An Independent Evaluation
Of
Oklahoma's Implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to State Programs
2013 - 2017

Prepared by
Carson Block Consulting, Inc
and
Himmel & Wilson Library Consultants
March 2017

Commissioned by Susan McVey, Director
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
State of Oklahoma

The Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is the primary source of federal support for the nation's 123,000 libraries and 35,000 museums. Our mission has been to inspire libraries and museums to advance innovation, lifelong learning, and cultural and civic engagement. For the past 20 years, our grant making, policy development, and research has helped libraries and museums deliver valuable services that make it possible for communities and individuals to thrive.

Table of Contents

EVALUATION SUMMARY **3**
A. Retrospective Questions 4
B. Process Questions 6
C. Methodology Questions 7

EVALUATION REPORT **8**
Goal 1 EVALUATION 10
Goal 2 EVALUATION 14
Goal 3 EVALUATION 21
Goal 4 EVALUATION 23
Goal 5 EVALUATION 29
B. Process Questions 32
C. Methodology Questions 33

Appendices **35**
Appendix A: Evaluation Methodology 36
Appendix B: List of Acronyms 40
Appendix C: LSTA FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures 41
Appendix D: LSTA FFY 2013 -FFY 2015 Expenditures (Detail) 42
All Programs 42
Goal 1 43
Goal 2 43
Goal 3 43
Goal 4 43
Goal 5 44
Appendix E: Oklahoma LSTA Target Population Summary 45
Appendix F: Oklahoma - Measuring Success Table 46
Appendix G: List of People Interviewed 47
Appendix H: Web Survey Instrument 49
Appendix I: Web Survey Summary 63
Appendix J: Oklahoma LSTA Evaluation Web Survey Report 65
Appendix K: Bibliography of all documents reviewed 72
Appendix L: Select Focus Group Summaries 73
Claremore Library - General LSTA Service Focus Group 73
Literacy Focus Group 77

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Given Oklahoma's 2015 estimated population of 3,911,338, the state's annual Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States [1] allotment of approximately $2 million per year translates into $0.54 person on an annual basis. LSTA funds alone are obviously inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Oklahoma residents. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries' (ODL) challenge has been to find ways to make $0.54 per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services.

In the opinion of the evaluators, ODL has been remarkably successful in accomplishing this task through a combination of the careful selection of projects that match the needs of the state's libraries, concerted efforts to maximize the impact of projects and activities by linking them together, leveraging productive, mutually-beneficial partnerships and, last, but certainly not least, through the hard work by a shrinking, but extremely devoted state library administrative agency (SLAA) staff.

ODL's LSTA program has had an impact in several of the Institute of Museum and Library Services and focal areas, most notably in the **Information Access** and **Institutional Capacity** areas. Furthermore, the evaluators find that ODL's categorization of projects probably understate the impact of the LSTA program in the **Lifelong Learning** area. This is primarily because some of the state's literacy efforts are assigned to the "improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources" intent under **Information Access**. This does not represent an inappropriate placement of projects; rather it reflects the fact that literacy impacts many different aspects of life.

There are five goals in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' LSTA Five-Year Plan for 2013 – 2017. They are:

Goal 1: Information Access, Lifelong Learning & Human Services
Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations.

Goal 2: Information Access
In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries will assist communities obtain these resources.

Goal 3: Employment and Economic Development, Civic Engagement, and Human Services
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.

Goal 4: Lifelong Learning, Human Services
Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills.

Goal 5: Capacity Building
ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to ensure they have the resources, tools, and methods necessary to deliver effective services to communities.

Oklahoma also established a total of fifteen (15) objectives under the five goals. This summary presents findings and the accomplishments of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries in implementing their Plan at the goal level. In the body of the evaluation, details will be provided supporting the conclusions that are reached regarding whether goals have been achieved, partly achieved or not achieved based on the objectives as well.

---

[1] For brevity's sake, this report will simply use LSTA to refer to the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States program throughout this evaluation.

