013.

“Re-Tooling Tech with Our Head in the Cloud – Google Chrome & Other Cloud Solutions for
Libraries,” October 8, 2015.

“Sequoyah Staff Day: Future of Libraries,” November 11, 2014.

“Showcasing Our Gems: Unique Treasures from Public Libraries,” October 6, 2016.s

“Spring Directors Meeting: IT Updates,” April 2015.

“Talking Points – New Director Orientation,” April 15, 2014.

“Tech Boot Camp Kickoff,” [no date].

“Troup-Harris Regional Library Staff Day,” April 15, 2014

IT – Outreach & Education – Tech Boot Camp

“2013 GPLS Technology Boot Camp Attendees,” April 2013.

“2015 GPLS Technology Boot Camp Attendees,” April 2015.

“Atlanta-Fulton Public Library System Capital Improvement Program,” April 2014.

“Atlanta-Fulton Public Library Wireless Network,” April 2014.

“Boot Camp Agenda 2013,” April 2013.

“Boot Camp Agenda 2014,” April 2014.

“Boot Camp Agenda 2016,” April 2016.

“Boot Camp Bios,” April 2014.

“Boot Camp 2013 Summary,” April 2013.

“Boot Camp 2015 Survey Results,” [no date].

“Boot Camp Roadmap,” April 2013.

“Checklist,” April 2014.

“Checklist – Directors Tech Boot Camp,” [no date].

“Chrome Update,” April 2014.

“Georgia Library Survey Results,” April 2013.

“Get the Edge! Benchmarks, Tools and Training, Georgia Library Technology Boot Camp,” April 25, 2013.

“Google+ Hangouts on Air,” April 2014.

“GPLS Network Upgrade: Update,” April 17, 2014.

“IT Team Meeting,” January 27, 2015.

“Kickstart Your Library! Tech Boot Camp 2014 – Welcome,” April 2014.

“nComputing in Libraries,” [no date].

“nComputing Tuning Cheat Sheet,” [no date].

“New Wireless Access Manager,” [no date].

“Open Source Options: Gateways & Filtering,” April 2014.

“Public Computing Using Virtual Desktops,” [no date].

“Putting It Together: GPS Technology Boot Camp,” April 2016.

“Sample Shopping List,” [no date].

“SIG Sessions,” April 2014.

“Speakers for Boot Camp,” April 2015.

“The State of the Internet,” April 2014.
“Tech Boot Camp Attendees 2013,” April 2013.
“Tech Boot Camp Tech Trends,” April 2016.
“Tell Us What You Know – Talk Topics,” April 2013.
“To Boldly Go: GPLS Technology Boot Camp,” April 23-25, 2013.
“Untangle Wifi Captive Portal Demo,” April 23, 2014.
“URL Filter,” April 21, 2014.
“Wireless Access Manager Reports,” [no date].
“Won’t Get Fooled Again: A Vendor Assessment Primer,” April 2014.
“Wordpress & Web Hosting,” April 2014.

IT – Outreach & Education – Technology Loaner Kits

“iPad Mini’s in the Assistive Technology Tool Kits,” October 29, 2015.
“Loaner Kit Inventory,” [no date].
“Tech Loaner Kit Reservations as of June 13th,” June 13, 2016.
“Tech Loaner Kit Schedule 2015-2016,” [no date].
“Tech Loaner Kit Stats 2016,” [no date].
“Tech Loaner Kit Survey,” November 11, 2015.
“Tech Loaner Kit Survey Responses,” November 18, 2015.
“Tech Loaner Kit Workflow Questions,” [no date].
“Tech Loaner Kits,” [no date].
“Tech Loaner Kits FAQs,” [no date].
“Technology Loaner Kit Use Policy,” [no date].
“TLK Nexus 7,” [no date].
“TLK Nexus 9,” [no date].
“User’s Guide, TrendNet Wireless Internet Camera,” [no date].

IT – Support – Internal & External – GALibTech.org

“Georgia Libraries Tech Center, An Information Clearinghouse for IT Administrators in Georgia’s Public Libraries,” November 18, 2016.

IT – Support – Internal & External – Google Chrome Management

“Chrome Computing in Libraries,” August 13, 2013.
“Chrome Device Setup,” November 18, 2016.

“Chromeboxes Shine in Public Library Pilot Program,” October 2013.

“Cloud Services Matrix,” [no date].

“Georgia Libraries Go Google,” [no date].

“Google Apps, Deployment Strategy Workshop,” April 22, 2011.

“Pilot Project: Georgia’s Rossville Public Library Begins Testing 20 Samsung Chromeboxes,” August 27, 2013.

“Rossville Library Gets 20 Chromebox Machines Free Through State Program,” August 16, 2013.

“Rossville Library Pioneering New Era of Computing for Walker County Patrons,” August 27, 2013.

“Setting Up Digital Signage with a Chromebox,” November 18, 2016.

IT – Support – Internal & External – Google for Work

“GPLS CAAS (Cloud as a Service) w/ Unlimited Storage – Initial Approach Document,” August 12, 2015.

“GPLS CAAS (Cloud as a Service) w/o Unlimited Storage – Initial Approach Document,” August 12, 2015.

“GPLS Gmail Conversion Project Roadmap,” [no date].

“GPLS Google for Work – Approach Document,” November 15, 2016.

Various publicity materials

IT – Support – Internal & External – GPLS Internal Support

“How to Deploy a 3D Printer in Your Library,” [no date].

“IT Environmental Scan,” November 21, 2013.

“IT Help Desk Routing,” [no date].

“IT Org Chart,” [no date].

“IT R&R,” [no date].”

“IT Roadmap,” [no date].

“IT Ticket Response Procedures,” [no date].

“IT Who Does What,” [no date].

IT – Support – Internal & External – MRR Grant Management

“2015 MMR Funds: How Georgia’s Public Libraries Spent Technology Funds in FY2015,” [no date].

“Makerspaces in Georgia’s Libraries,” [no date].

“MRR – Computer Replacement Funds FY’17,” November 18, 2016.

“MRR Technology Replacement Funds - 2/3 by Population, 1/3 by County,” [no date].

“MRR Technology Replacement Funds – FY2015,” [no date].

“MRR Technology Replacement Funds as Recommended by RPLAC – FY2014 Population,” [no date].

“MRR Vendor Menu,” [no date].

“MRR FY17, Intention for Funding,” [no date].

“Proposal for Distribution of Appropriations Funds for Public Access Computing,” [no date].

“Sample Weighted Formula,” [no date].

“Technology Procurement Plan FY ‘15 – MRR Public Computer Replacement Funds,” [no date].

“Technology Procurement Plan FY ‘17 – MRR Public Computer Replacement Funds,” [no date].

LSTA SPR Reports

“Georgia State Program Report Summary,” Fiscal Year 2011.

“Georgia State Program Report Summary,” Fiscal Year 2012.

“Georgia State Program Report Summary,” Fiscal Year 2013.

“Georgia State Program Report Summary,” Fiscal Year 2014.

“Georgia State Program Report Summary,” Fiscal Year 2015.

PINES Consortium Data

“PINES Consortium Data for 2011.”

“PINES Consortium Data for 2012.”

“PINES Consortium Data for 2013.”

“PINES Consortium Data for 2014.”

“PINES Consortium Data for 2015.”

“PINES Consortium Data for 2016.”

PINES Surveys

“PINES Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey 2010.”

“PINES 2012 Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey.”

“PINES 2013 Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey.”

“PINES 2014 Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey.”

“PINES 2015 Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey.”

“PINES 2016 Annual Patron Satisfaction Survey.”

PINES U

“Circulation for Evergreen 2.3 Upgrade,” March 2013 (video).

“GLASS Patron Profile,” November 2014 (video).

“Link the OPAC to Library Web Sites,” February 2014 (video).

List of PINES Video Tutorials.

“NoveList Select in the PINES Catalog,” May 2014 (video).

“OPAC for Evergreen 2.3 Upgrade,” March 2013 (video).

“PINES Address Alerts,” February 2014 (video).

“PINES Multi-Part Functionality,” March 2015 (video).

“PINES Patron Self-Registration Video,” August 2014 (video).

“PINES Standalone Procedures,” January 2014 (video).

“PINES U. Notes from Meeting with TM and DD,” October 2016.

“PINES Upgrade 2.5 - New Features,” January 2014 (video).

“PINES Upgrade 2015: Info for Library Staff,” January 2015 (video).

“PINES Upgrade 2015: Info for PINES Patrons,” January 2015 (video).

“PINES Upgrade 2016 - version 2.9,” January 2016 (video).

“PINES Upgrade 2016: New Patron Features,” January 2016.

Professional Library

“Georgia Public Library Service Professional Collection,” November 2016 [spreadsheet].

Resource Sharing

“GOLD ILL Stats,” 2012 – 2016 [spreadsheet].

“OCLC Connexion Stats,” July 2015 – June 2016 [spreadsheet].

“OCLC Services RDA Toolkit GOLD Summary.”

“Public Library Group Monthly Z39.50 Cataloging Usage,” July 2015 – June 2016 [spreadsheet].

“Public Library ILL Stats,” 2012 – 2016 [spreadsheet].

“Resource Sharing 2015 LSTA Report,” October 2015.

“WebDewey Summary Report,” July 2015 – June 2016 [spreadsheet].

“Z3950 CAT Usage,” July 2015 – June 2016 [spreadsheet].

Strategic Partnerships – 529 Plan

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – Braves

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – Carlos Museum

“Michael C. Carlos Museum Family Pass: Frequently Asked Questions,” [no date].

“Michael C. Carlos Museum Partners with Georgia’s Public Libraries,” September 27, 2016.

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – GA National Fair

“Georgia National Fair Press Release,” [no date].

“Read more about agriculture at your Georgia public library!,” [no date].

Strategic Partnerships – Go Fish

“Read more about fish and fishing at your Georgia public library!,” [no date].

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – Hawks

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – Kill-a-Watt

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – National Park Service

“GPLS, National Park Service Partnership Press Conference,” April 26, 2016.

“United States National Park Service, Suggested Georgia Reading List,” [no date].

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – ParkPass

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – PuppetryArts

Various materials

Strategic Partnerships – Zoo Atlanta

“Zoo Atlanta Family Pass, Frequently Asked Questions for Library Patrons,” September 15, 2015.

“Zoo Atlanta Family Pass, Frequently Asked Questions for Library Staff,” September 15, 2015.

Various materials

Youth Services

“EBB PRIME TIME Program Report for FY12.”

“EBB Youth Services Program Report for FY12.”

“PRIME TIME Final [Survey] Report [for FY12].”

“Program Report: Clifford the Big Red Dog’s Tour de Georgia,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Athens Regional Library System/Central Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Atlanta-Fulton Public Library – Mechanicsville Branch,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Athens-Clarke County Library, part of the Athens Regional Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Brooks County Public Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Chamblee Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library/Chamblee Branch,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Elbert County Public Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Fitzgerald-Ben Hill County Library System,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Lilburn Branch of the Gwinnett County Public Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library –

Norcross Branch, part of the Gwinnett County Public Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – DeKalb County Public Library – Roddenbery Memorial Library,” October 2013.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Fitzgerald-Ben Hill County Library System,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Gwinnett County Public Library/Lilburn Branch,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Gwinnett County Public Library/Norcross Branch,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time— Marshes of Glynn Libraries/Central Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Mechanicsville Library/Atlanta-Fulton Public Library System,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Roddenbery Memorial Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Three Rivers Regional Library/Charlton County Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Three River Regional Library/Wayne County Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Tifton-Tift County Library/Coastal Plain Regional Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time – Troup Harris Regional Library System/LaGrange Memorial Library,” October 2014.

“Program Report: Summer Reading,” October 2014.

“Program Report: Youth Services,” October 2014.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Athens – Fall 2014,” October 2015.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Athens – Spring 2015,” October 2015.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Atlanta/Mechanicsville – Fall 2014,” October 2015.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Chattahoochee Valley Libraries/Mildred Terry Branch – Spring 2015,” October 2015.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Chattahoochee Valley Libraries/South Columbus Branch – Fall 2014,” October 2015.

“Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME DeKalb County Public Library/Chamblee – Fall 2014,” October 2015.

- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Family Reading Time,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Fitzgerald – Spring 2015,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Marshes of Glynn Libraries/Brunswick-Glynn Cty – Fall 2014,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Roddenbery – Spring 2015,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: Summer Reading,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Three Rivers/Charlton Cty – Spring 2015,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: PRIME TIME Three Rivers/Wayne Cty – Spring 2015,” October 2015.
- “Project and Activity Report: Youth Services – General,” October 2015.

Appendix D
Survey of Library Staff

GPLS LSTA Evaluation 2016
Survey of Library Staff

1. In which area of the library do you work? Please select the area where you spend most of your time.

- Administration
- Technical Services
- Circulation
- Reference
- Children's & Youth Services
- Technology Services
- Other, please specify:

2. Are you familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project, which provides a comprehensive array of services for children's and teen services practitioners in Georgia, including continuing education?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 8. If yes, ask questions 3 - 7.)

3. How important is the GPLS Youth Services Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

4. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Youth Services Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

5. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve the library workforce	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve users' ability to participate in their community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Youth Services Project?

8. Are you familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project, an annual project that brings children and families into local public libraries for reading and activities?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 14. If yes, ask questions 9 - 13.)

9. How important is the GPLS Summer Reading Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

10. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Summer Reading Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

11. To what extent did the GPLS Summer Reading Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. To what extent did the GPLS Summer Reading Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to participate in their community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Summer Reading Project?

14. Are you familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project, which helps economically and educationally vulnerable families with children ages 6 to 10 bond around the act of reading and talking about books?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 20. If yes, ask questions 15 - 19.)

15. How important is the GPLS Prime Time Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

16. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Prime Time Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

17. To what extent did the GPLS Prime Time Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. To what extent did the GPLS Prime Time Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Prime Time Project?

20. Are you familiar with the GPLS Communications Project, which enhances GPLS's Internet and social media presence, hosts Websites for some public libraries, issues press releases, and distributes information about GPLS and its programs?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 26. If yes, ask questions 21 - 25.)

21. How important is the GPLS Communications Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

22. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Communications Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

23. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to discover information resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

25. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Communications Project?

26. Are you familiar with GPLS GLASS, Georgia's talking book and braille library, which serves those in Georgia who are vision impaired, physically impaired, or with a reading disability such that they are unable to read standard print?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 32. If yes, ask questions 27 - 31.)

27. How important is the GPLS GLASS Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

28. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS GLASS Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

29. To what extent did the GPLS GLASS Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. To what extent did the GPLS GLASS Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to discover information resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS GLASS Project?

32. Did you participate in the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project, which provided public libraries in Georgia local broadband network management, CIPA filtering support and E-rate application services through 2013?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 38. If yes, ask questions 33 - 37.)

33. How important was the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

34. How satisfied was your library with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

35. To what extent did the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

36. To what extent did the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

37. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?

38. Are you familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project, which includes GALILEO, GOLD, OCLC service contracts, and access to the RDA Toolkit for public libraries?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 44. If yes, ask questions 39 - 43.)

39. How important is the GPLS Resource Sharing Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

40. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

41. To what extent did the GPLS Resource Sharing Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

42. To what extent did the GPLS Resource Sharing Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

43. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?

44. Are you familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project, which makes current and retrospective resources on library science and related fields available to library staff and trustees and to the general public throughout Georgia?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 50. If yes, ask questions 45 - 49.)

45. How important is the GPLS Professional Library Services Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

46. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

47. To what extent did the GPLS Professional Library Services Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

48. To what extent did the GPLS Professional Library Services Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve the library workforce	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

49. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Professional Library Services Project?

50. Are you familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project, which develops and implements a coordinated program of statewide strategic partnerships with businesses and organizations to provide free materials and programming for public libraries, including the ParkPass loan program, the Kill-a-Watt loan program, the Zoo Atlanta Family Pass program, the Go Fish Education Center Pass program, and others?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 56. If yes, ask questions 51 - 55.)

51. How important is the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

52. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

53. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

54. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users’ ability to participate in their community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

55. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?

56. Are you familiar with the GPLS PINES Project (Public Information Network for Electronic Services), which provides a public library automation and lending network, EBSCO/Novelist Select, courier services, and the Linked Data Project for 285 libraries in Georgia?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 62. If yes, ask questions 57 - 61.)

57. How important is the GPLS PINES Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

58. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS PINES Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

59. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

60. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' ability to discover information resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

61. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS PINES Project?

62. Are you familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project, which provides a technology boot camp to bring together an IT representative from each of Georgia's 63 library systems for sharing and collaboration?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 68. If yes, ask questions 63 - 67.)

63. How important is the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

64. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

65. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

66. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve library operations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

67. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project?

68. Are you familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project, which provides information technology services for GPLS and for all public libraries throughout Georgia, including a staffed help desk, risk assessment, technology loaner kits, MR&R grant management, GALibTech.org, cloud computing, Chromebooks, e-rate reimbursement reconciliation, and statewide email support?