A. Retrospective Questions

A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' 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?

As part of the evaluation process, the consultants asked key Oklahoma Department of Libraries' staff closely associated with the LSTA program to offer their personal appraisal of progress on each of the five goals included in ODL's 2013-2017 five-year plan. In the self-assessment, ODL's internal appraisal was mixed with some individuals differing in their opinions as to whether ODL has achieved or partly achieved individual goals (no one offered a NOT ACHIEVED rating on any of the goals). All, including the evaluators, agreed that ODL has ACHIEVED Goal 2 and only PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 5. Staff were split on Goals 1, 3, and 4. Based on an examination of information and data from a variety of sources, the evaluators conclude that ODL has ACHIEVED Goals 1, 2, and 4 and that the SLAA has PARTLY ACHIEVED Goals 3 and 5.

Table 1 offers a summary of both the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' internal assessments and the evaluators' conclusions.

Table 1 – Oklahoma Department of Libraries' and Evaluators' Assessment of Progress

Goal	Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Assessment	Evaluator's Assessment
Goal 1: Information Access, Lifelong Learning & Human Services *Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations.*	Partly Achieved/ Achieved	Achieved
Goal 2: Information Access *In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries will assist communities obtain these resources.*	Achieved	Achieved
Goal 3: Employment and Economic Development, Civic Engagement, and Human Services *The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.*	Partly Achieved/ Achieved	Partly Achieved
Goal 4: Lifelong Learning, Human Services *Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills.*	Partly Achieved/ Achieved	Achieved
Goal 5: Capacity Building *ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to ensure they have the resources, tools, and methods necessary to deliver effective services to communities.*	Partly Achieved	Partly Achieved

Goal 1: Information Access, Lifelong Learning & Human Services - ACHIEVED
Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations.

The evaluators find one compelling reason to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 1. It is:

1. The projects undertaken in support of Goal 1 address physical infrastructure needs in two ways (assessment and remediation) as well as efforts to better prepare library staff to deal with ever changing technologies. The integration of programs ranging from EDGE to Small Library Technology Grants is exceptional and effective.

Goal 2: Information Access - ACHIEVED
In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries will assist communities obtain these resources.

The evaluators find two compelling reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 2. They are:

1. The ongoing support for the Statewide Databases project (Oklahoma Digital Prairie) is probably sufficient in and of itself to qualify Goal 2 for an ACHIEVED rating.
2. ODL's considerable effort to support resource sharing among the state's libraries solidifies this rating. ODL goes above and beyond to ensure that small libraries with very limited resources can fully participate in interlibrary loan and other sharing activities

Goal 3: Employment and Economic Development, Civic Engagement, and Human Services - PARTIALLY ACHIEVED
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.

The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has only PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 3. They are:

1. The primary limiting factor in judging that Goal 3 has not fully been achieved is the fact that there has been limited activity under this goal. Only one project (Immigration and Citizenship) has been funded under this goal.

2. The evaluators' rationale for determining that the goal has been PARTLY ACHIEVED comes from the considerable evidence that the spirit of Goal 3 pervades many other areas of ODL's LSTA program. ODL's literacy efforts are exemplary in establishing mutually-beneficial alliances that deliver tremendous value to the public.

Goal 4: Lifelong Learning, Human Services - ACHIEVED
Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills.

The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 4. They are:

1. As has already been mentioned, the evaluators find that Oklahoma's efforts in the area of literacy are truly exceptional. In fact, based on experience working with more than two dozen SLAAs and being aware of the activities of most of the rest, we would venture to say that Oklahoma is THE model among SLAAs in this field. Given that literacy is such an essential part of success in most life pursuits, ODL's projects and activities qualify for an ACHIEVED rating.

2. The other compelling factor for assigning an ACHIEVED rating to Goal 4 is the exceptional degree to which ODL integrates its LSTA-funded program. The combination of literacy, health literacy and summer reading in ODL's implementation of its Summer Reading project is both intriguing and a model worthy of replication.