Yes No

(If No, skip page 13, to question 74. If yes, ask questions 69 - 73.)

69. How important is the GPLS IT Services Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

70. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS IT Services Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

71. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

72. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

73. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS IT Services Project?

74. Are you familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects, which provide funding to public library systems in Georgia to enhance their materials and services by providing access to STEM and STEAM books, supplies, computers, software, and robotic equipment?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 80. If yes, ask questions 75 - 79.)

75. How important are the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

76. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

77. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

78. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select "No Opinion.")

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve users' general knowledge and skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

79. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?

80. Are you familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project, which collects, analyzes, and publishes data for Georgia’s public libraries?

Yes No

(If No, skip to question 86. If yes, ask questions 81 - 85.)

81. How important is the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project to your library?

Very Important Important Somewhat Important Not Important Not Applicable

82. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project?

Very Satisfied Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Not Satisfied Not Applicable

83. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project meet the following goals from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Providing and encouraging visionary leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ensuring equal access to information and technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

84. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project address the following IMLS priorities? (If you do not know, select “No Opinion.”)

	Achieved	Partly Achieved	Not Achieved	No Opinion
Improve library operations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

85. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project?

86. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS’s use of LSTA funds over the past five years?

87. What needs or programs would you like to see the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan address?

Appendix E

Results of the Survey of Library Staff

During the first three weeks of January 2017, the Georgia Public Library Service conducted a survey of public library staff members in Georgia to help evaluate the use of LSTA funds in Georgia. A total of 354 individuals responded to the online survey, which was hosted on Survey Monkey. (This total represents 13 per cent of the public library employees in the state of Georgia, a very good response rate.)

The survey first asked respondents to indicate which areas of the library they work in, and the responses can be seen in Tables E-1 and E-2.

As Table E-1 shows, the largest number of respondents worked in Circulation (27 per cent) and Administration (27 per cent). In fact, over half of the respondents indicated that they worked in one of those two areas.

Table E-1. Area of Work for Respondents
In which area of the library do you work?

Circulation	97	27%
Administration	94	27%
Children's & Youth Services	56	16%
Reference	38	11%
Other (please specify)	34	10%
Technical Services	22	6%
Technology Services	13	4%
<i>Total</i>	<i>354</i>	

Table E-2 shows the responses given by respondents who selected the “Other” category on the survey. Most answers reflect the fact that many of the respondents work in multiple areas. As one respondent noted, “I wear many hats for an equal amount of time.”

Table E-2. Area of Work for Respondents
Other responses

Administration and Reference
Adult services/circulation/tech - I wear many hats for an equal amount of time
All of the above. Our employees are crossed-trained for most jobs.
Branch
Branch Manager
Branch Services (All from administration to Reference to programming for all ages)

Table E-2. Area of Work for Respondents
 Other responses
 (Continued)

Children's & Youth Services and Circulation
customer service
eResources
Friends
Genealogy and Local History
Genealogy Department.
Genealogy, History and Archives
Genealogy/Reference
General library services
I am a library assistant, and I mostly do circulation and technology services.
I work in a smaller, rural library, so I do some of everything - mainly circulation, shelving, reference, children, youth, and adult services, as well as assistance with computers, etc.
I work in all these capacities as Media Specialist of an elementary school
I work in my library's Reference Department, but I am also responsible for planning library programming for teens.
Library Associate
Local history and Genealogy Room
Management and public programming for children and adults.
Manager
Media Specialist at a public school
programing & marketing
Some of all of the above as I work in a small library.
Staff Training
Talking Books
Talking Books
Talking Books
Teaching ELA standard based lessons.
Technology, reference, circulation, YA
We have a one desk model - so Reference and Circulation.
Youth and Media Services

GPLS Youth Services Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project. Those who indicated a familiarity with the project were then asked further questions about that project. As Table E-3 shows, just under half of the respondents (45 per cent) were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project.

Table E-3. Are you familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project?

Yes	158	45%
No	196	55%

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As Table E-4 indicates, half of the 101 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Youth Services Project as very important to their libraries. Another 29 per cent rated the project as important, and only 7 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-4. How important is the GPLS Youth Services Project to your library?

Very important	50	50%
Important	29	29%
Somewhat important	15	15%
Not important	7	7%
Not applicable	3	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. Table E-5 shows that less than one fourth (23 per cent) of the 94 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) felt that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Youth Services Project. (This represents the lowest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 55 per cent felt that they were satisfied with the project, and only 4 per cent said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-5. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Youth Services Project?

Very satisfied	22	23%
Satisfied	52	55%
Somewhat satisfied	16	17%
Not satisfied	4	4%
Not applicable	9	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As can be seen in Table E-6, 61 per cent of the 57 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 39 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and none of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-6. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning?

Achieved	35	61%
Partly Achieved	22	39%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	45	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving the library workforce. As Table E-7 shows, just over half (51 per cent) of the 49 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 37 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while 12 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-7. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve the library workforce?

Achieved	25	51%
Partly Achieved	18	37%
Not Achieved	6	12%
No Opinion	52	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills. As Table E-8 on the following page indicates, over half (54 per cent) of the 52 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 40 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 6 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-8. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills?

Achieved	28	54%
Partly Achieved	21	40%
Not Achieved	3	6%
No Opinion	49	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users' ability to participate in their community. As shown in Table E-9, just over half (51 per cent) of the 53 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "No Opinion") indicated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 45 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 4 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-9. To what extent did the GPLS Youth Services Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to participate in their community?

Achieved	27	51%
Partly Achieved	24	45%
Not Achieved	2	4%
No Opinion	48	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Youth Services Project were asked to provide further comments about the GPLS Youth Services Project, and nine respondents did provide useful comments. These are shown in Table E-10 and include both positive remarks ("This department is extremely helpful to the local libraries") and more critical remarks ("Too much \$ spent on equipment for programs that did not reach over 15 people").

Table E-10. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Youth Services Project?

Expand PRIME TIME! Bring on PTPS! Add more cohorts.

I am a new face within my local library staff and know little about the GPLS Youth Services Project but not for long. In the future, I will have some ideas that I would like to share if it would mean helping to improve the project a little further.

Table E-10. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Youth Services Project?
(Continued)

I am aware that GPLS provides education and training for YS staff, however, I did not know that it was part of a project. It makes me want to learn more!
I think there needs to be a more comprehensive state-wide event, similar to what we used to do with CSAC and the Teen Services Conference. The training provided is excellent, but so limited in scope that it only addresses very specific issues when it is held.
I would like to see more training hosted below Macon. For example, the 3-d printer training back in the Fall was in Conyers only.
School taxes should be used for school libraries. Adults are being taxed to support adult public library services which are being cut completely or dumbed down in order to shift funds to publicity children's programming that duplicates what good children's librarians were already doing better than the glam programs. Admin staff salaries for statewide "youth services" are a drain on funds that could be going to the already existing avenues and staff that are underfunded and hard pressed to keep up their already excellent service.
The Children's Services Conference that used to be held once a year is brought up many times as something that our Youth Services staff members miss.
This department is extremely helpful to the local libraries. It provides an education base for the children's library staff, which is not affordable through local budgets. Many opportunities are open to staff who want to learn more about their jobs and the patrons that they serve.
Too much \$ spent on equipment for programs that did not reach over 15 people.

GPLS Summer Reading Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project. Those who indicated a familiarity with the project were then asked further questions about that project. As Table E-11 shows, almost all of the respondents (91 per cent) were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project. This (along with GLASS) represents the highest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-11. Are you familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project?

Yes	269	91%
No	27	9%

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As indicated in Table E-12, 87 per cent of the 243

respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Summer Reading Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the highest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 12 per cent rated the project as important, and only 1 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-12. How important is the GPLS Summer Reading Project to your library?

Very important	211	87%
Important	29	12%
Somewhat important	3	1%
Not important	0	0%
Not applicable	2	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. Table E-13 indicates that just under half (48 per cent) of the 234 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) stated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Summer Reading Project. Another 42 per cent felt that they were satisfied with the project, and 9 per cent indicated that they were not satisfied.

Table E-13. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Summer Reading Project?

Very satisfied	113	48%
Satisfied	99	42%
Somewhat satisfied	20	9%
Not satisfied	2	1%
Not applicable	7	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-14, where 73 per cent of the 160 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 26 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 1 per cent of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-14. To what extent did the GPLS Summer Reading Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning?

Achieved	117	73%
Partly Achieved	41	26%
Not Achieved	2	1%
No Opinion	81	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users' ability to participate in their community. Table E-15 shows that 60 per cent of the 129 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "No Opinion") felt that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 36 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, and 5 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-15. To what extent did the GPLS Summer Reading Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to participate in their community?

Achieved	77	60%
Partly Achieved	46	36%
Not Achieved	6	5%
No Opinion	112	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Summer Reading Project were asked to provide further comments about the project, and 28 respondents did provide useful comments. These are shown in Table E-16. Several respondents were positive about the project, calling it "great fun," recognizing that "any summer reading program is vital to all children," and praising the staff for doing "an excellent job in this area." Others made specific recommendations for changes in the program, including encouraging "youth and children to get involved in community or literacy [and not] simply striving to entertain them and not focusing on education or enrichment," getting "more input as to what the subject for the program should be," and having "better prizes and events to get them excited to participate in summer reading."

Table E-16. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Summer Reading Project?

Elaine/GPLS does an excellent job in this area. We appreciate the tools and training provided.

Get more input as to what the subject for the program should be

Table E-16. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Summer Reading Project?
(Continued)

<p>GPLS does a great job of promoting the Summer Reading Project. However, getting people (children and adults) to participate in the program has become more difficult.</p>
<p>GPLS Summer Reading Project is always great fun. I marvel at the creativity of the staff to decorate and come up with programs, and I like seeing children read.</p>
<p>I only just started my position in October of 2016. I look forward to learning more.</p>
<p>I think more should be done to encourage youth and children to get involved in community or literacy. At the moment, I feel like we are simply striving to entertain them and not focusing on education or enrichment.</p>
<p>I'm not sure what we would do without this program!</p>
<p>I'm too low on the food chain to comment.</p>
<p>As a former teacher, I firmly believe any summer reading program is vital to all children.</p>
<p>In my experience, my library needs more funding to make this a fully realized success. Right now, we have people coming in but we could do so much more for them.</p>
<p>It is a highly anticipated activity in our community!</p>
<p>It is well promoted in our library system and we have good participation beyond our regular patrons.</p>
<p>It would be nice to see the programming grants back. That allowed many libraries to afford a better quality of performer for the youth.</p>
<p>More outdoor community contact needed by managers and library representatives to encourage/bring the community into the library. First-time users of the library still do not know the additional benefits/programs offered.</p>
<p>My local public library conducts the Summer Reading Project every summer and I think it is great. I do not because I am at an elementary school and we are closed during the summer.</p>
<p>Patrons want us to have better prizes and events to get them excited to participate in summer reading. Summer reading incentives and events have been slowly becoming worse and worse.</p>
<p>See above. Summer reading programs have been a function of children's library services since early in the 20th century. The "official" programs divert funds and stifle local excellence, shifting planning and design to statewide bureaucracies.</p>

Table E-16. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Summer Reading Project?
(Continued)

<p>Summer Reading needs to be re-evaluated. In concept, it is wonderful, in practice, it doesn't reach the mark. As a parent, I hate summer reading, there is too much pressure. My children always hated it too...it was too much like school. It didn't promote the love of reading. It made my kids feel like they HAD to read. It doesn't create or facilitate the love of reading.</p>
<p>The artwork the past few years has been a little scary.</p>
<p>The group that puts together each year's theme does an awesome job!</p>
<p>The program is very nice and lots of ideas are included, however staffing levels and materials budgets limit ability of local libraries to take full advantage of all these materials.</p>
<p>The services and projects supplied to the local libraries is beyond what we could afford to provide in the local budget. Being part of the Coalition gives the libraries professional artwork and program ideas to pull off a great program. SRP is a major part of library programming throughout the year and a major investment from the community. In these rural libraries, we do not have the community services and recreational programs that larger communities have available. SRP is one of the only recreational opportunities here and the LSTA program funding is a major part of its success.</p>
<p>The themes chosen are neither engaging nor informative. And the promotional materials are poorly designed and lack variety. The longer I work at a public library, the more I appreciate subscription libraries that are not affiliated with the state at all and all their convoluted ideas and initiatives.</p>
<p>We offer a lot, but it's up to parents and caretakers to take advantage of what we offer. Children can't get to the library on their own--they have to have transportation, supervision and parents have to be motivated to help children succeed.</p>
<p>When I was assisting patrons, I know the parents and the kids look forward to the Summer Reading Project every year.</p>
<p>Would like more in-branch activities.</p>
<p>Would like to see more Teen incentives</p>
<p>Yes, I'd like to see libraries and schools work more together about the Summer Reading Lists. Often we do not have the nonfiction titles until the following year.</p>

GPLS Prime Time Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project. Those who indicated a familiarity with the project were then asked further questions about that project. Table E-17 shows that just over one third of the respondents (35

per cent) were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project. This represents the second lowest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-17. Are you familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project?

Yes	93	35%
No	176	65%

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As Table E-18 indicates, 45 per cent of the 67 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Prime Time Project as very important to their libraries. Another 27 per cent rated the project as important, and 10 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-18. How important is the GPLS Prime Time Project to your library?

Very important	30	45%
Important	18	27%
Somewhat important	12	18%
Not important	7	10%
Not applicable	22	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. The results can be seen in Table E-19, where just over one third (34 per cent) of the 64 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) stated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Prime Time Project. Another 48 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and 5 per cent indicated that they were not satisfied.

Table E-19. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Prime Time Project?

Very satisfied	22	34%
Satisfied	31	48%
Somewhat satisfied	8	13%
Not satisfied	3	5%
Not applicable	25	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-20, where 71 per cent of the 51 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 25 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 4 per cent of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-20. To what extent did the GPLS Prime Time Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning?

Achieved	36	71%
Partly Achieved	13	25%
Not Achieved	2	4%
No Opinion	41	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills. Table E-21 shows that 72 per cent of the 53 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved the goal of addressing this priority. Another 25 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, and only 4 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-21. To what extent did the GPLS Prime Time Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills?

Achieved	38	72%
Partly Achieved	13	25%
Not Achieved	2	4%
No Opinion	39	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Prime Time Project were asked to provide further comments about the project, and 11 respondents did provide useful comments. These are shown in Table E-22. While some respondents had good things to say about Prime Time (“Please don’t ever stop this program” and “This is an important project that has positive impacts in our community”), several individuals questioned whether the time involved was worth the results. Typical was this comment: “The time commitment (huge) did not seem to equal the results of the program. The families wanted their free meal and books, and it’s all they seemed to care about.”

Table E-22. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Prime Time Project?

I didn't work on it directly. It seems like a worthy idea, but the implementation seemed rough on the librarians involved.
I wish we could participate with Prime Time each year. We simply have a hard time getting commitment to attend from the family participants. Those that are committed the time to attend really enjoyed it the years we conducted the program.

Table E-22. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Prime Time Project?
(Continued)

More more more
Our director is just going to training so we have not implemented yet.
Please don't ever stop this program. PRIME TIME does not hit a large audience, like Summer Reading, but is hands down the best program my libraries offer to promote the importance of literacy in the home. The parents that participate are not usual/habitual library users, and come from low income households. After participating in PRIME TIME, I have seen a dramatic increase in library usage from the parents. They are coming in for programs, checking out books, and their children are reaping the benefit. This program works - and we've got stats to prove it.
The GPLS Prime Time Project has been implemented at another branch in my system, but I have no involvement with it.
The time commitment (huge) did not come close to meeting the planned results. Most families came for their free meals and free books, and didn't really care about the rest. Also, the books were books familiar to the children, so that didn't help keep their interest either.
The time commitment (huge) did not seem to equal the results of the program. The families wanted their free meal and books, and it's all they seemed to care about.
This is an important project that has positive impacts in our community. I would like to see it grow.
This is the most talked about program in our community--Please keep it going!
We have heard very good reports from families who have attended the Prime Time projects. The parents are taught how to read to their children and encouraged to make family reading an integral part of their lives. Families who have attended this program have returned to the library as regular users.

GPLS Communications Project

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Communications Project. Those who indicated a familiarity with the project were then asked further questions about that project. As Table E-23 indicates, just under one third of the respondents (32 per cent) reported being familiar with the GPLS Communications Project. This represents the lowest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-23. Are you familiar with the GPLS Communications Project?

Yes	86	32%
No	180	68%

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Communications Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As indicated in Table E-24, 44 per cent of the 75 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Communications Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the third lowest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 37 per cent rated the project as important, and only 3 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-24. How important is the GPLS Communications Project to your library?

Very important	33	44%
Important	28	37%
Somewhat important	12	16%
Not important	2	3%
Not applicable	4	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Communications Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. The results can be seen in Table E-25, where just over one third (34 per cent) of the 70 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) stated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Communications Project. (This represents the third lowest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 47 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and only 1 per cent indicated that they were not satisfied.

Table E-25. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Communications Project?

Very satisfied	24	34%
Satisfied	33	47%
Somewhat satisfied	12	17%
Not satisfied	1	1%
Not applicable	7	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Communications Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results can be seen in Table E-26, where 59 per cent of the 49 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 19 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 1 per cent of the

respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-26. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	29	59%
Partly Achieved	19	19%
Not Achieved	1	1%
No Opinion	30	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Communications Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-27 shows that two thirds (67 per cent) of the 57 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 28 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 3 per cent of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-27. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning?

Achieved	38	67%
Partly Achieved	16	28%
Not Achieved	3	3%
No Opinion	22	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Communications Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As shown in Table E-28, 63 per cent of the 56 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 32 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 3 per cent of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-28. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	35	63%
Partly Achieved	18	32%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	23	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Communications Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users' ability to discover information resources. As Table E-29 shows, 57 per cent of the 54 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "No Opinion") indicated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing this priority. Another 37 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, and 6 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-29. To what extent did the GPLS Communications Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to discover information resources?

Achieved	31	57%
Partly Achieved	20	37%
Not Achieved	3	6%
No Opinion	24	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Communications Project to provide further comments about the project, and nine respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-30 and include positive remarks ("I am so thankful that GPLS provides this service for my library system and does it so well") as well as concerns that local staff do not have the time to properly implement the program ("I want to do more with this program but just don't have the time") and concerns about the Website ("really needs some work").

Table E-30. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Communications Project?

I am so thankful that GPLS provides this service for my library system and does it so well!
I think the website really needs some work.
I want to do more with this program but just don't have the time.
Just keep in mind that we all don't have full time technology staff.

Table E-30. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Communications Project?
(Continued)

Maybe handouts or brochures directed to library staff or materials provided to line staff would help all these efforts. If the communications project means user aids for GALILEO, then there have been good materials produced but I think that Intro to GALILEO programming on GPLS or Librarian led programs on "information literacy" on GPLS would help users more and direct them to libraries for one on one assistance.
The information that we receive from GPLS allows the local library staff to have access to information that we would not ordinarily have available. It's created a team environment for all the library directors and staff to work together to improve our services statewide. I think that this project as made Georgia one of the most connected staff in the country.
The proper role of the GPLS state staffing is to expand information access. This is a good program.
We couldn't afford to host our own website without this service.
Zoo program is great, and popular, but unnecessarily complex.
Would love more emphasis on GALILEO

GPLS GLASS Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project. Those who reported being familiar with the project were then asked further questions about the GLASS Project. As Table E-31 indicates, a large percentage of the respondents (91 per cent) reported being familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project. This (along with Summer Reading) represents the highest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-31. Are you familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project?

Yes	237	91%
No	24	9%

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project how important the project is to their libraries. As shown in Table E-32, 32 per cent of the 220 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "Not applicable") rated the GPLS GLASS Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the lowest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 33 per cent rated the project as important, and 6 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-32. How important is the GPLS GLASS Project to your library?

Very important	71	32%
Important	72	33%
Somewhat important	64	29%
Not important	13	6%
Not applicable	13	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project to indicate how satisfied they were with the project. Table E-33 shows that 39 per cent of the 204 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS GLASS Project. Another 48 per cent stated that they were satisfied with the project, and only 2 per cent of the respondents said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-33. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS GLASS Project?

Very satisfied	79	39%
Satisfied	98	48%
Somewhat satisfied	23	11%
Not satisfied	4	2%
Not applicable	27	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results can be seen in Table E-34, where 65 per cent of the 129 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 34 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 1 per cent of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-34. To what extent did the GPLS GLASS Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	84	65%
Partly Achieved	44	34%
Not Achieved	1	1%
No Opinion	105	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users’ ability to discover information resources. Table E-35 shows that 62 per cent of the 121 respondents who

expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing this priority. Another 36 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 2 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-35. To what extent did the GPLS GLASS Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users’ ability to discover information resources?

Achieved	75	62%
Partly Achieved	44	36%
Not Achieved	2	2%
No Opinion	113	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS GLASS Project to provide further comments about the project, and 24 respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-36. Several respondents made positive comments about the GLASS Project (“GLASS is fabulous” and “brings so much enjoyment to patrons who do not have an independent lifestyle”), while others had suggestions for improving the project (“I think that some of the regulations on eligibility are too strict” and “I think that the GLASS project should be more integrative into ways of use”).

Table E-36. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS GLASS Project?

Better education on what the Glass project provides to public libraries at the staff level to help us help our patrons.
Bookshare was a great addition to GLASS offerings.
GLASS is fabulous. Getting patrons to enroll in and use GLASS is a problem. I don't understand why patrons we tell about GLASS are not excited about it. Maybe we need advertisements on state-wide radio and TV to get caretakers on board. most of the time, it's the caretakers who come to the library, and they tell us, "Oh, he/she would never go for that."
Great service for so many.
I am thankful that all of my staff have been trained by Pat Herndon. They feel confident and comfortable speaking to our patrons about this program.
I do not feel qualified to speak for "my library" (question #13), only myself. For myself, I think GLASS is an excellent program underused as most library staff/library patrons are only vaguely aware of it at best.
I have recommended GLASS to some of our patrons, and each one has come back and commented on how helpful and fast this service is. It brings so much joy to people to know they can continue enjoying reading material.

Table E-36. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS GLASS Project?
(Continued)

I know that librarians in my library system have referred patrons to the GPLS GLASS Project, but I do not know anything else about it.
I loved receiving the hearing and visually impaired resources for our libraries. They have made a large difference with our patrons. And quite honestly, we would not have known about the MagniLink Voice or the other low-vision aids if we did not receive them for our library system. I attended the GLASS conference in March 2016 and learned so much. It was a very valuable conference for me.
I think that some of the regulations on eligibility are too strict. I think that it should be more open to people who have a hard time seeing and not as restrictive. I have had patrons who have difficulty seeing, but are not by the definition of the doctors release eligible.
I think that this program helps its patrons to participate in reading for recreation and education and brings so much enjoyment to patrons who do not have an independent lifestyle.
I would like the resources to be given to each library. Often I look for a handout and cannot find one. I bring the handouts back from Staff Development Day classes.
I think that the GLASS project should be more integrative into ways of use. For example, there should be lessons plans included for the schools. Augusta Glass is doing an Audio Book Club series at Senior Centers and a Sensory Book Club for pre-schools. I have also seen where Personal Care Homes who are registered with the program uses the Talking Book Machines for Bible Study and morning devotionals. It is this type of programming that will allow the talking books programs to transcend the stereotype of people sitting there listening as if they are waiting to die.
I've been able to promote it maybe twice in three years. It's not a service our community has asked for.
It has never been used since I have been an employee at the library: 08-01-2007
It is a shame that GLASS had to limit users to statewide services. Regional services were more personal and many former library users really like seeing and speaking with their personal librarian. Unfortunately, the funding powers that be do not, at present, care about the differently abled of our society and providing equal life enhancing services to them.
It is disturbing that the GLASS project in our library has priority over any other department to the point where the library's primary outreach vehicle is no longer available to any other department for their programming and outreach needs.
Love GLASS. We have been promoting it quite heavily at our libraries. Love your Outreach Librarian, Stephanie. She's been very informative on the project.
More advertising in the libraries.

Table E-36. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS GLASS Project?
(Continued)

Several local residents have made use of the services.
Teachers seemed excited during demonstrations for visually impaired students. Less interest by adults in the library.
There are still many people in our community and the surrounding communities that do not know that this resource is available to them. It should be the goal of GPLS to spend some time marketing these services to those who could use them. Possibly getting advertisement into doctor's offices so that potential users have the information at the point of contact with the need.
We do not get many patrons in the library for whom GLASS is appropriate, but it is nice to be able to recommend it to those for whom it is appropriate.
We have received GLASS tools but I do not believe we have had any patrons that need the service.

GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project. Those who reported being familiar with the project were then asked further questions about the project. As Table E-37 shows, 38 per cent were familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project.

Table E-37. Are you familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?

Yes	95	38%
No	157	62%

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. The results are shown in Table E-38, where 85 per cent of the 84 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the second highest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 14 per cent rated the project as important, and none of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-38. How important is the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project to your library?

Very important	71	85%
Important	12	14%
Somewhat important	1	1%
Not important	0	0%
Not applicable	5	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As shown in Table E-39, 56 per cent of the 80 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project. (This represents the second highest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 40 per cent indicated that they were satisfied with the project, and none of the respondents said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-39. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?

Very satisfied	45	56%
Satisfied	32	40%
Somewhat satisfied	3	4%
Not satisfied	0	0%
Not applicable	8	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-40 indicates, 85 per cent of the 59 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) believed that the project had achieved this goal. Another 15 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and none of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-40. To what extent did the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	50	85%
Partly Achieved	9	15%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	32	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving the library’s physical and technological infrastructure. The results are shown in Table E-41 shows and indicate that 84 per cent of the 58 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 16 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while none of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-41. To what extent did the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure?

Achieved	49	84%
Partly Achieved	9	16%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	33	

The survey asked respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project to provide further comments about the project, and 13 respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-42 and include positive remarks (“Every year GPLS gets better and better at assisting us with this very stressful element of providing technology and its infrastructure affordably”) as well as several responses that indicated a desire to see aspects of the project reinstated (“I wish that the Statewide Network Management would return”).

Table E-42. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?

Every year GPLS gets better and better at assisting us with this very stressful element of providing technology and its infrastructure affordably.
Handled by library admin.
I am thankful for the opportunity to do our own networks. The trade-off has been wonderful in that we now have a fiber connection. Before we did that, our speed was so slow that the Chrome boxes took forever to print or refused to print at all. Our patrons and staff are much happier.
I believe we participated in this project, however, the ins and outs were handled by our IT department and it was right when I first started working in Georgia.

Table E-42. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project?
(Continued)

I was not personally involved in 2013 and prior. The above ratings are from staff here that were involved.
I can say that I really appreciate the e-Rate support provided through a full-time dedicated person just this year. It has been immensely helpful.
I wish that the Statewide Network Management would return.
I would like to see the GPLS Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support Project reinstated.
Is filtering services still offered?
Looking forward to GPLS taking that process back. It is a HUGE drain on staff time.
Please Hurry!
Take over erate, please!
The telecommunication support will be missed.
We depend so much on the help of GPLS staff for these services. We took a major hit during the time of restructuring the staff and project at GPLS because the local libraries were not prepared for the change. GPLS creates the services so seamless, that many of the libraries did not understand the benefits that they were getting from GPLS. Once the local libraries had to do some of these services on their own, I think they began to appreciate the work at the state library more.

GPLS Resource Sharing Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project. Those who reported being familiar with the project were then asked further questions about the project. As shown in Table E-43, three fourths of the respondents (75 per cent) reported being familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project.

Table E-43. Are you familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?

Yes	184	75%
No	63	26%

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As Table E-44 indicates, 61 per cent of the 173 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS

Resource Sharing Project as very important to their libraries. Another 31 per cent rated the project as important, and only 2 per cent of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-44. How important is the GPLS Resource Sharing Project to your library?

Very important	105	61%
Important	54	31%
Somewhat important	11	6%
Not important	3	2%
Not applicable	5	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As can be seen in Table E-45, 47 per cent of the 165 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) stated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project. Another 44 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and none of the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied.

Table E-45. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?

Very satisfied	78	47%
Satisfied	72	44%
Somewhat satisfied	15	9%
Not satisfied	0	0%
Not applicable	9	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-46 indicates that 73 per cent of the 108 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 25 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 3 per cent of the respondents felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-46. To what extent did the GPLS Resource Sharing Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	79	73%
Partly Achieved	27	25%
Not Achieved	2	2%
No Opinion	71	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources. As Table E-47 shows, just over three fourths (78 per cent) of the 114 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "No Opinion") said that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 21 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 1 per cent indicated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-47. To what extent did the GPLS Resource Sharing Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources?

Achieved	89	78%
Partly Achieved	24	21%
Not Achieved	1	1%
No Opinion	66	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Resource Sharing Project were asked to provide further comments about the project, and fourteen respondents provided useful comments. As shown in Table E-48, these comments include positive remarks ("GALILEO is such a wonderful product for all of Georgia" and "an excellent resource that we actively promote"), recommendations for improved marketing ("There needs to be better publicity to the general public about these services" and "Need more awareness resources of specific databases in GALILEO"), and suggestions for further resources ("Need software that can stream movies and TV shows for users on overdrive at a fair cost to the library system").

Table E-48. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?

A lot of the resources are available through schools, so not as likely to get used at the public library.

Table E-48. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Resource Sharing Project?
(Continued)

At the branch level, we are primarily familiar with GALILEO, an excellent resource that we actively promote. Every great once in a while, we use GOLD for a patron. Other than that, this applies to admin.
Galileo and the Learning Express are wonderful resources.
GALILEO has continued to improve, with the addition of Mango Languages and the many e-library sources (including Tumble Books). Our staff throughout the region continues to promote GALILEO in a variety of ways.
I can't explain how important the Resource Sharing project is. GALILEO is such a wonderful product for all of Georgia. The resources would not be available to the patrons if each library had to pay for their access to these databases. This allows for in-depth study down to homework help. It is an important resource for all of us.
I don't know what my library thinks --- frankly, I didn't know it was capable of thinking -- I feel uncomfortable being asked what "my library thinks." DID YOU MEAN, what do my fellow workers think?
I use RDA Toolkit often.
It is great to be able to borrow microfilm for our genealogists. Since we are in the PINES network and can satisfy patron needs for books, the only request for materials to borrow are microfilm.
Need more awareness resources of specific databases in GALILEO. No more quarterly password changes.
Need software that can stream movies and TV shows for users on overdrive at a fair cost to the library system.
There needs to be better publicity to the general public about these services. The publicity needs to expand beyond institutional and library walls.
We need to get more of our community introduced to this wonderful asset!
We refer patrons to GALILEO frequently. Interlibrary Loans through OCLC are also used quite a bit.
We still need more GALILEO training - and not the training provided by EBSCO.

GPLS Professional Library Services Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project. Those who were familiar with the project were then asked further questions about it. Table E-49 shows that just over one third of the respondents (36 per cent) reported being familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project.

Table E-49. Are you familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project?

Yes	88	36%
No	156	64%

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project how important the project is to their libraries. Table E-50 shows that 36 per cent of the 84 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Professional Library Services Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the second lowest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 37 per cent rated the project as important, and 5 per cent of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-50. How important is the GPLS Professional Library Services Project to your library?

Very important	30	36%
Important	31	37%
Somewhat important	19	23%
Not important	4	5%
Not applicable	2	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project to indicate how satisfied they were with the project. Table E-51 shows that 31 per cent of the 83 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project. (This represents the second lowest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 58 per cent indicated that they were satisfied with the project, and just 1 per cent said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-51. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project?

Very satisfied	26	31%
Satisfied	48	58%
Somewhat satisfied	8	10%
Not satisfied	1	1%
Not applicable	3	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, the goal associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-52, where 78 per cent of the 59 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 17 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 5 per cent of the respondents felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-52. To what extent did the GPLS Professional Library Services Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	46	78%
Partly Achieved	10	17%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	26	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving the library workforce. As can be seen in Table E-53, 70 per cent of the 64 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 22 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while 8 per cent indicated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-53. To what extent did the GPLS Professional Library Services Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve the library workforce?

Achieved	45	70%
Partly Achieved	14	22%
Not Achieved	5	8%
No Opinion	21	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Professional Library Services Project to provide further comments about the project, and seven respondents provided useful comments. The comments are shown in Table E-54, and for the most part, they were positive (“The professional services library is current and features topic of interest to us”).

Table E-54. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Professional Library Services Project?

Access through extra passwords to the library science databases and an inability of the CE courses to communicate with whoever is required to issue the CE certificate just add extra steps that hinder participation and usefulness. Archived presentations should count for at least partial CE credit as programs are not frequently repeated and often conflict with library responsibilities.
CEU Credits are not (IACET) International Association for Continuing Education and Training accredited.
I borrow 3-5 items each year.
I have used the professional library resources and it has helped me learn more about my job. The resources are too expensive for me to buy at the local level. It helps to have the resources at a central location where all library staff and library scholars can benefit. I am so appreciative of this resource.
Our hours and staff have been very limited for a long time, making this less useful than it should be. That is finally changing. Hopefully this will be more utilized by us in the near future.
The professional services library is current and features topic of interest to us.
This collection needs to go.

GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project. Those who were familiar with the project were then asked further questions about that project. As shown in Table E-55, 85 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project.