Goal 5: Capacity Building - PARTIALLY ACHIEVED
ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to ensure they have the resources, tools, and methods necessary to deliver effective services to communities.

The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has only PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 5. They are:

1. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries finds itself in a time of transition in regard to staff development and continuing education. Staff losses have placed practical limits on what can be achieved in an environment where constant change means that standing still is going backwards. ODL is quite aware of the ways in which in-house capacity has been diminished. Staff development efforts are ongoing, but are not as robust as they once were. However, ODL is doing several things right. They have expanded opportunities for virtual participation in staff development activities and they are close to completing the redevelopment of a staff development curriculum that will guide them in the coming years.

2. A real bright spot in staff development efforts is the Computer Lab project. While this effort is also impacted by staffing limitations, the range of topics covered and the responsiveness of the program to the needs of local libraries is very good. There is real achievement on this front.

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

Appendix F shows that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA program has been most successful in addressing the intents falling under the INFORMATION ACCESS, and INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY categories. It can also be argued that ODL's coding of LSTA projects understates the impact of its literacy efforts in the LIFELONG LEARNING focal area. This is not to suggest that these projects have been categorized inappropriately. It simply underscores the fact that literacy impact many facets of life.

A-3. Did any of the groups identified by IMLS as target audiences represent a substantial focus of Oklahoma's Five-Year LSTA Plan activities? (Yes/No)

None of the targeted audiences reach the 10% expenditure threshold established by IMLS as representing a substantial focus. This is primarily due to the fact that neither of the two largest projects carried out in support of the 2013 – 2017 Plan (Statewide Databases and Resource Sharing), which together account for over forty-six percent (46.04% of total LSTA expenditures, target any of the identified groups. It should be noted that both the Digital Prairie project and the Resource Sharing project clearly benefit many in the identified groups.

B. Process Questions

B-1. How has the Oklahoma Department of Libraries used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan?
ODL has used information obtained from the SPR and elsewhere to design new projects that respond to the needs of libraries in the state. Early literacy projects, STEM, Website Development, and the Computer Lab projects are all examples.

ODL has also used feedback from the evaluations of LSTA projects reported in the SPR to increase or decrease the scale of projects in terms of eligible libraries, amount of funding, and project length.

B-2. Specify any changes the Oklahoma Department of Libraries made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred.

No formal changes or amendments were made to the Plan since it was submitted to IMLS in 2012.

B-3. How and with whom has the Oklahoma Department of Libraries shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources?

Data from LSTA projects has been shared with local public librarians, with the Public Library Director's Council, institution librarians, school librarians, as well as with literacy coordinators from around the state. Statistics and stories drawn from the SPR are also shared with Oklahoma legislators and with the general public on the ODL website, in the Annual Report and on other printed materials produced by ODL.

C. Methodology Questions

C-1. Identify how ODL implemented an independent Five-Year Evaluation using the criteria described in the section of this guidance document called Selection of Evaluators.
To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation, ODL issued a Request for Quotation (RFQ) on July 6, 2016 inviting qualified parties to submit a proposal for carrying out the evaluation.

As a result of the competitive bid process, Carson Block Consulting Inc, a library consulting firm, was awarded the contract to conduct the independent evaluation. Carson Block Consulting does not have a role in carrying out LSTA-funded activities and is independent of those who are being evaluated or who might be favorably or adversely affected by the evaluation results. Carson Block Consulting has in depth evaluation experience and demonstrated professional competency in that associate consultant, Bill Wilson, of Himmel & Wilson Library Consultants, has implemented more than 29 evaluation studies for the three previous cycles of LSTA evaluation starting in 2003. The associate is also experienced in both quantitative and qualitative methods. Carson Block is a well-known library consultant who is highly experienced in the areas of library technology, planning, facilities, and operations.