Table E-55. Are you familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?

Yes	205	85%
No	35	15%

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. The results are shown in Table E-56, where 66 per cent of the 201 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not

applicable”) rated the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project as very important to their libraries. Another 28 per cent rated the project as important, and none of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-56. How important is the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project to your library?

Very important	133	66%
Important	57	28%
Somewhat important	11	5%
Not important	0	0%
Not applicable	1	

Respondents who said that they were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-57 shows, 58 per cent of the 201 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) felt that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project. (This represents the highest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 31 per cent indicated that they were satisfied with the project, and just 1 per cent said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-57. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?

Very satisfied	116	58%
Satisfied	63	31%
Somewhat satisfied	20	10%
Not satisfied	2	1%
Not applicable	1	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-58, where 67 per cent of the 112 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved this goal. Another 30 per cent felt that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 3 per cent of the respondents stated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-58. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	75	67%
Partly Achieved	34	30%
Not Achieved	3	3%
No Opinion	88	

The survey asked respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results can be seen in Table E-59, where 74 per cent of the 137 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) believed that the project had achieved this goal. Another 25 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 1 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-59. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	101	74%
Partly Achieved	34	25%
Not Achieved	2	1%
No Opinion	63	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-60 indicates, 74 per cent of the 134 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 24 per cent felt that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 2 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-60. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	99	74%
Partly Achieved	32	24%
Not Achieved	3	2%
No Opinion	65	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users' ability to participate in their community. As Table E-61 shows, just over three fourths (78 per cent) of the 133 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "No Opinion") stated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 21 per cent felt that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 1 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-61. To what extent did the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to participate in their community?

Achieved	104	78%
Partly Achieved	28	21%
Not Achieved	1	1%
No Opinion	65	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project to provide further comments about the project, and 21 respondents provided useful comments. These are provided in Table E-62 and include positive remarks ("All the state passes are very popular" and "I love all of these partnerships") as well as concerns about complex or confusing rules ("Zoo program is great, but unnecessarily complex" and "From the perspective of the circulation desk, rules concerning checking out Atlanta Zoo DVD seem to change which is frustrating to staff and patrons").

Table E-62. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?

All the state passes are very popular
From the perspective of the circulation desk, rules concerning checking out Atlanta Zoo DVD seem to change which is frustrating to staff and patrons. Ex. "the zoo Atlanta DVD will be shown in-house only - except if the patron really complains then let them check it out" per my manager; only 2 passes a day may be given out, unless 4 people are waiting at opening for it, then give a pass to all four per my manager; etc. Confusing and creates perceptives of unfairness.
Get the Atlanta Aquarium on board for a full pass program like the Zoo!
I love all of these partnerships. It brings some users to us for the first time!
I wish they could offer things that are closer to people in the Southern Part of the State

Table E-62. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?
(Continued)

<p>If nothing else, this encouraged libraries to offer services beyond their walls to their community by partnering with other community services/organizations. It improved community literacy to many populations who would not normally participate in State Parks or the Go Fish center and actually encourages families who would not travel beyond their city to widen their horizons and discover a broader world out there. It is amazing in a large community with parks and stores and local recreation offerings that some never travel beyond their city. These programs have broken generational practices and expanded the world of the next generation.</p>
<p>If you want my thoughts, my opinions please make the effort to word the survey thus.</p> <p>I would BIGLY appreciate it.</p>
<p>It is easy to publicize these partnerships and the passes get used.</p>
<p>Our patrons love the many opportunities offered by the partnerships!</p>
<p>Our patrons love the passes! This service is a great way to get people who aren't regular library users into the library who hear about the service from friends.</p>
<p>Really limited to those near Atlanta, for the most part. Zoo program is great, but unnecessarily complex. Hard for front line staff. Would love to see partnerships that tie better into libraries' missions /vision.</p>
<p>The GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project is extremely important to those libraries in rural areas. It gives our patrons access to resources they otherwise might not know about and definitely could not afford.</p>
<p>The passes for the park, zoo, etc. are a great benefit to our patrons. Maybe we should advertise the Learning Express to all of Georgia's schools?</p>
<p>These are wonderful programs.</p>
<p>This has been a great opportunity for promoting the partners and promoting the use of library services to the citizens of Georgia. The patrons have really enjoyed being able to have these opportunities.</p>
<p>This is far too limited. I moved here from a Boston suburb. Almost every cultural attraction in Boston (and some outside of Boston) offered free passes through the library. There were no once-a-year limits and advance reservations could be made. You didn't need to check out a video first. Being able to place these items on hold (with penalties for those who don't show up) would go a long way to making these items more usable, as would increasing the number and type of partnerships, and bigger discounts on things like the puppet shows. No parent wants to take a child to a museum and then tell the child, "No, we can't afford to go to the puppet show."</p>

Table E-62. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Strategic Partnerships Project?
(Continued)

We would love to have a partnership with other attractions like the Georgia Aquarium and the World of Coke. If that isn't possible, we are so thrilled with the partnerships that we currently have.
Would be nice to partner with locations all over GA and not just ATL centered resources. (EX: Zoo) is a long way to travel for our patrons.
Would love to see more partnerships for statewide museums and parks - The High Museum, Atlanta Botanical Gardens, The Atlanta Symphony, Ballet companies, Gibbs Gardens, etc.
Zoo Atlanta is really the only one people clamor over, and it's NEVER IN during the summer months. Lots of angry mothers with that one. When families can't really plan when they're going to make a (what ends up being a big deal) trip to the zoo, it's aggravating. Other than that, my library hasn't seemed to be all that affected by it.
Zoo passes are highly sought after and rarely available. The other passes get used, but not like the zoo passes.

GPLS PINES Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project. Those who stated that they were familiar with the project were then asked further questions about it. As Table E-63 shows, 87 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS PINES Project. This represents the third highest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-63. Are you familiar with the GPLS PINES Project?

Yes	205	87%
No	31	13%

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS PINES Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As Table E-64 indicates, 81 per cent of the 175 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than "Not applicable") rated the GPLS PINES Project as very important to their libraries. (This represents the third highest percentage of respondents rating one of the GPLS projects as very important to their libraries.) Another 10 per cent rated the project as important, and only 4 per cent of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-64. How important is the GPLS PINES Project to your library?

Very important	142	81%
Important	18	10%
Somewhat important	8	5%
Not important	7	4%
Not applicable	24	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-65 shows, 54 per cent of the 166 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) stated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS PINES Project. Another 38 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and only 2 per cent of respondents indicated that they were not satisfied.

Table E-65. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS PINES Project?

Very satisfied	90	54%
Satisfied	63	38%
Somewhat satisfied	10	6%
Not satisfied	3	2%
Not applicable	31	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-66 indicates, 71 per cent of the 112 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 27 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 2 per cent of the respondents felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-66. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	80	71%
Partly Achieved	30	27%
Not Achieved	2	2%
No Opinion	85	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results can be seen in Table E-67, where 82 per cent of the 126 respondents who expressed an

opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 18 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and none of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-67. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	103	82%
Partly Achieved	23	18%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	69	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-68, where 80 per cent of the 121 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved this goal. Another 18 per cent felt that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 2 per cent indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-68. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	97	80%
Partly Achieved	22	18%
Not Achieved	2	2%
No Opinion	74	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users’ ability to discover information resources. As Table E-69 indicates, 81 per cent of the 125 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) believed that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 17 per cent felt that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while just 2 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-69. To what extent did the GPLS PINES Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve users' ability to discover information resources?

Achieved	101	81%
Partly Achieved	21	17%
Not Achieved	3	2%
No Opinion	71	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS PINES Project were asked to provide further comments about the project, and 24 respondents provided useful comments. Table E-70 shows the responses, which include mostly positive remarks (“The PINES Project is crucial to our library!” and “This program is essential for us”) as well as various suggestions for improving the service (“Should have a spell check option” and “An app would be great too”).

Table E-70. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS PINES Project?

All of our libraries are better because of the availability of PINES.
Being able to borrow books from other libraries is awesome. It is sad that it takes over a week for most of them to come--even when they are sitting on the shelves.
Hands down one of the best endeavors GPLS has ever undertaken and provided!
I can't say thank you enough for PINES. We could not afford an ILS of this caliber. It has been great for our patrons in that so few work in this county and therefore work in the surrounding counties. They love being able to use their card at home, where they work and travel throughout the state.
I feel that some of the poor rural libraries would still be using card catalogs if we didn't have the PINES project. This has meant so much to all of the libraries. We are able to circulate materials throughout the entire state, so one library does not have the responsibility of providing all kinds of materials. In this mobile society patrons are able to visit any of the PINES libraries to check out books or use the computers when they are away from home on business or vacation. No need to borrow a stack of books to enjoy while away; just use the local PINES library. The executive committee has provided leadership, answered questions, and provided policies that cover the entire program. It's a major asset to local libraries.
I use PINES as a patron to see if the public library has copies of books that teachers may request that I do not have.
Love PINES since day one.
Love PINES!

Table E-70. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS PINES Project?
(Continued)

<p>Most patrons do not know how or only minimally know how to use PINES, GALILEO and EBSCO. There are almost no programs to educate the public on how to use these programs in our community and the programs that are provided are very rarely attended by the public.</p>
<p>My library does not participate in PINES.</p>
<p>PINES is one of the best things about Georgia. More states should follow suit.</p>
<p>Should have a spell check option.</p>
<p>Runs very slow most of the time.</p>
<p>The evergreen website needs to be updated. It looks like something from the 90's. An app would be great too.</p>
<p>The Library system I work for is not part of PINES, since we are a large system I believe we would have an enormous amount of data and books to convert over to the PINES system. I am aware PINES work for those systems that have smaller libraries in terms of the numbers.</p>
<p>The PINES Project is crucial to our library!</p>
<p>The PINES staff always provides excellent support. After being a part of PINES for so long, our patrons now expect to be able to borrow books from libraries throughout the state, and it's wonderful. It's an excellent selling point for our library services. The courier service does a wonderful job getting books from one library system to another.</p>
<p>The search engine for the PINES catalog is too specific for author name spelling, especially for patrons to do their own searching. To make it easier, it might be helpful to figure a way where the program could pick up on slight misspelling (i.e. James Paterson) and offer an option (did you mean James Patterson?) like internet search engines.</p>
<p>This program is essential for us.</p>
<p>We are not a PINES library, but the courier is supposed to come daily for interlibrary loans and other materials sent by other GPLS & USG libraries/headquarters. However, sometimes they will not come for a few days (not during holiday times) and sometimes someone will send us something through the courier that never arrives.</p>
<p>We don't use it.</p>
<p>We've come a long way, baby!</p>
<p>West Georgia Regional Library staff is exceptionally helpful! They continually develop an interrelated relationship between the libraries in our 5 counties.</p>

Table E-70. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS PINES Project?
(Continued)

When we are able to get collaborative/shared subscription to popular e-book, magazine and documentary movie services, even if at a distributed cost to local systems, Georgia will have truly joined the current digital age.

would like for juvenile accounts to be connected on PINES end for paying fines at one time, rather than multiple times if multiple juveniles

GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project. Those who reported being familiar with the project were then asked further questions about it. As Table E-71 shows, 37 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project.

Table E-71. Are you familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project?

Yes	85	37%
No	146	63%

The survey asked respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project how important the project is to their libraries. As can be seen in Table E-72, 52 per cent of the 81 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project as very important to their libraries. Another 27 per cent rated the project as important, and 5 per cent of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-72. How important is the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project to your library?

Very important	42	52%
Important	22	27%
Somewhat important	13	16%
Not important	4	5%
Not applicable	3	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-73 shows, 55 per cent of the 75 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) indicated that they were very satisfied with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project. (This represents the third highest percentage of respondents saying that they were very satisfied with one of the GPLS projects.) Another 29 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and only 4 per cent stated that

they were not satisfied.

Table E-73. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project?

Very satisfied	41	55%
Satisfied	22	29%
Somewhat satisfied	9	12%
Not satisfied	3	4%
Not applicable	7	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-74, where 77 per cent of the 65 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 18 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and 5 per cent of the respondents felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-74. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	50	77%
Partly Achieved	12	18%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	19	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-75 indicates that 76 per cent of the 66 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved this goal. Another 22 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 1 per cent indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-75. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	51	76%
Partly Achieved	15	22%
Not Achieved	1	1%
No Opinion	17	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-76 shows that 78 per cent of the 65 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 17 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and 5 per cent felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-76. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	51	78%
Partly Achieved	11	17%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	19	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving library operations. The results are shown in Table E-77, where 71 per cent of the 65 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 25 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, and 5 per cent indicated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-77. To what extent did the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve library operations?

Achieved	46	71%
Partly Achieved	16	25%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	19	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project were asked

to provide further comments about the project, and six respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-78 and include mostly positive remarks (“This has been extremely helpful to keep the local library IT staff up to date on new products and trends that affect the IT environment” and “the Tech Boot Camp Project assists us in staying current with new technology”).

Table E-78. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS IT Tech Boot Camp Project?

I think there needs to be more that targets smaller libraries with limited resources and staff.
I wish there was a library tech basics for new employees who are in charge of technology but don't have a tech background. There are still many libraries who do not have IT personnel.
New advances in technology are happening at lightning speed--the Tech Boot Camp Project assists us in staying current with new technology.
Our IT person shared some Tech Toys that are available to borrow from GPLS but I would like some publicity directed to line staff about how to use this technology in programming or how we might borrow the material for personal development of tech usage.
This has been extremely helpful to keep the local library IT staff up to date on new products and trends that affect the IT environment. The staff returns to work with motivation and excitement and new ideas for our libraries. Because of the work at the Boot Camp, we now have 3D printers in all of our libraries and STEM projects that are motivating the staff and patrons.
This project provides an excellent opportunity to network with other professionals and learn about many IT topics.

GPLS IT Services Project

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project. Those who stated that they were familiar with the project were then asked further questions about that project. As Table E-79 shows, 39 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project.

Table E-79. Are you familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project?

Yes	89	39%
No	139	61%

The respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project were asked how important the project is to their libraries. As can be seen in Table E-80, 65 per cent of the 88 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the

GPLS IT Services Project as very important to their libraries. Another 28 per cent rated the project as important, and just 1 per cent of the respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-80. How important is the GPLS IT Services Project to your library?

Very important	57	65%
Important	25	28%
Somewhat important	5	6%
Not important	1	1%
Not applicable	0	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project to indicate how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-81 shows, 48 per cent of the 84 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS IT Services Project. Another 43 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and none of the respondents said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-81. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS IT Services Project?

Very satisfied	40	48%
Satisfied	36	43%
Somewhat satisfied	8	10%
Not satisfied	0	0%
Not applicable	3	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As indicated in Table E-82, 76 per cent of the 63 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 22 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 2 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-82. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	48	76%
Partly Achieved	14	22%
Not Achieved	1	2%
No Opinion	23	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-83 shows, 81 per cent of the 68 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 19 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and none of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-83. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	55	81%
Partly Achieved	13	19%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	18	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-84 shows that 82 per cent of the 62 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 16 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 2 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-84. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	51	82%
Partly Achieved	10	16%
Not Achieved	1	2%
No Opinion	21	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving the library’s physical and technological infrastructure. As Table E-85 shows, 79 per cent of the 63 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) indicated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 19 per cent stated that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 2 per cent felt that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-85. To what extent did the GPLS IT Services Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure?

Achieved	50	79%
Partly Achieved	12	19%
Not Achieved	1	2%
No Opinion	23	

The survey asked respondents who were familiar with the GPLS IT Services Project to provide further comments about the project, and seven respondents provided useful comments. As Table E-86 shows, most of the remarks were positive (“Technology loaner kits have been a big hit” and “I am so thankful for these services”). A few suggestions for improving the service were also made (“Line staff needs to be made more aware of and allowed access to technology and services being provided” and “We borrowed the tech loaner kit once. I was very disappointed that there was not more information on the items”).

Table E-86. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS IT Services Project?

By providing these services, the local library does not have to support these services within our budgets. These are services that we would not be able to provide.
I am so thankful for these services, especially the MR&R component. It has helped us replace our public computers over the years and put a Wi-Fi service in place. In the past year, we have seen Wi-Fi usage surpass our public computers. We don't ever turn off the network so it is available 24 hours a day.
I love the website help that Darrin Givens has provided to us over the years and I look forward to working with Roy Cummings as well.
I really only know about the help desk. Most of this pertains to admin IT.
Line staff needs to be made more aware of and allowed access to technology and services being provided. i.e. Do we have access to cloud storage for our work? Why can't line staff contact the help desk directly? Is there access to a program that provides discounts for library staff to purchase computers and technology as there is for college professors and employees? The higher levels of this program work for aiding administration but nothing relates to the daily world, or professional development of line staff.
Technology loaner kits have been a big hit!
There needs to be more of you in order to help us more effectively!
We borrowed the tech loaner kit once. I was very disappointed that there was not more information on the items. Sometimes we had to guess what the item was and supposed to do. Also, the items did not match up with the slots in the foam casing.

GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project. Those who stated that they were familiar with the project were then asked further questions about it. The results can be seen in Table E-87, which shows that 70 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project.

Table E-87. Are you familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?

Yes	159	70%
No	68	30%

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to indicate how important the project is to their libraries. The results can be seen in Table E-88, where 58 per cent of the 155 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project as very important to their libraries. Another 30 per cent rated the project as important, and just 1 per cent rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-88. How important is the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects to your library?

Very important	90	58%
Important	47	30%
Somewhat important	17	11%
Not important	1	1%
Not applicable	2	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-89 shows, 48 per cent of the 151 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project. Another 43 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and only 1 per cent of the respondents said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-89. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?

Very satisfied	72	48%
Satisfied	65	43%
Somewhat satisfied	13	9%
Not satisfied	1	1%
Not applicable	6	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals of the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. Table E-90 indicates that 70 per cent of the 105 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) indicated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 26 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 4 per cent felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-90. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	74	70%
Partly Achieved	27	26%
Not Achieved	4	4%
No Opinion	52	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning, one of the goals of the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As indicated in Table E-91, 77 per cent of the 112 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved this goal. Another 20 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 4 per cent said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-91. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Promoting the value and joy of life long reading and learning?

Achieved	86	77%
Partly Achieved	22	20%
Not Achieved	4	4%
No Opinion	44	

Respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals of the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. The results are shown in Table E-92, where 79 per cent of the 113 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) felt that the project had achieved this goal. Another 19 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 3 per cent of the respondents believed that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-92. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	89	79%
Partly Achieved	21	19%
Not Achieved	3	3%
No Opinion	44	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving users’ general knowledge and skills. The results can be seen in Table E-93, where just over three fourths (77 per cent) of the 114 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 20 per cent indicated that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while only 3 per cent stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-93. To what extent did the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects address the following IMLS priority: Improve users’ general knowledge and skills?

Achieved	88	77%
Partly Achieved	23	20%
Not Achieved	3	3%
No Opinion	43	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Project were asked to provide further comments about the project, and 20 respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-94 and include positive remarks (“Both of these are fantastic opportunities to acquire timely and useful resources for our organization” and “We would not have these resources without you”) as well as concerns that local staff do not have the time to apply for the grants (“Single Rural systems with essentially 1 full time professional do not have enough time to put together a STEAM grant proposal with such a fast approaching deadline as you've given the past few years. Give us more time!!!!”) and suggestions for improving the focus of the project (“I would like to see a greater focus on

the arts portion of STEAM”).

Table E-94. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?

<p>A common remark from our patrons about the availability of the STEAM resources that have been afforded to our library system because of the STEAM grants: "An excellent use of money!"</p>
<p>Both of these are fantastic opportunities to acquire timely and useful resources for our organization.</p>
<p>I know it exists. I know we have had some benefits from it. I can't say any more than that. Admin buys things and might mention they are courtesy of a grant or something through GPLS. The branches aren't directly involved. We don't have a good idea about various GPLS projects. They may have meeting with YA and children's specialists, but the rest of the branch personnel don't get much background information. It would be nice to have an information session on these things for everyone at staff development day.</p>
<p>I would like to see a greater focus on the arts portion of STEAM.</p>
<p>I'm assuming that this includes the STEM/STEAM grants that are issued? Single Rural systems with essentially 1 full time professional do not have enough time to put together a STEAM grant proposal with such a fast-approaching deadline as you've given the past few years. Give us more time!!!!</p>
<p>It takes us forever to get our items, we still have not received everything from two years ago</p>
<p>LOVE LOVE LOVE this grant opportunity.</p>
<p>This helps so much!</p>
<p>Need more time for these grants - more time to obtain materials and to evaluate success before grant report is due.</p>
<p>Our community is excited about the 3-d printer we purchased with STEAM funds. We wouldn't have been able to bring this exciting technology to our library without GPLS support. Also, we added a painting class led by a local artist for adults. The classes fill each month and they are so proud of the art they create. I've been amazed at how this class is bringing people to the library who haven't been in years because their kids are grown.</p>
<p>Our library would be able to do nearly half of the amount of STEAM projects that we do without this opportunity from GPLS.</p>
<p>Our patrons really love these projects.</p>
<p>Our STEM and STEAM books just sit on the shelves. If the schools and parents don't push it, all the books in the world on the subjects will achieve nothing.</p>

Table E-94. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Projects?
(Continued)

Our system has 150+ STEM and STEAM kits that circulate and have more that 1,000 circulations!
STEM & STEAM events are not inclusive.
These projects have helped us move into the trends that are happening throughout the nation.
We love STEM and STEAM!
We need to keep on improving our STEAM offerings!
We would not have these resources without you.
Without Some MAKER camps/workshops or more instruction to line staff on how to use these resources we will not be ensuring equal access to technology. There will always be the haves and have nots. This project is great at the beginning but must be funded to continue to be useful - parts and pieces must be replaced, books become outdated.
You guys need to work on the rules for reimbursements for these grants. This year's was a nightmare!

GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project. Those who reported being familiar with the project were then asked further questions about it. The results can be seen in Table E-95, which shows that 35 per cent of the respondents reported being familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project. This represents the third lowest percentage of respondents who stated that they were familiar with one of the GPLS projects.

Table E-95. Are you familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project?

Yes	80	35%
No	147	65%

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project were asked to indicate how important the project is to their libraries. As Table E-96 shows, 48 per cent of the 77 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) rated the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project as very important to their libraries. Another 29 per cent rated the project as important, and only 3 per cent of the

respondents rated the project as not important to their libraries.

Table E-96. How important is the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project to your library?

Very important	37	48%
Important	22	29%
Somewhat important	16	21%
Not important	2	3%
Not applicable	0	

The survey asked respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project how satisfied they were with the project. As Table E-97 shows, 44 per cent of the 72 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “Not applicable”) said that they were very satisfied with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project. Another 39 per cent said that they were satisfied with the project, and none of the respondents said that they were not satisfied.

Table E-97. How satisfied is your library with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project?

Very satisfied	32	44%
Satisfied	28	39%
Somewhat satisfied	12	17%
Not satisfied	0	0%
Not applicable	5	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of providing and encouraging visionary leadership, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. These results are shown in Table E-98, where 76 per cent of the 55 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) indicated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 20 per cent stated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and only 4 per cent felt that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-98. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Providing and encouraging visionary leadership?

Achieved	42	76%
Partly Achieved	11	20%
Not Achieved	2	4%
No Opinion	22	

Respondents who were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of ensuring equal access to information and technology, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As shown in Table E-99, 75 per cent of the 56 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) indicated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 21 per cent stated that the project had partly achieved the goal, and just 4 per cent of the respondents said that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-99. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Ensuring equal access to information and technology?

Achieved	42	75%
Partly Achieved	12	21%
Not Achieved	2	4%
No Opinion	21	

Respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project were asked to rate the extent to which the project met the goal of facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community, one of the goals associated with the project in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-100 indicates, 76 per cent of the 58 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) stated that the project had achieved this goal. Another 19 per cent said that the project had partly achieved the goal, and 5 per cent of the respondents indicated that the project had not achieved the goal.

Table E-100. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project meet the following goal from the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan: Facilitating collaboration and innovation in the broader library community?

Achieved	44	76%
Partly Achieved	11	19%
Not Achieved	3	5%
No Opinion	19	

The survey asked respondents who reported being familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project to rate the extent to which the project addressed the IMLS priority of improving library operations. As Table E-101 shows, almost three fourths (74 per cent) of the 58 respondents who expressed an opinion (other than “No Opinion”) said that the project had achieved the goal of addressing the priority. Another 26 per cent believed that the project had partly achieved the goal of addressing the priority, while none of the respondents stated that the project had not achieved the goal of addressing the priority.

Table E-101. To what extent did the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project address the following IMLS priority: Improve library operations?

Achieved	43	74%
Partly Achieved	15	26%
Not Achieved	0	0%
No Opinion	19	

The survey asked respondents who stated that they were familiar with the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project to provide further comments about the project, and five respondents provided useful comments. These are shown in Table E-102 and include exclusively positive remarks (“The changes/improvements that Whitney has made have been very helpful with collection” and “I appreciate the publication Current Look and refer to it often”).

Table E-102. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS Library Research and Statistics Project?

I enjoy seeing how we compare to other libraries. I am sure that administration uses the figures to justify budget requests.
Statistics are a tremendous help when we take our story to the library board, funders and politicians. I appreciate the publication Current Look and refer to it often.
The changes/improvements that Whitney has made have been very helpful with collection.
This project helps us stay connected nationwide with other libraries. With these statistics, we can prove to the opponents of libraries that they are still being used, are still helping with education, are still providing recreational reading opportunities. In my library system of six counties, we have only one book store available. Other than those stores connected with churches, Goodwill, or thrift stores, the libraries only competition is a small independent book store. The library is important here and we need these statistics to explain our position.
This service has greatly improved over the last two years.

Use of LSTA Funds Over the Past Five Years

The survey asked respondents to provide comments at the use of LSTA funds by GPLS over the past five years. As Table E-103 shows, 15 respondents provided comments. Many of these were positive (“I am so pleased with the services that are provided” and “Our library has been very grateful for the opportunities provides by the funds for our patrons”). However, several respondents indicated that they were not aware of the various LSTA projects (“I do wish I knew more about these projects” and “since I barely knew what any of these were, how are you communicating to regular staff members?”).

Table E-103. Do you have any further comments about the GPLS's use of LSTA funds over the past five years?

GPLS's use of LSTA funds has been exemplary and much appreciated!
I am so pleased with the services that are provided.
I do wish I knew more about these projects.
I know nothing about the LSTA nor most of the other projects as our board members and administrators share next to ZERO information with the employees doing the real work in libraries across this state. We are kept out of the loop and our insight is neither sought nor appreciated. We cannot even address the local library board without going through a thousand steps beforehand.
I like seeing innovator/committed library staff honored in the newsletter.
I want to know about the projects that I do not know about.
I wish information about all of these things were available to people outside of a region or at the management level.
I'm sure it's all good. I just don't know enough to comment intelligently.
If I purchase resources for my library but they are not being used by the patrons, then it is difficult to say that I am meeting the needs of my patrons. Using that analogy, even though I am not familiar with all of the programs listed in this survey, I believe that GPLS does an excellent job of providing the kinds of resources library systems need to succeed. In that sense, I am very satisfied with the knowledge and resources GPLS provides.
Noticed that leadership was one of the goals. Would like to see a firmer hand from GPLS and more visibility to the general public.
Our library has been very grateful for the opportunities provides by the funds for our patrons.
Overall, I'm very satisfied with the way GPLS uses LSTA funds.
Please do not remove anything at this time. I realize that means you may not be able to add any services - but the ones offered are all fantastic.
Public libraries should serve adults first and children as a reading room/storytime adjunct. They should not be turned into summer schools or parks and rec wannabes. Library funds are being disproportionately used to replace failing school budgets. This is improper redirection of tax dollars that are intended to serve the adult information community.
Well, since I barely knew what any of these were, how are you communicating to regular staff members?

Needs or Programs for Next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan

The survey asked respondents to identify needs or program for the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-104 shows, 25 respondents provided suggestions. There were few common threads among the suggestions, but they provide GPLS staff with some ideas to consider for the next LSTA Five-Year Plan.

Table E-104. What needs or programs would you like to see the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan address?

a music lending service
Additional Adult Service Programming focus
Continue Summer Reading Programs, more literacy programs, more on how to engage your community, continue the STEM/STEAM grants.
Coordination among youth specialists.
DIGITIZATION help!!!!!!
Early literacy outreach efforts
Expand technology resources for underserved adults. A program specifically targeting information access for job hunters. An improved emphasis on support for online education at the high school and college level.
Focus on the arts. Maybe a tour of authors program where GPLS helps cost share author events for libraries.
I am overwhelmed by what projects are being done.
Increased variety of books
It has been discussed many years, but I still would like a GEEK squad. Or at least a professional IT yearly evaluation of our IT equipment and what needs to be done in the future. Without a trained IT person on the staff it is very hard to evaluate whether our technology equipment is up to date and providing adequate service. I want to know if the firewalls are protecting the network, that the older Ethernet cabling is not slowing down the network, and if it is the computers that are causing slowness seen by the public or something else.
It would be nice to GPLS actually provided training and resources to the lay staff that was applicable and needed and not a band-aid with simplistic solutions. The same five topics get used and reused (like customer service) and not adding anything new or innovative to the discussion. Just moving words around and ultimately being a waste of time. Sometime I really wonder what the heck GLPS actually does for me because mostly it seems like saying you're doing things, but I rarely see the end result.

Table E-104. What needs or programs would you like to see the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan address?
(Continued)

<p>It would be nice to have HR support for smaller libraries, maybe someone who is shared among several libraries. It would also be nice to have a facilities manager who was shared with several libraries/systems. We can't afford to hire anyone to do either of those functions but it would be nice to have someone on call who could answer HR questions and someone who could come out and provide advice on maintenance or mechanical questions.</p>
<p>It would be nice to see funds reserved for public libraries that have special collections and heritage rooms. These rooms have special needs for preservation supplies and conduct programs for genealogical and historical research which encourages patrons to use their public libraries on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Keeping, Galileo, the Learning Express, Ancestry. Continuing passes (State parks & Zoo, etc.) for patrons. Glass must be beneficial to so many.</p>
<p>Literacy is a stepping stone to success; so, I believe that books are forever needed!!!</p> <p>Personally, I like the inclusion of all ages, all abilities/disabilities, taking part in library programs/functions!!!</p> <p>More hands-on activities/programs from infancy to adulthood!</p> <p>I love programs for 'older' populations, too!!!</p>
<p>More on digital resources for the library staff and library users.</p>
<p>Please do not reduce the statewide services for competitive grants. All libraries do not have access to the staff who can take the time for the grant writing and management and those are usually the libraries who need the most grants.</p>
<p>Preservation for historic documents.</p>
<p>Some time ago, there was talk of funding e-books for all libraries using LSTA. Is this a possibility within the scope of LSTA?</p>
<p>Take back e-rate</p>
<p>updating AND RENOVATING OLDER FACILITIES AND COLLECTIONS</p>
<p>Updating public access and workplace computer technology and programs. It is ridiculous that we are still operating Windows 7 and that we cannot print in color from public access computers/ scan documents to PDF/or use the internet and PINES on the same computer without PINES crashing. There also needs to be accountability for speed and performance from companies who are awarded contracts to provide internet access.</p>

Table E-104. What needs or programs would you like to see the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan address?
(Continued)

We really, really, REALLY need to see about making GALILEO more easily accessible to Georgia residents and easier to use. At the very least, Georgia residents should not have to come into the library every three months to get a password; we should be able to have proxies like the academic libraries. The interface should also not be the same for k-12 schools, universities, and public libraries.

Whatever the LSTA Five-Year Plan is, I would like to see it address the plethora of problems plaguing our public libraries--overworked and unappreciated staff, poor pay lack of meaningful, regular pay raises, lack of transparency, bureaucracy run amok, limited program budgets, micro-management gone wild, lack of community partnerships and funding sources that only care about adding more fluff books and movies to the collection.

Familiarity with LSTA-Funded Projects

Throughout the survey, respondents were asked to indicate whether they were familiar with the various LSTA-funded projects that the survey covered. It is interesting to compare the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were familiar with each project. Table E-105 provides this comparison.

Table E-105. Percentage Familiar with the Project

Summer Reading	91%
GLASS	91%
PINES	87%
Strategic Partnerships	85%
Resource Sharing	75%
STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing	70%
Youth Services	45%
IT Services	39%
Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support	38%
IT Tech Boot Camp	37%
Professional Library Services	36%
Library Research and Statistics	35%
Prime Time	35%
Communications	32%

A large percentage of respondents were familiar with some projects: Summer Reading, GLASS, and PINES, for example. On the other hand, fewer respondents indicated being familiar with the Library Research and Statistics, Prime Time, and Communications projects. GPLS staff may wish to consider how to better market some of its projects.

Importance of LSTA-Funded Projects

Throughout the survey, respondents were asked to indicate how important the various LSTA-funded projects were to their libraries. Table E-106 shows how the projects rank in terms of the percentage of respondents stating that the project was very important to their libraries.

Over four fifths of the respondents rated three of the projects – Summer Reading, Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support, and PINES – as very important to their libraries.