C-2. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation.
Carson Block Consulting deployed a mixed methods protocol for data collection that is multi-faceted and rigorous. Our firm conducted a site-visit to the state library administrative agency, in person interviews with key staff engaged in LSTA five-year plan projects, and a series of focus groups. The activities provided qualitative evidence and context and was grounded in the observations of the local context. An additional survey collected data from Oklahoma libraries regarding key programmatic areas. The survey was reviewed for representativeness to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additional corroborative evidence from comments collected in the survey served to triangulate the evidence gathered.

The State Program Reports (SPR) were reviewed in detail and additional reports, documentation, fliers, newspaper articles, and social media feeds were consulted selectively as corroborating evidence.

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

- All agency staff engaged in LSTA activities were interviewed. Please see Appendix G for a list of ODL staff.
- Staff recommended participants for focus groups. Four in-person focus group sessions were conducted.
- Librarians and library staff were engaged through focus groups and personal interviews. Please see appendix L for details.
- Librarians and other library staff from school and public libraries were engaged through a web-based survey. Please see appendix J for survey details.

C-4. Discuss how you will share the key findings and recommendations with others.
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries will share the findings of the evaluation with a variety of partner agencies in Oklahoma (governmental, other public, and nonprofit) and with the larger public by alerting the libraries in Oklahoma of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will also be presented and reviewed with the ODL Board of Directors. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website.

EVALUATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is based on a review of three years of performance by ODL in implementing the ***Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5-YEAR PLAN 2013 – 2017***. It covers activities conducted using Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States funding for Federal Fiscal Year FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015. The challenges associated with evaluating this period were significant. The Institute of Museum and Library Services' (IMLS) transition from a legacy State Program Report (SPR) system to a new SPR system represents a major change in the way in which State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) report on their projects and activities.

Changes built into the new system to enhance the ability to track outcomes, focal areas and targeted audiences in the long-term affected the ways in which states reported their projects in the short-term. This change in reporting protocols as well as the fact that the SPR system itself was still undergoing revision during the period covered by the evaluation often resulted in a lack of parallel reporting of some data elements. These variations in reporting were due to changes in the emerging software and shifting protocols rather than any shortcoming on the part of ODL.

Fortunately for the evaluators, the Oklahoma Department of Libraries was ahead of most states in making the transition to the new SPR in that they participated in pilot efforts and at least reported all of their activity for the three years using the new, if still emerging, SPR. The change in the SPR was long overdue and should enhance reporting in the future. However, in some instances, it left the evaluators with a difficult task in making "apples to apples" comparisons. Fortunately, the mixed methods evaluation approach used by Carson Block Consulting that incorporated focus groups, a web-based survey, and personal interviews in addition to a review of the SPR and other statistical reports provided by the state library agency proved invaluable and successfully dealt with most of these challenges.

Charts that appear in Appendix D (Oklahoma LSTA Grants to States Expenditures – FFY 2013 – FFY 2015), present all the project categories used as well as expenditures in each of these categories for each of the three years included in the evaluation. One chart shows all expenditures for efforts undertaken in pursuit of all goals followed by a breakdown of project categories and expenditures for each of the three goals. Other charts that may be useful in tandem of a reading of the report are the Measuring Success Focal Areas and Intents Table (Appendix F) and the Targeted Population Table (Appendix E). These charts map the projects that were undertaken to the focal areas and targeted audiences and are good comparisons when reviewing required responses to questions A-2 and A-3.

The evaluation that follows is structured around the IMLS' "***Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation,***" and the five goals and fifteen objectives that appeared in the ***Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5-YEAR PLAN 2013 – 2017.*** After presenting a short background section, the evaluators will proceed to report on the "Retrospective Questions" (Section A) posed by IMLS for each of the five goals. We will then proceed to respond to the "Process Questions" (Section B) and "Methodology Questions" (Section C) as a whole, noting any differences that apply to individual goals.