Table E-106. Percentage Rating Project as Very Important to Their Libraries

Summer Reading	87%
Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support	85%
PINES	81%
Strategic Partnerships	66%
IT Services	65%
Resource Sharing	61%
STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing	58%
IT Tech Boot Camp	52%
Youth Services	50%
Library Research and Statistics	48%
Prime Time	45%
Communications	44%
Professional Library Services	36%
GLASS	32%

Satisfaction with LSTA-Funded Projects

Throughout the survey, respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied their libraries were with the various LSTA-funded projects. Table E-107 shows how the projects rank in terms of the percentage of respondents stating that their libraries were very satisfied with the project.

Over half of the respondents rated their libraries as very satisfied with four of the projects

– Strategic Partnerships, Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support, IT Tech Boot Camp, and PINES.

Table E-107. Percentage Who Said They Were Very Satisfied with Project

Strategic Partnerships	58%
Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support	56%
IT Tech Boot Camp	55%
PINES	54%
Summer Reading	48%
STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing	48%
IT Services	48%
Resource Sharing	47%
Library Research and Statistics	44%
GLASS	39%
Prime Time	34%
Communications	34%
Professional Library Services	31%
Youth Services	23%

Appendix F

Focus Group Questions and Input

On December 8, 2016, the Georgia Public Library Service sponsored a focus group of public library directors representing various sizes and geographic areas of the state. Dr. Robert Burgin served as the facilitator.

Focus group members were provided with a handout describing GPLS's LSTA activities, the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan goals, and the IMLS focal areas and were asked to respond to three questions:

- What parts of the GPLS LSTA program have been successful, especially when you consider the four goals in the GPLS LSTA plan and the six IMLS areas of focus?
- What suggestions do you have for improving any of the current GPLS LSTA activities?
- What ideas do you have for the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? What current activities would you continue? What new programs would you recommend?

The responses to these questions are listed below.

What parts of the GPLS LSTA program have been successful, especially when you consider the four goals in the GPLS LSTA plan and the six IMLS areas of focus?

- The GPLS Strategic Partnerships Program in particular and programs that foster collaboration in general
- Activities that support the institutional capacity of local libraries (especially for small libraries), including statewide email support, Website hosting, training of any kind, and the E-Rate Support Program
- The PINES Program is another example of improving the institutional capacity of libraries.
- The PRIME TIME Program and its focus on improving family skills

- The statewide network upgrade has been extremely helpful in providing libraries with adequate bandwidth for programs like AARP's tax training.
- The GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Programs; in many cases, libraries are the only source of these resources in a community.
- The GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Programs allow libraries to reach groups that they might otherwise not reach, like homeschoolers.
- The GPLS STEM and STEAM Resource Sharing Programs sparked some local grants.
- The expertise of the GPLS staff in general, particularly in IT
- IT, especially its focus on new trends and new technologies
- Funding to purchase technologies
- Many LSTA-funded projects foster a more unified view of the state and combat the "us vs. them" mentality.
- Many LSTA-funded projects take what's working to poorer parts of the state.
- Learning Express and other resources provided through GALILEO
- GALILEO
- The GPLS Summer Reading Program, which has been expanded to include adults and teens
- GLASS, especially its focus on helping public libraries understand and provide assistive technologies
- All of the boot camps – marketing, IT, cataloging, assistive technologies, etc.
- Educational opportunities for staff, especially those provided via the Web
- The Facilities Summit
- RDA training and the cataloging conference
- OCLC access – ILL and cataloging – for the public library systems in Georgia
- The GPLS Library Research and Statistics Program
- The focus on "national level" issues, like Legislative Day in Washington, the Linked Data Project, Outcome Based Evaluation, etc.
- The consultants at GPLS, all of whom are helpful
- The ability of the GPLS staff to provide local librarians with assistance in "delicate situations"
- The ability of the GPLS staff to balance local differences with common goals
- The financial and legal information provided by the GPLS staff
- Helping local libraries with long range planning

What suggestions do you have for improving any of the current GPLS LSTA activities?

- Reimbursements sometimes take too long, but this may be a function of the Board of Regents.
- Need examples of successful grant applications or better models of successful grant programs.
- More time is needed to plan the grant programs and to purchase resources and services associated with them.
- Need clearer expectations about communicating with GPLS.
- Need better relations with other types of libraries throughout the state, more collaboration.
- GALILEO is really an academic product and not meant for the general user.
- More work needs to be done on the usability of GALILEO, which lacks a discovery layer
- More work needs to be done on promoting GALILEO
- PINES doesn't meet the needs of larger public library systems. In order for it to do so, more staff, more funding, and additional modules (like acquisitions) would be needed.
- Better publicity and promotion are needed for the "mundane" services of libraries.
- Something like Design 101 is needed for library staffs.
- An *annual* children's service conference is needed.
- More sharing of regional resources is needed.
- More money needs to be spent on early childhood programs like PRIME TIME and 1000 Books Before Kindergarten.
- "Stick with what works."

What ideas do you have for the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan? What current activities would you continue? What new programs would you recommend?

- Focus on older adults
- Families with special needs children
- Helping library users navigate bureaucracies and validate information
- Helping library users with financial issues
- Helping library users with health issues

- Support for the Ferst Foundation for Childhood Literacy
- Anything that fosters cooperation with other libraries, including electronic and visual aids
- Being more proactive with the vetting of vendors
- Ways to work with the state Department of Education to foster greater collaborating with local schools and to leverage the purchasing power of public and school libraries
- Support for the State Superintendent of Education's 2020 plan
- Continued support for new library directors
- Marketing, advocacy, and awareness

Appendix G

Targets from LSTA Five-Year Plan vs Actual Performance

Table G-1. Communications

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>Coordinated Communications</i>		
Increase by a minimum of 5 percent each year (for a total of 27.6+ percent over five years) the number of visits and hits to each: the GPLS Web, our hosted library system Web sites, and our hosted non-system Web sites, and the number of Facebook followers and post views.	<p>Visits to the GPLS Website increased from 372,663 in FY2012 to 440,935 in FY2015, an increase of 18%. Hits to the GPLS Website declined from 14,040,952 in FY2012 to 6,884,986 in FY2015, a decrease of 51%, but this was due to the “rightsizing” of previously inflated counts.</p> <p>Visits to hosted library system Websites increased from 646,151 in FY2012 to 2,839,771 in FY2015, an increase of 339%. Hits to those Websites increased from 33,233,408 in FY2012 to 121,650,745 in FY2015, an increase of 266%.</p> <p>Visits to hosted non-system sites increased from 89,129 in FY2012 to 253,704 in FY2015. Hits to those sites increased from 956,253 in FY2012 to 1,436,926 in FY2015, an increase of 50%.</p> <p>The number of Facebook followers increased from 449 in FY2012 to 1,352 in FY2015, an increase of 201%. Comparable figures for post views are not available, because Facebook has changed the way it counts post views. However, post reach increased 67% between FY2014 and FY2015.</p>	Yes
By establishing a Twitter feed for GPLS will build additional online awareness.	A Twitter feed was established and is active. As of December 2016, the Twitter feed had 2,585 tweets, 1,403 followers, and 659 likes.	Yes

By adding online subscription forms for the newsletter and options for PDF delivery by email, increase circulation by 2 percent each year.	Between FY2012 and FY2015, the subscription base for <i>GPLS News</i> increased from 2,229 to 2,568 in hard copy (an increase of 15%) and from 136 to 347 in electronic format (an increase of 155%).	Yes
By updating and expanding our past media list of 90 print and television outlets and adding online news outlets we plan to more than double the number of media outlets we provide with our press releases.	In FY2015, GPLS issued press releases to about 250 media outlets and national trade journals.	Yes
By also increasing the average annual number of press releases from 12 to 18 in each of the coming five years, increase the amount of press coverage about Georgia's public libraries and their LSTA- sponsored programs by at least 50 percent over past levels.	The number of press releases increased from 8 in FY2012 to 15 in FY2015.	No
<i>Marketing Boot Camp and Pilot Program</i>		
Conduct a two-day marketing boot-camp to provide the strategic direction for a set of shared state- wide marketing goals and equip librarians with the critical knowledge and skills needed to develop and implement a marketing plan to address at least one of those goals.	A one-day camp was conducted in August 2015 and was attended by 24 librarians from 15 library systems.	Yes
Conduct a minimum of four online webinars to assist libraries in the evaluation and refinement of those goals.	Marketing Webinars were offered every month or two during FY2014 and FY2015. Attendance was typically ten or fewer.	Yes
Develop an ongoing communication network designed to allow the State Library to communicate best practices and innovative ideas and create a sense of community amongst libraries participating in the program.	GPLS has had an ongoing unofficial network since the August 2015 camp.	Yes

<p>Fund a pilot program for no fewer than 10 public library systems to facilitate the development and implementation of a cohesive and effective marketing plan. Strategies will align with the communities' priorities; strengthen relationships with community partners and stakeholders; establish a communication network to reach both users and nonusers in the communities; and increase attendance of library sponsored events and use of the libraries' resources. Each library will receive ongoing training and coaching by marketing experts and will be provided a leading-edge tool for one year that will empower these libraries to implement and evaluate the success of their plan.</p>	<p>The program ran from FY2013 to FY2015 and initially involved 19 systems. Due to local funding issues, libraries dropped out each year. Five participants remain active.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Secure a commitment from each library to serve as "Master Marketers" and share their experiences and expertise in a train-the-trainer formatted program to be offered to the rest of Georgia's public libraries.</p>	<p>A train-the-trainer workshop was conducted in Athens in March 2013. Two librarians agreed to serve as "Master Marketers."</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Table G-2. Continuing Education

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>Leadership Institute – PINNACLE Program</i>		
<p>20 PINNACLE graduates will be better prepared for their next leadership advancement.</p>	<p>Due to funding issues, the PINNACLE program was not conducted during FY2013 and FY2014. The most recent program began in October 2015 and was completed in October 2016 but was state funded. A second class is expected in October 2017.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>5 PINNACLE graduates will go on to become library directors.</p>	<p>State funded – not LSTA funded – in FY2015.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Graduates will formally develop leadership skill sets they would otherwise have not gained.</p>	<p>State funded – not LSTA funded – in FY2015.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

The Georgia public library community will retain more quality professionals.	State funded – not LSTA funded – in FY2015.	N/A
The Georgia public library community will benefit from PINNACLE graduates assuming formal and informal leadership positions in association, political, and internal committees.	State funded – not LSTA funded – in FY2015.	N/A
<i>Virtual Library Staff Development Day</i>		
Increased comfort in working with changing customer needs.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period. The most recent program was hosted in 2016, with a total attendance of over 1,375.	No
Increased collaboration between libraries.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
Increased opportunities to share insights and best practices.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
Increased participant comfort with using web conferencing.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
Average of 150 library staff attend each session.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
Archive of each session to be available on WebJunction after event concludes.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
At least 20 of Georgia's public library systems will participate each year offered.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No
At least 10 libraries will submit video content to include for community building during the event.	Due to staffing and funding issues, the Virtual Library Staff Development Day program was not conducted during the FY2013-FY2015 period.	No

Table G-3. Georgia Library Research and Statistics Program

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Reduce number of edits in annual reports by 5% each year as evidence that the training sessions are improving compliance.	Anecdotal evidence that edits have been reduced.	Yes
Request number of library systems using statistical data with local stakeholders, and increase usage by 5% each year.	Anecdotal evidence that library systems are using the statistical data with local stakeholders.	Yes
Over 45 statistical reports delivered for various projects throughout Georgia. Increase statistical reports and publications for national/local audiences by 10% each year.	Over 66 statistical reports were delivered in FY2013, over 66 were delivered in FY2014, and over 45 were delivered in FY2015.	Yes
Develop maps for projects in Georgia using ArcGIS software to visually report on library programs and needs throughout Georgia.	Maps using ArcGIS software were developed in both FY2013 and FY2014.	Yes
Publish analyses in national journals highlighting Georgia's public library achievements.	No analyses were published.	No

Table G-4. GLASS, including AMLAS, Distribution Center, Outreach

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>Public Library Service to Individuals with Print Impairments</i>		
Use of Assistive Technology (AT) at public libraries by people with disabilities will increase by 50%.	Data regarding usage were not provided, but in FY2015, 63 video magnifiers, 126 handheld video magnifiers, 63 text-to-speech readers, and 5 audio amplifier systems were purchased for use in public libraries in Georgia.	Yes
After current use is determined, those with disabilities will increase visits to public libraries by 40%.	No data are available on the number of persons with disabilities who visit public libraries in Georgia.	N/A

Public library staff will implement accommodations when planning services and programs.	Anecdotal evidence that staff are implementing accommodations when planning services and programs. A 3-day Accessibility Conference in FY2015 was attended by 86 librarians. Instruction included how to implement accommodations when planning services and programs.	Yes
People with disabilities will participate in programs at local public libraries.	Anecdotal evidence that people with disabilities are participating in programs at local public libraries. The 3-day Accessibility Conference in FY2015 included instruction on how to encourage people with disabilities to participate in programs at local public libraries.	Yes
People with disabilities will access all library resources through the use of AT.	Anecdotal evidence that people with disabilities are accessing library resources through the use of AT. The 3-day Accessibility Conference in FY2015 included instruction on how to help people with disabilities access library resources through the use of AT.	Yes
GLASS Outreach		
A total of Two hundred (200) more outreach contacts by OAC staff.	A total of 1,349 outreach visits were made in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, with a total of 5,181 persons contacted in FY2015 alone.	Yes
Information tables and presentations at professional training programs will increase by 100%.	The number of outreach presentations increased from 26 in FY2012 to 304 in FY2015, an increase of 1,069%.	Yes
GLASS has 15,422 active patrons; Goal is to increase active patrons by 4% each year.	The number of active readers increased from 14,151 in FY2012 to 15,388 in FY2015, an increase of 9% or roughly 3% per year.	No
Provide 50% more information available for those eligible at public libraries.	In FY2015, GLASS made 266 posts on social media and published 18 editions of the GLASS newsletter, with 22,268 copies circulated.	Yes
Staff at public libraries will be better equipped to talk to eligible library users about talking books.	Anecdotal evidence that staff are better equipped to talk to eligible library users about talking books. The 3-day Accessibility Conference in FY2015 included instruction on how to talk to eligible library users about talking books.	Yes

Service providers will include information about talking books when consulting with eligible clients.	Anecdotal evidence that staff are including information about talking books when consulting with eligible clients. The 3-day Accessibility Conference in FY2015 included instruction on how to include information about talking books when consulting with eligible clients.	Yes
The general public will be more aware of the program.	Data not provided, but the most recent report from the NLS consultant noted that GLASS “has implemented a coordinated public awareness, education, and outreach plan for use in its service area.”	Yes
Increased number of patrons and increased number of inquiries.	Between December 2013 and December 2015, the number of walk-in customers increased 650% from 412 to 3,091, but the number of readers’ advisory inquiries increased 728% from 2,568 to 21,259.	Yes
Provide 75 locally-recorded local interest materials per year.	The recording studio did not become productive until FY2015.	No
Use of statewide and other media to increase awareness of GLASS services.	In FY2015, GLASS made 266 posts on social media and published 18 editions of the GLASS newsletter, with 22,268 copies circulated.	Yes
GLASS Distribution Center		
100% of the cassette collection will be returned to NLS by 2015.	GLASS followed NLS guidelines to keep two copies of its cassettes until 2016, when NLS gave permission to return the items.	N/A
100% of requested “Download Only” titles will be sent to patron within five (5) business days.	Downloadable items are available immediately.	Yes
75% of the digital book collection will be checked out to patrons at any given time.	This target is no longer meaningful in a cloud-based, digital environment.	N/A
95% of patrons will receive requested books within seven (7) business days.	Requested books are mailed on a same-day-as-requested basis.	Yes
AMLAS Program for Children and Youth		
Twelve (12) children will attend the first summer program;	Twenty-five students registered and completed the first summer reading program in FY2015.	Yes
15% increase in attendance in summer program each following year.	Fourteen students completed the program in FY2015, a decrease of 44%.	No

Use of BARD by children will increase by 10% each year.	BARD does not provide data based on the age of the user.	N/A
Use of the NLS braille collection by children will increase by 2% each year.	Data for braille usage by age is not available.	N/A
10% increase in children registered for the GLASS Network service each year.	The number of children registered for the GLASS Network service increased from 270 in FY2014 to 287 in FY2015, an increase of 6%.	No
Develop existing and build new partnerships with key stakeholder service providers.	Anecdotal evidence that existing partnerships have been maintained and that new partnerships have been developed.	Yes

Table G-5. HomePLACE

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Conduct activities to increase the public's and library staff awareness of HomePlace.	The new Digital Public Library of America Website, which includes HomePlace content, was unveiled in April 2013. In FY2013, HomePlace staff made presentations about HomePlace projects at several libraries and conferences.	Yes
Increase public use of HomePlace by 15%.	Data comparing public use of HomePlace is not available for the time period under consideration.	N/A
Add several historic newspapers from major population centers and smaller communities; add oral history projects; improve access to more media via digitization improvements.	In FY2014, HomePLACE undertook several newspaper digitization projects of both local and statewide interest: the initial phase of the massive Savannah Historic Newspapers Archive; the beginning of the North Georgia Historic Newspapers Archive; the Dooly County expansion project; and conversion of the Athens Historic Newspapers Archive to the new JPG2000 format.	Yes