Within the sections for each goal, individual projects will be presented in the order of the magnitude of LSTA expenditures by project. Typically, greater detail will be presented regarding larger scale projects. Very small projects (those that account for less than 3% of the total LSTA expenditures for the three-year period) will get little more attention than a brief description due to the small amount of

LSTA funding expended. As an example, the Read Harder Challenge Grant amounted to four one-hundredths of one-percent of LSTA funding for the three-year period covered by the evaluation and is simply described rather than being the subject of analysis.

BACKGROUND

Since the LSTA Grants to States program uses a formula that is primarily population-driven to determine state allotments, Oklahoma, as a state with a moderate size population, receives a moderate allocation. Oklahoma's LSTA funding allotment ranks 28th among the states and territories included in the program. The Sooner State received an average of just over $2 million ($2,095,518) per year over the course of the three years (Federal Fiscal Year FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015), covered by this evaluation.

Given Oklahoma's 2015 estimated population of 3,911,338, the state's annual LSTA allotment of approximately $2 million per year translates into 54 cents ($0.54) per person on an annual basis. LSTA funds alone are obviously inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Oklahoma residents. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries' (ODL) challenge has been to find ways to make 54 cents per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services.

There are five goals in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' LSTA Five-Year Plan for 2013 – 2017:

Goal 1: Information Access, Lifelong Learning & Human Services
Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations.

Goal 2: Information Access
In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries will assist communities obtain these resources.

Goal 3: Employment and Economic Development, Civic Engagement, and Human Services
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.

Goal 4: Lifelong Learning, Human Services
Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills.

Goal 5: Capacity Building
ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to ensure they have the resources, tools, and methods necessary to deliver effective services to communities.

Oklahoma also established a total of fifteen (15) objectives under the five goals. This portion of the report presents information about each of the projects.

Goal 1 EVALUATION

Goal 1 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 1 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 1: Information Access, Lifelong Learning & Human Services
Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations.

Following are the titles and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 1.

Projects & Expenditures

Network Assessment & Remediation	$ 570,847.92
Literacy Management System	$ 133,459.00
Edge	$ 59,753.95
Small Library Technology Grant	$ 59,500.00
Website Development	$ 27,081.61
Annual Report	$ 20,423.09
Video Conference Training	$ 2,871.00
	$ 873,936.57

Goal 1 expenditures represent 13.90% of Oklahoma's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Many of the projects undertaken in support of Goal 1 are closely linked together. The Edge assessment project leads to Network Assessment and Remediation, which is linked to Small Library Technology Grants. The Website Development project can also be linked to Edge. In short, ODL has used information gained from one assessment project to define and refine action steps to address the issues that have been identified. In fact, the beginnings of these linked Goal 1 projects can actually be traced back to the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP). The evaluators have observed that one of the greatest strengths of ODL's LSTA program is a close linkage between and among their programs. This helps enable the SLAA to accomplish more than they would be likely to achieve if programs were less integrated.

ODL's State Program Report for FFY 2015 recognizes the importance of linking programs together. The SPR contains the following statement:

> "The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) has learned that libraries have benefited by merging LSTA grants with the Edge project Assessment and Action Plan. Not only the Network Assessment and Website Development grants, but also grants for Health Literacy, Community Health, Immigration and Citizenship and the Small Library Technology grant have strengthened community partnerships. These grants all work together to assist the small libraries in Oklahoma."

NETWORK ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION
(9.08% of total LSTA expenditures and 65.32% of the Goal 1 amount)

The Network Assessment and Remediation project was begun in 2014 after completion of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP), which, among other things, clearly indicated that Oklahoma public libraries needed help to evaluate and improve their technology networks.

Round 1 of EDGE assessments followed and it was clear that there was a great need to do far more than to identify deficiencies. The Network Assessment and Remediation program was born and libraries wanting to apply for remediation grants have been required to first complete a Round 2 Edge Technology Assessment and to develop an Edge Action Plan.

Perhaps the greatest criticism that can be leveled at the Network Assessment and Remediation project is that it's far too small given the magnitude of the need. Even though this project represents almost 10% (9.08%) of LSTA expenditures for the three-year period covered by the evaluation, only 71 libraries (including 25 branches of the Tulsa City/County Library have been impacted. All of these libraries were highly deserving of assistance and needs were documented; however, in many cases, only in-depth assessment, and not remediation, has been completed. This point is raised not as a criticism, but as an illustration of the enormity of the need.