Table G-6. IT, including Boot Camp, CIPA, Network, E-Rate, Edge, Services

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>Annual Extreme Learning Lab for Libraries, i.e., IT Boot Camp</i>		
Staff will gain proficiency in working with patrons and technology.	3-day IT Boot Camps were offered each year for FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015. Anecdotal evidence that staff who attended gained proficiency in working with patrons and technology.	Yes
Increased skill in using multimedia and apps to design learning solutions for library users.	Anecdotal evidence that staff who attended increased their skill in using multimedia and apps to design learning solutions for library users.	Yes
Increased knowledge of emerging technologies with implications for public libraries and their patrons.	Anecdotal evidence that staff who attended increased their knowledge of emerging technologies with implications for public libraries and their patrons.	Yes
More than 100 library staff will attend the learning lab.	86 staff attended in FY2013. 94 staff attended in FY2014. 105 staff attended in FY2015.	Yes
More than 50 library staff will virtually attend each keynote presentation broadcast from the event.	The ability to virtually attend the presentations was not implemented, because the site lacked adequate bandwidth.	N/A
More than 20 online resources will initially be shared by GPLS with the library community immediately after the event.	Targeted number of online resources were shared via the Techlib listserv immediately after the event.	Yes
More than 25 online resources that directly benefit patrons will be generated by attendees within one year of the event.	No data are available for the number of online resources of direct benefit to patrons that were generated by attendees within one year of the event.	N/A
We will change locations annually, and utilize the various state park lodges around the state, which serves the function of also boosting the local economy.	The Boot Camps were held annually at the same state park due to state procurement guidelines.	N/A
Speakers from the library IT world as well as from the broader IT industry will provide expertise, perspective, best practices and new ideas.	Speakers from the library IT world as well as from the broader IT industry were used.	Yes

Speakers from Georgia public libraries will also present current projects and best practices.	Speakers from Georgia public libraries did present current projects and best practices.	Yes
Edge Initiative		
No targets listed in the LSTA Five-Year Plan	In FY2014, 14 Georgia libraries completed the assessment in phase 1 of the project	N/A
Maintenance & Upgrade of a Statewide Wide Area Network (WAN)		
The Georgia Public Library Service will take advantage of a statewide economy of scale – more than 384 libraries in Georgia will utilize the service.	The statewide WAN was dismantled and a different approach was taken, because the cost of providing a 10-Mbps connection to every library was too great. Instead, 63 RFPs for local 3-year contracts were issued, and most of the 399 public libraries in the state have at least a 75- Mbps connection, with the average being 300 Mbps.	Yes
GPLS will realize a significant savings on behalf of Georgia's libraries by centrally managing and providing the statewide network, as opposed to 61 individual systems managing contracts individually.	The statewide WAN was dismantled, and even greater savings were realized by issuing local 3-year contracts.	Yes
Through the use of authentication for wired and wireless access, well over 13.3 million library patrons will utilize the broadband network.	In FY2015, 13.2 million public-access Internet computer sessions were used at Georgia's public libraries.	No
Libraries would realize a significant increase in bandwidth – the statewide Intranet will be increased to 6-8Mbps by 2014, and the Public Access network will increase to 20-50Mbps by 2014.	Most of the 399 public libraries in the state have at least a 75- Mbps connection, with the average being 300 Mbps.	Yes
Management of Hardware & Provision of Support for Statewide Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) Filtering		
384 public libraries in Georgia will be provided a centralized web filtering service in order to maintain compliance with the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA).	In FY2013, GPLS did provide centralized filtering using Actiance Unified Security Gateway software. In FY2014, GPLS switched to a server running Norton SmartFilter software. When the statewide WAN was dismantled, individual library systems became responsible for their own filtering, and GPLS ensured that filtering was included in the individual contracts for bandwidth provision.	Yes

<p>GPLS will complete a state-wide upgrade to library Internet point of presence locations, encompassing the (5) zoned Local Access and Transport Areas (LATAs) and the library systems within replacing the legacy filtering hardware with (5) Crossbeam network security chassis, utilizing Actiance Unified Security Gateway software.</p>	<p>In FY2013, GPLS did provide centralized filtering using Actiance Unified Security Gateway software. In FY2014, GPLS switched to a server running Norton SmartFilter software. When the statewide WAN was dismantled, individual library systems became responsible for their own filtering, and GPLS ensured that filtering was included in the individual contracts for bandwidth provision. GPLS also partnered with two companies – Crossbeam and Actiance – to put a system in place to provide filtering and better traffic management while the libraries were transitioning.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>GPLS will control appliance sprawl by consolidating the (10) existing appliances (“content engines”) into fewer new units, reducing administrative overhead.</p>	<p>Accomplished in FY2013.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>GPLS will greatly improve throughput performance, allowing implementation of dynamic content filtering and deep packet inspection rather than simple URL filtering. This addresses many of the web filtering loopholes in the current system.</p>	<p>Throughput performance has improved and dynamic content filtering and deep packet inspection have been implemented.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>GPLS will provide a unified threat management system, resulting in an increase in network security, mitigating many of the Internet threats that have emerged over recent years and ones to come.</p>	<p>While the statewide WAN was in place, a unified threat management system was provided. Threat management is now handled at the individual system level.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The upgrade will result in a more efficient use of bandwidth resources through mitigation of illicit traffic.</p>	<p>More efficient use of bandwidth resources through mitigation of illicit traffic has been realized.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Preparation & Management of Statewide E-Rate Program for Telecommunications/Internet Network</i></p>		
<p>GPLS will apply for E-rate discounts on managed telecomm service on behalf of all of the regional libraries with the exception of 2 systems, totaling 362 libraries.</p>	<p>In FY2013 and FY2014, GPLS applied for E-rate discounts on managed telecomm service on behalf of all but two regional systems, totaling 370 libraries. In FY2015, GPLS processed 237 ISP reimbursement requests for 385 libraries.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>GPLS will provide assistance and training for all Georgia Public Libraries in E-rate application preparation, in the form of workshops, online meetings, and documentation provided via the GPLS web presence.</p>	<p>Accomplished in all years, FY 2012, FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<i>Thin Client / Virtualization</i>		
<p>3-5 library systems will be chosen to pilot the virtualization of their public access computing areas.</p>	<p>Instead of using thin clients, GPLS provided Google Chrome Boxes and Chrome Books for 42 systems in FY2015, thereby increasing the state's public computing "footprint" by 47%</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Once rolled into production, every library system in Georgia would realize the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant reduction in replacement costs: instead of every 3-5 years, each client would need only be replaced every 5-8 years, resulting in a cost savings per machine of up to 100%. • Significant reduction in maintenance costs would be realized, since software application updates, virus scanning and patches can be executed on the server. • Significant reduction of information security risk: data and applications would be securely stored on the server. • Significant reduction of deployment costs: thin clients can be remotely configured and do not need to be set up individually. Break-fix simply requires replacing the thin client. 	<p>The Chrome Books represent a significant reduction in replacement costs, maintenance costs, information security risk, and deployment costs, particularly because the devices are hosted and configured from GPLS.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<i>Statewide Email Upgrade</i>		
<p>Upgrade of email service for 48 library systems in Georgia.</p>	<p>GPLS did provide Zimbra's email program on a statewide basis and, in FY2015, there were 2100 mailboxes on the hosted email server, serving 45 systems. GPLS has recently decided to migrate the libraries to Google for Work, which will provide an improved platform.</p>	<p>No</p>

Replacement of current system will result in incorporation of shared contacts/calendars/documents & advanced tagging & searching of data.	Public libraries now have access to shared contacts, calendars, and documents as well as advanced tagging and searching of data. These capabilities will improve with Google for Work.	Yes
Installing the email program Zimbra statewide, the upgrade will also align with the GPLS commitment to utilizing open-source software where it makes sense.	Zimbra is open source.	Yes
Geek Squad		
GPLS will employ at least (1) contractor per LATA (Local Access and Transport Area) to work in the field at individual library branches.	GPLS did not fill the position that would have implemented this project. A similar project (“Uber Tech”) is planned for the future.	N/A

Table G-7. LSTA Administration

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Work with state library staff to develop several types of different analyses to determine the direction of the state library administrative agency and the focus for their community stakeholders.	Ongoing	Yes
Complete the State Program Report and Financial Status Report and submit annually to IMLS	Completed in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015	Yes
Use the statistics to determine if the LSTA funding has helped the program administrators to increase the use of their services.	Ongoing	Yes
Survey community stakeholders to determine improvement.	Annual and periodic surveys are conducted for several projects, including GLASS Outreach, PINES, IT Boot Camp, IT Technology Loaner Kits, and HomePLACE.	Yes
Increase number of anecdotal reports to IMLS about LSTA funded programs in Georgia.	Ongoing	Yes
Publish LSTA program innovations in national journals highlighting Georgia's public library achievements.	None	No

Table G-8. PINES Project

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>PINES U</i>		
More than 100 to 175 staff members will attend online training sessions.	The PINES U courses have averaged 120 participants.	Yes
Archived training recordings will be presented online with a minimum expected viewing of 400 views.	The 16 PINES-related videos on the GPLS YouTube channel have 768 views.	Yes
More than 2.7 million active library users will be able to view online education products.	The PINES U courses were focused on staff, not patrons.	N/A
Moving PINES trainings into online format will result in a 3000% increase in direct training recipient (735 staff members trained via live and archived online sessions versus 20 per face-to-face session) resulting in an increase of a minimum expected 100,000 trained patrons.	The PINES U courses have averaged 120 participants, more than the average of 20 per face-to-face session.	Yes
PINES U will result in a greater number of PINES library staff directly trained by GPLS staff.	The PINES U courses have averaged 120 participants, more than the average of 20 per face-to-face session.	Yes
PINES U will result in increased confidence in using the software and applying PINES policy.	Anecdotal evidence that staff are more confident in using the software and applying PINES policy.	Yes
PINES U will result in a significant cost savings to GPLS and the PINES libraries as compared to the expense of travel for in-person trainings.	By eliminating the need for staff to be reimbursed for travel, online training has been more cost-effective.	Yes
In the case of RDA training and the catalogers, PINES catalogers will feel more confident working with RDA records and feel prepared for the impending PINES implementation of this new standard.	The PINES cataloging coordinator provided RDA training for PINES libraries and opened it to non-PINES staff. GPLS purchased the RDA online toolkit and the Catalogers' Desktop for all public libraries.	Yes
Increased knowledge of cataloging rules and standards.	Anecdotal evidence that knowledge of cataloging rules and standards has increased.	Yes
Speakers from specialized topical areas will provide expertise, perspective, best practices and new ideas.	A cataloging conference, with speakers from specialized topical areas, was provided.	Yes

Speakers from Georgia public libraries will also present current projects and best practices.	The cataloging conference included speakers from Georgia public libraries.	Yes
<i>PINES Development – Mobile App, Holds Module, Reports and Acquisitions</i>		
The Georgia Public Library Service will take advantage of a statewide economy of scale to develop a mobile application and software developments that can be used by all PINES member libraries.	Rather than develop a mobile app, GPLS implemented a mobile-friendly, ADA-compliant Website that adjusts to screen size. There were substantial cost savings with this approach vs developing and maintaining an app.	Yes
Development of a mobile app will result in increased use of the library services and materials.	PINES circulation declined by 14% from 2011 to 2014.	No
Encourages research, personal knowledge and educational entertainment among Georgia's citizens.	Over 2.3 million Georgia citizens are PINES cardholders.	Yes
PINES libraries will require fewer helpdesk calls for assistance.	Anecdotal evidence that fewer helpdesk calls are required.	Yes
Project will result in improved library services to our customers.	The percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with PINES rose from 91.7% in 2012 to 92.9% in 2014.	Yes
Improved productivity for library staff; Staff will be able to manage, review, locate, and price item for possible acquisition.	Between FY2012 and FY2015, PINES operational costs averaged about \$1.4 million each year. By contrast, it would cost approximately \$20 million to replace PINES with individual automation systems for the current member library systems and GPLS, as well as the approximately \$5 million per year to maintain those systems over time. GPLS staff estimate that PINES has saved Georgia's public libraries more than \$11 million in one-time costs and, exclusive of staff salaries, nearly \$61.5 million in ongoing costs over the 10-year period of the consortium's existence.	Yes
Staff and patrons will be able to access bibliographic and item records more readily; Staff will be able to provide accurate financials; PINES libraries staff will be able to accomplish tasks more readily.	The percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that they typically find what they are looking for using the PINES online catalog rose from 91.7% in 2012 to 92.9% in 2014.	Yes

The PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey results will show more satisfaction (and absence of complaints) about accessing, finding and obtaining library materials.	The percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend PINES to their friends rose from 94.9% in 2012 to 96.7% in 2014.	Yes
<i>PINES Database Clean-Up Projects</i>		
Database clean-up projects will result in fewer but more effective search results.	Database clean-up was completed in FY2014.	Yes
Less staff intervention will be needed to assist patrons in using the software effectively; Patrons will be more comfortable with searching and using the PINES catalog and understand search results more readily.	Patron satisfaction with the PINES catalog, as measured by the percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that it was easy to use the PINES online catalog, rose from 84.2% in 2013 to 91.7% in 2014.	Yes
The multi-part cleanup will result in improved search return speed and more accurate records for statistical reports.	Anecdotal evidence that search return speed has improved and that more accurate records are available for statistical reports.	Yes
A clean patron database will allow more efficient searching by PINES library staff and prevent duplication of records.	The number of bibliographic records decreased from 1.9 million to 1.7 million due to the matching and merging of duplicate records, and the percentage of records that are OCLC records increased from 60% to 75%.	Yes
The PINES patron database will be more precise, increasing overall staff efficiency and enable better customer service to PINES patrons by decreasing staff workflow time and effort.	The number of bibliographic records decreased from 1.9 million to 1.7 million due to the matching and merging of duplicate records, and the percentage of records that are OCLC records increased from 60% to 75%.	Yes
The PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey results will show more satisfaction (and absence of complaints) about accessing, finding and obtaining library materials.	Patron satisfaction with the PINES catalog, as measured by the percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that it was easy to use the PINES online catalog, rose from 84.2% in 2013 to 91.7% in 2014.	Yes
<i>PINES Courier Service</i>		
GPLS will take advantage of a statewide economy of scale to transfer library materials to 385 library facilities via delivery to regional headquarters libraries.	In FY2015, the PINES courier service provided 2.7 million transits, representing 15.5 million items and 632,540 ILL transactions among 285 libraries.	Yes

GPLS will realize a significant savings on behalf of Georgia's libraries by centrally managing and providing the statewide courier service as opposed to libraries paying individual postage costs to send items via US postal service or other commercial carrier.	GPLS staff estimate that the cost of the PINES courier service is about \$740,000 per year, which is less than the \$1.8 million that the USPS was charging.	Yes
Libraries patrons will continue to realize efficient and cost effective delivery of materials to their local library making the borrowing of materials from across the state a seamless process.	Patron satisfaction with the PINES courier service, as measured by the percentage of respondents to the PINES Annual Satisfaction Survey who agreed or strongly agreed that it was easy to find and obtain items not owned locally through the PINES system, rose from 85.3% in 2013 to 89.9% in 2014.	Yes
Encourages research, personal knowledge and educational entertainment among Georgia's citizens.	Over 2.3 million Georgia citizens are PINES cardholders.	Yes

Table G-9. Prime Time

Target	Actual	Target Met?
150 family participants attending sessions.	Attendance totaled 10,163 in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.	Yes
100 new library cards issued.	325 new cards were issued in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.	Yes
96 books read/discussed.	340 books were discussed in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.	Yes
10 PRIME TIME series held in GA.	34 series were held in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.	Yes
Families' attitude toward the library as a positive community resource improves.	In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, 100% of respondents expressed an improved awareness of library resources.	Yes
Families demonstrate an improved attitude toward reading and learning.	In FY2013, 92% of parents demonstrated an enhanced sense of their roles as educators. In FY2014 and FY2015, 100% did so.	Yes
Families demonstrate an increased level of family interactions.	No data are available on the percentage of respondents indicating an increased level of family interactions.	N/A

Table G-10. Professional Library Services (i.e., Professional Collection)

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Increased circulation by 10%.	Circulation through PINES and World Share ILL increased by 25% between FY2013 and FY2014 but decreased by 57% between FY2014 and FY2015.	No
Increased awareness of the specialized collections to the broader library community.	The number of reference questions answered decreased by 13% between FY2013 and FY2015, although these increased by 48% between FY2014 and FY2015.	No

Table G-11. Resource Sharing

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>GALILEO Training, Marketing, Enhancement, Alternate Reality Game</i>		
Increased media exposure for GALILEO and libraries to the public.	The number of links to databases through GALILEO increased by 51.2%, from 214,057 in FY2012 to 323,657 in FY2015.	Yes
Increased multiple literacy skills in participants.	No data are available on the literacy skill levels of GALILEO participants.	N/A
Increased proficiency in navigating GALILEO for participants.	No data are available on the navigational skill levels of GALILEO participants.	N/A
More than 200 Georgia library cardholders will actively participate in the online game.	The online game was not created.	No
More than 100 user submissions will be uploaded during the game.	The online game was not created.	No
More than 200 people will follow the game via social media.	The online game was not created.	No
Increase searching use of GALILEO by 15%/year by contributing to a discovery layer service.	The number of links to databases through GALILEO increased by 51.2%, from 214,057 in FY2012 to 323,657 in FY2015.	Yes
Increase public library staff awareness (and therefore public use) of GALILEO by changing /contributing to changes of the database interfaces / aggressive use of express links.	GALILEO provides an ongoing program of continuing education for library staff, primarily through Webinars and a User Group conference. 124 librarians attended the last User Group conference.	Yes

Increase the public's awareness, interest and use of GALILEO by creating and assisting in the creation of creative self-paced training.	GALILEO provides an ongoing program of continuing education for the public, primarily through Webinars.	Yes
<i>GALILEO: Flexible Web Conferencing for Staff and Patron Training</i>		
Increased media exposure for GALILEO and libraries to the public.	No data are available on the level of media exposure for GALILEO, although GALILEO staff do provide different marketing strategies for library staff and for the public.	N/A
Increased literacy skills.	No data are available on the literacy skill levels of GALILEO participants.	N/A
Increased proficiency in navigating GALILEO for participants.	No data are available on the navigational skill levels of GALILEO participants.	N/A
<i>GALILEO: Discovery Layer</i>		
GPLS will participate in an environmental scan to determine the best product for library patrons.	GALILEO has used Ebsco's EDF discovery layer since 2009.	Yes
GPLS will partner with the Board of Regents in decisions on the best use of the product such as policy, navigation, usability and branding.	GALILEO has used Ebsco's EDF discovery layer since 2009.	Yes
The Discovery layer will drive traffic to the GALILEO databases, with a projected increase in use of 15% each year after implementation.	The number of links to databases through GALILEO increased by 51.2%, from 214,057 in FY2012 to 323,657 in FY2015.	Yes
<i>GOLD</i>		
Every library, regardless of size or type that participates in-network, shares resources for free, saving over \$400K/year in normal out-of-network fees.	In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, over 140,000 items were loaned by over 200 Georgia libraries through GOLD. This represented a savings of over \$2.8 million.	Yes
GPLS responsibly leverages OCLC training for all, and Georgia residents have access to a wider range of materials than they might otherwise.	In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, over 140,000 items were loaned by over 200 Georgia libraries through GOLD.	Yes
Eliminates costs to individual libraries to participate.	Costs for individual libraries to participate in OCLC training were eliminated.	Yes

OCLC Group Services		
Unlimited cataloging means that libraries don't have to meter their searches.	In FY2014 and FY2015, Georgia's public libraries added over 414,000 WorldCat records to their local catalogs, input over 5,600 new WorldCat records, and corrected approximately 22,000 existing records.	Yes
Facilitates greater copy cataloging statewide; lessens need for as much original cataloging.	OCLC access facilitates copy cataloging statewide.	Yes
Includes free batch-loading of records, saving staff time from individual record loading.	OCLC access includes batch loading.	Yes
Allows greater cataloging facilitation from GPLS; many systems don't have a full-time cataloger.	GPLS pays for OCLC access – ILL and cataloging – for the public library systems in GA, which includes the cost of both ILL and cataloging.	Yes
Eliminates costs to individual library systems.	Costs to individual library systems have been eliminated.	Yes
RDA		
GPLS responsibly leverages the coordination of cataloging training for all public libraries state-wide including forthcoming RDA.	In FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, a statewide subscription provided 90 users and served all 63 systems as well as State Library.	Yes

Table G-12. Resource Sharing – STEAM and STEM

Target	Actual	Target Met?
No targets listed in the LSTA Five-Year Plan	Funding was provided in FY2014 and FY2015 for all systems to enhance STEM materials, supplies, computers, software, and robotic equipment. In addition, funding for STEAM resources was provided in FY2015 for 37 libraries. In FY2015, 3,000 print materials, 225 pieces of hardware, 20 software, 7500 print materials, and 275 electronic materials were acquired. No data were provided for FY2014.	N/A

Table G-13. Strategic Partnerships

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Our goal in the coming five years is to nurture and expand our current programs, while pursuing additional partnership opportunities around the state that will increase library use and educational opportunities for Georgia citizens as we save them additional millions of dollars.	In FY2013, the Strategic Partnerships project added the Georgia GoFish Education Center, and in FY2014, the Center for Puppetry Arts, Atlanta Braves “Home Run Readers” were added. In FY2015, the project estimated that its individual partnerships had saved Georgia citizens \$11.5 million in 10 years.	Yes
We hope that our just-begun relationship with VSA Arts of Georgia will show that partnerships can pay dividends and increase traffic for our LSTA-supported GLASS Talking Book Libraries as well as traditional facilities.	The partnership with VSA Arts of Georgia began in September 2011. Arts for ALL Gallery/VSA Arts of Georgia provided two exhibits at Georgia’s Talking Book Libraries in each of FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.	Yes

Table G-14. Summer Reading Program

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Increased program attendance.	Program attendance did increase from 442,849 in FY2012 to 444,078 in FY2015, an increase of 0.3%.	Yes
Increased media attention.	No evidence was provided.	No
More families join SRP.	The number of children, teens, and adults registered for the Summer Reading Program declined, from 285,827 in FY2012 to 212,279 in FY2015, a decrease of 26%.	No
Increased children’s circulation.	The number of books read as part of the Summer Reading Program declined, from 2,651,744 in FY2012 to 2,168,272 in FY2015, a decrease of 18%.	No

Table G-15. WebJunction Georgia

Target	Actual	Target Met?
Increased comfort in working with changing customer needs.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A
Increased sharing of documents, resources and best practices between libraries.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A
Increased collaboration between libraries.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A
10% increase in registered users.	In FY2014, there were 3714 member affiliations with WebJunction, but comparable data were not provided for FY2013.	N/A
25% increase in active users as defined by WebJunction.	In FY2014, there were 581 active users per month with WebJunction, but comparable data were not provided for FY2013.	N/A
10% increase in user-submitted content.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A
25% increase in documents and resources shared on WJ by various GPLS departments.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A
5% increase in average monthly web traffic on the WJGA site.	WebJunction was eventually replaced by the Georgia Learning Center, which was not LSTA funded.	N/A

Table G-16. Youth Services, including the Clifford Tour

Target	Actual	Target Met?
<i>Conferences, training and travel</i>		
250 public library staff will attend the 8 quadrant meetings	Training was provided to youth services librarians but not as quadrant meetings. Instead, GPLS focused on virtual training, providing at least six Webinars in FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015, attended by 427 individuals. In addition, 275 individuals attended workshops at the annual COMO conferences.	Yes
Users will make informed decisions when planning library programs for children and teens	Anecdotal evidence that informed decisions are being made	Yes
<i>B4 (Birth-to-four) Early Literacy Initiative</i>		
800 library staff and childcare providers will attend early literacy strategies training	Program implemented as IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA	N/A
60% of participants will translate early literacy strategies into their parent training	Program implemented as IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA	N/A
50% of participating libraries' parent-toddler/infant story times will incorporate early literacy strategies into their programming	Program implemented as IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA	N/A
80% of attendees will report increased awareness of early literacy	Program implemented as IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA	N/A
2400 library-staff led story times (over a period of six weeks) will be modeled for caregivers and children in child-care environments statewide	Program implemented as IMLS National Leadership Grant, not LSTA	N/A
<i>Storytime Outreach to Children in Out-of-Home Care</i>		
100 childcare centers	Program not implemented due to changes in GPLS personnel.	No
600 storytimes	Program not implemented due to changes in GPLS personnel.	No
12,000 children served	Program not implemented due to changes in GPLS personnel.	No
Childcare providers will report increased understanding of the importance of reading to young children	Program not implemented due to changes in GPLS personnel.	No

Childcare providers will see the library as a positive community resource	Program not implemented due to changes in GPLS personnel.	No
<i>Clifford Tour</i>		
No targets listed in the LSTA Five-Year Plan	In FY2013, 16 programs were presented with a total attendance of 825. In FY2014, 13 programs were presented with a total attendance of 1,245.	N/A

Appendix H

Recommendations

The Georgia Public Library Service has done an effective job of leveraging the use of LSTA funds over the years under review to support significant improvements and changes in library services in the state of Georgia. Nevertheless, improvements in the use of LSTA funds to support library services and in the measurement of program outputs and outcomes can be made, and this evaluation provides the following recommendations.

1. **Awareness.** The survey of public library staff members in Georgia found that many library staff did not understand the scope and breadth of LSTA funding in the state and how those program choices relate to federal priorities.

Of the 14 projects listed on the survey, more than half the respondents reported being familiar with only six. The least familiarity was found for the Communications (32 per cent), Prime Time (35 per cent), and Library Research and Statistics (35 per cent) projects. Comments from survey respondents included “I do wish I knew more about these projects,” “I wish information about all of these things were available to people outside of a region or at the management level,” “I am aware that GPLS provides education and training for YS staff, however, I did not know that it was part of a project,” and “It should be the goal of GPLS to spend some time marketing these services to those who could use them.”

During the next LSTA planning effort, GPLS may want to promote better awareness of its use of LSTA funds so that public library staff members, library partners, policy makers, and other stakeholders understand the breadth and impact of LSTA-funded initiatives.

Increased awareness may also improve the level of satisfaction with LSTA-funded projects. For example, the survey of public library staff members in Georgia asked respondents to indicate their libraries’ level of satisfaction with various projects. Of the five lowest rated projects – Youth Services (23 per cent of respondents reported being very satisfied with the project), Professional Library Services (31 per cent), Communications (34 per cent), Prime Time (34 per cent), and GLASS (39 per cent) – all but one (GLASS) were also rated low on

the percentage of respondents who were familiar with the project. If library staff members are more aware of what the projects have achieved, their satisfaction with the projects may also increase.

2. **Evaluation.** The targets established for the various projects in the GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan have been useful, for the most part. However, the evaluation of LSTA-funded projects in Georgia could be improved in two ways: by improving some of the targets and objectives used in the Five-Year Plan; and by including more focus on outcomes-based evaluation.

Some targets in the current Five-Year Plan were difficult, if not impossible, to measure. For example, one of the targets for the GLASS project was “After current use is determined, those with disabilities will increase visits to public libraries by 40%.” It is likely impossible that the number of individuals with disabilities who visit public libraries in Georgia could be determined. Consequently, only anecdotal evidence is available to judge whether this target was met. Another target for the GLASS project was “Use of BARD by children will increase by 10% each year.” However, BARD does not provide data based on the age of the user, and so that target could not be evaluated.

Other targets were vague. For example, one of the targets for the GLASS project was, “Public library staff will implement accommodations when planning services and programs.” However, no mechanism was set up to measure the extent to which these accommodations were implemented, and again, only anecdotal evidence is available to judge whether this target was met.

Other targets were not fully developed. For example, one of the targets for the Virtual Library Staff Development Day was “Increased comfort in working with changing customer needs.” However, there was no indication as to how this increased comfort was to be measured (for example, through a survey of participants at some point after the event) nor what level of improvement was targeted.

The GPLS staff should consider ways to improve the targets and objectives associated with projects in its next Five-Year Plan. The targets and objectives could be improved by establishing more realistic, measurable targets and identifying specific indicators for the targets; by establishing specific data sources for each target; by specifying measures for the

change desired in these outputs or outcomes; and by gathering the benchmark data needed to ensure that these targets can be properly assessed. Not only would the improved use of outputs and outcomes by GPLS likely improve its own operations and the use of LSTA funds; it would also model good behavior for other libraries in the state.

GPLS should consider also training library staff members in Georgia and GPLS staff on Outcomes-Based Evaluation. Admittedly, OBE is not an easy to concept to grasp, and staff members will likely need continuing education and assistance in this area. GPLS might establish measures and metrics for evaluating projects and might even create template data collection instruments for grant recipients, with instructions on how to perform data collection and analysis.

3. **Grants Process.** For the most part, the process of managing the LSTA funds in Georgia appears to work very well. However, a few survey respondents noted some problems with the grants process, and GPLS staff should examine these concerns and adjust the grants process where possible.

For example, respondents noted that the timeline for subgrants, like the STEM and STEAM Projects, was too short. One survey respondent noted, “Single Rural systems with essentially 1 full time professional do not have enough time to put together a STEAM grant proposal with such a fast-approaching deadline as you've given the past few years. Give us more time!!!!” Another said, “Need more time for these grants - more time to obtain materials and to evaluate success before grant report is due.” A focus group member added that “More time is needed to plan the grant programs and to purchase resources and services associated with them.” Providing more time between the announcement of grant availability and the due date for applications would likely help libraries, particularly smaller libraries with fewer staff to devote to grants writing, develop stronger applications.

Other issues involved the time required for reimbursements and the need for assistance with grants writing. One focus group member said that “Reimbursements sometimes take too long,” and another asked for “examples of successful grant applications or better models of successful grant programs” to help local libraries with their grants writing. Assistance to libraries with the application and management process, in particular, is likely to be a

continuing need. The GPLS staff should consider more training in grants writing (which could be helpful to libraries seeking outside funding from sources beyond LSTA).

4. **Build on strengths.** The survey of public library staff members in Georgia asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with the various projects that they were familiar with. On four projects, over half of the respondents said that they were very satisfied: Strategic Partnerships (58 per cent of respondents reported being very satisfied), Statewide Network Management and E-Rate Support (56 per cent), IT Tech Boot Camp (55 per cent), and PINES (54 per cent). GPLS staff are to be commended for their efforts in these areas and are encouraged to build on these strengths by continuing to support these projects.
5. **Opportunities for improvement.** When the survey of public library staff members in Georgia asked respondents to rate their satisfaction with the various projects that they were familiar with, the five projects with the lowest satisfaction ratings were Youth Services (only 23 per cent of respondents reported being very satisfied), Professional Library Services (31 per cent), Communications (34 per cent), Prime Time (34 per cent), and GLASS (39 per cent). GPLS staff are encouraged to further investigate why these projects received lower satisfaction ratings. In several cases, new staff members have recently taken over these projects and implemented new ideas that may improve their reception by the library community. An improved awareness campaign to make library staff members throughout the state more familiar with these projects and their accomplishments may also help.
6. **Next Five-Year Plan.** As the GPLS staff begin drafting the next LSTA Five-Year Plan, they are encouraged to involve as many stakeholders as possible and to consider the ideas that were shared on the survey of public library staff members, the focus groups, and the staff interviews.

Given the diverse needs faced by public libraries and their users throughout the state of Georgia, a wide-ranging conversation that involves as many stakeholders as possible should be part of the process of drafting the next LSTA Five-Year Plan. Stakeholders can not only provide the GPLS staff with good ideas for inclusion in the next plan, but their involvement in the planning process will also improve the likelihood that they are aware of and support the projects from the plan that is developed.

The survey of public library staff members in Georgia asked respondents to identify needs or program for the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. As Table E-104 in Appendix E shows, 25 respondents provided suggestions. There were few common threads among the suggestions, but the comments should provide GPLS staff with some ideas to consider for the next LSTA Five-Year Plan.

Input from members of the December 8, 2016, focus group is included in Appendix F and should provide ideas for the next LSTA Five-Year Plan. Focus group members were asked to identify the parts of the GPLS LSTA program that have been successful, to make suggestions for improving current GPLS LSTA activities, and to share ideas for the next GPLS LSTA Five-Year Plan. In general, focus group participants were particularly interested in projects that foster collaboration and projects that support or build the institutional capacity of local libraries.

Several GPLS staff members reported having “wish lists,” and these should be taken into consideration as well. Among the ideas mentioned in interviews with GPLS staff were hiring an in-house developer for PINES; developing the capability for online patron registration and renewal; implementing a PINES-wide collection service for overdues; enabling HomePLACE to focus on audio recordings or video recordings that public libraries may have; enabling HomePLACE to help public libraries with the curation, weeding, and selection of vertical file materials; making *Current Look* (the annual report of statistics on Georgia’s public libraries) more visual, e.g., through the use of infographics; helping individual library staff members learn to manipulate the data collected annually by the Library Research and Statistics Program; and making e-books available through the Professional Library.