Libraries appreciate and value the help that they receive. In the web survey conducted as part of the evaluation, one librarian said,

> "The technological support ODL provides to our state libraries is very greatly appreciated. We could not participate in many tech advances without ODL's assistance."

A participant in the Interlibrary Loan/Resource sharing focus group gave the Network Assessment and Remediation high praise after she had stressed the importance of ODL's Resource Sharing project when she offered,

> "The only thing that's more important to my library than ODL's interlibrary loan assistance is the help we've received through the remediation grant."

LITERACY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
(2.12% of total LSTA expenditures and 15.27% of the Goal 1 amount)
Although the Literacy Management System project isn't directly linked to BTOP, Edge, or the Network Assessment and Remediation projects, it is nevertheless closely integrated with ODL's other LSTA-funded efforts, specifically Literacy efforts that are carried out under Goal 4.

The ODL Literacy Resource Office's (LRO) effectiveness depends on a complicated and extended network of organizations and individuals spread across the state of Oklahoma. For more than a decade LRO used a failing legacy system to track information about adult learners. Over the past several years, and in several phases, this legacy system has been replaced with Literacy Tracker, a web-based solution.

The recently completed Phase III focused on including tutor and volunteer information and created new reporting capabilities that is making the monitoring and coordinating of literacy activities far more efficient.

EDGE
(0.95% of total LSTA expenditures and 6.84% of the Goal 1 amount)

Much has already been said about the Edge program and its importance in a series of events designed to address technological infrastructure deficiencies in Oklahoma's libraries. The program's importance has been much greater than the small investment of LSTA funding (less than one-percent

[0.95%] of total LSTA expenditures for the three years covered by the evaluation).

At the same time, it is fair to say that Oklahoma librarians have had a love/hate relationship with the program. Responses to the web survey conducted as part of the evaluation revealed both emotions. This response from one respondent:

> "The Edge assessment was a godsend this past year due to the fact that I needed information and support from a professional source and not the local 'I'll do it for free because I know a lot about computers' source."

Was literally followed by this statement from the next respondent:

> "We know our technological deficiencies. We didn't need to do a survey to find that out."

The web survey places the Edge program in perspective. Seventy-three percent rated the importance of the investment of LSTA funds to pay for the EDGE assessment program as important or very important. Eighty-one percent agreed or strongly agreed that the EDGE assessment program has provided useful information about the strengths and weaknesses of their library's technological infrastructure. Sixty-two percent agreed or strongly agreed that the EDGE assessment program has provided their library with a valuable opportunity to have a conversation with community leaders and decision-makers about the importance of the library in providing the public with access to the Internet and electronic/digital resources.

One librarian said,

> "With this new assessment I can talk intelligently to providers, where before I expected them to tell me what I needed without knowing what was needed. I feel like I am now a Technology Savvy Librarian so now you can hear me ROAR and ask for what is needed instead of waiting and someone giving it to me."

Finally, the ODL staff offered in the SPR that:

> "The Edge Assessment program's results have helped the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) make strategic, data-driven decisions on how best to aid libraries in the state."

SMALL LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY GRANT
(0.95% of total LSTA expenditures and 6.81% of the Goal 1 amount)
This small sub-grant program was designed to help libraries who served under 7,000 population with desperately needed funding for upgrades. Again, a requirement to receive funding was the completion of the Edge Technology Assessment. The development of an Edge Action Plan, which was intended to increase awareness of technology and improve libraries' ability to form community partnerships was also required. Thirty-five libraries received grants of up to $ 5,000 through this program, which was funded with FFY 2015 LSTA dollars.

WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT
(0.43% of total LSTA expenditures and 3.10% of the Goal 1 amount)
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) provides website templates, hosting services, and software training for libraries and literacy organizations to facilitate and encourage functional, and attractive websites. Over the three years included in this evaluation, more than 100 libraries and literacy organizations have either migrated from their old websites to new WordPress-based websites or had their first site established.

In order for librarians and literacy directors to have the skills to maintain the websites, ODL required one or two library/literacy staff members to attend a two-day course to learn the website editing

software.

ANNUAL REPORT
(0.32% of total LSTA expenditures and 2.34% of the Goal 1 amount)
LSTA funding enables ODL to use Bibliostat Collect and Bibliostat Connect to collect and report public library statistics from 213 Oklahoma public libraries. The information collected is used to determine state aid eligibility and to report library statistics to IMLS.

VIDEO CONFERENCE TRAINING
(0.05% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.33% of the Goal 1 amount)
The 46 sites that received video conferencing equipment as part of OkConnect, the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) grant, were provided a "refresher" and/or first time video conferencing training to enable libraries to effectively use their equipment for videoconferencing and staff development purposes. The evaluators once again wish to point out that this project is connected to several others (Okconnect and ODL Video Conference Maintenance) funded with LSTA dollars.

Objectives
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries established two objectives for Goal 1. Following is a discussion of the degree to which these objectives have been met as a result of projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 1.

Objective 1: Provide reliable, electronic access to high-quality information resources through enhancement of libraries' technology capabilities.
Although the challenge of providing reliable, electronic access to high-quality information resources is elusive, ODL is doing as much as it can with limited funds to meet this objective. We conclude that the objective has been at least partially met.

Objective 2: Lead statewide technology planning. Assist libraries in creatively adapting to societal changes through innovation and technology adoption.
ODL has exercised real, and high-quality leadership in technology planning and assistance.

A-2. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 1 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?
ODL's efforts undertaken in support of Goal 1 have had a significant impact in two Measuring Success focal areas. They are:

1. Information Access
2. Institutional Capacity

The Measuring Success Focal Area Table in Appendix F details which of the intents has been served.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 1 activities? (Yes/No) NO
The only target audience directly impacted by Goal 1 projects and activities is the Library Workforce and expenditures do not rise to the 10% level of funding identified as constituting a substantial focus.

GOAL 1 CONCLUSIONS
The evaluators find one compelling reason to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 1. It is:

1. The projects undertaken in support of Goal 1 address physical infrastructure needs in two ways (assessment and remediation) as well as efforts to better prepare library staff to deal with ever changing technologies. The integration of programs ranging from EDGE to Small Library Technology Grants is exceptional and effective.

Goal 2 EVALUATION

Goal 2 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 2 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 2: Information Access
In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries will assist communities obtain these resources.

Following are the titles and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 2.

Projects & Expenditures

Statewide Databases	$ 1,610,956.00
Resource Sharing	$ 1,283,117.72
Okconnect Video Conference Equipment Maintenance	$ 359,125.20
E-Media Collection Grant	$ 253,500.00
Brainfuse	$ 88,029.75
ODL Video Conference Maintenance	$ 70,460.81
Images of Oklahoma	$ 66,844.54
	$ 3,732,034.02

Goal 2 expenditures represent 59.37% of Oklahoma's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Goal 2 represents the lion's share of Oklahoma's LSTA expenditures over the three-year period included in this evaluation. Simply put, the goal is about ensuring that Oklahomans have access to quality information resources. ODL achieves this goal in a variety of ways including purchasing print materials, licensing digital content, creating digital content from print resources, providing a digital communication platform, and facilitating interlibrary loan. In short, Goal 2 represents a coordinated system of information access.

STATEWIDE DATABASES
(25.63% of total LSTA expenditures and 43.17% of the Goal 2 amount)
The Digital Prairie Statewide Database project may not be the largest or most extensive program of its kind in the nation, but it probably rivals any similar effort in terms of its importance in a resource-poor state.

ODL uses LSTA funds to provide statewide access to two "families" of resources; Ebsco and Britannica. Oklahoma citizens of all ages have access to high-quality licensed digital information through public libraries, school libraries (public and private), academic libraries, and special libraries.

Libraries also provide remote access to users so that their information needs can be met 24 hours per day/ 7 days per week from home, school or office.

The statewide databases provide a portal for Oklahoma citizens to access resources that can facilitate workforce development, digital literacy, and lifelong learning, as well as educational and recreational pursuits.

The FFY 2015 SPR reported that an impressive 220 public libraries, 1,368 school libraries, 62 academic libraries, and 64 special libraries were participating in the Statewide Database project. Furthermore, it appears that usage of the online resources is increasing.

Table 2 – Database Usage		
	Ebsco Searches	Britannica Searches
FFY 2013	43,500,000	47,519,282
FFY 2014	157,110,500	63,306,487
FFY 2015	50,700,877	7,300,573

That said, the Digital Prairie Statewide Databases project suffers the same fate shared by many other similar programs. Public libraries report relatively low usage and few librarians, let alone the public, are very knowledgeable in regard to the scope of what is available. The web survey conducted as part of the evaluation showed that many librarians were unfamiliar with or felt unable to rate many of the resources included in Digital Prairie.

Table 3 – Librarian Satisfaction with Specific Database Resources		
E-Resource	**% Satisfied**	**% Unfamiliar with or Unable to Rate**
Britannica School Elementary	64.1%	28.1%
Britannica School Middle	61.0%	31.2%
Academic Search Premier	59.3%	32.5%
Health Research	47.2%	45.4%
Explora Middle School Student Research	44.1%	43.2%
Explora High School/Public Library Search	43.0%	45.6%
Consumer Health Complete	42.6%	48.7%
MasterFILE Premier	42.6%	51.1%
Explora Elementary Student Research	41.0%	46.3%
Explora Educators' Edition	38.5%	49.1%
Business Source	33.1%	57.3%
Professional Development for Teachers	33.1%	55.1%
Small Business Reference Center	27.2%	61.2%

Britannica Spanish Reference Center	26.7%	61.6%
EBSCOhost Espanol	20.9%	68.1%

That said, virtually every database available had its supporters.

> "Every year, my school's Spanish population continues to grow so I LOVE the Spanish version of encyclopedia Britannica. I can't afford to buy print encyclopedias anymore, regardless of language, so those databases are especially wonderful. But really, all the databases are great because they have been vetted for quality and give accurate info to my students. As much as their teachers and I tell them otherwise, if they find it on the internet, it must be true! When I direct them to the Digital Prairie resources, I know my kids are getting good information."

From the evaluators' perspective, the most important aspect of the Statewide Database project is summed up in the words of one librarian who said,

> "We would not have database access at all if ODL did not provide it."
> "Our patrons simply would NOT have access if these resources were not available to us. We use them, and love them. If they were not available through Digital Prairie they would not have them because there is no way we would be able to pay for them and provide them ourselves."

The resources are particularly vital in school libraries that have sustained ongoing cuts and typically lack up-to-date resources.

> "Digital Prairie is vital to the continued education of Oklahoma students. Resource costs continue to climb while budgets decrease and our students must have access to quality resources."

The Statewide Database project also addresses equity of access issues:

> "My small high school cannot keep pace with libraries in schools that are better funded, but with Digital Prairie, we are able to level the playing field and build more equity through the resources we can offer our students."

The resources are also extremely important to academic libraries, particularly in smaller institutions:

> "I cannot stress enough how valuable this service is to our library and patron community. As an academic library at a small public university, we have limited funds that must stretch to cover a large number of subject areas."

In at least one case, the Statewide Database project was credited with playing a part in the viability of an entire institution:

> "The Digital Prairie program helped ensure the College of the Muscogee Nation library had the necessary resources to receive initial accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission."

Seventy percent of the public library respondents said they were satisfied or completely satisfied with ODL's database licensing program. Seventy-six percent of the school library respondents were satisfied or completely satisfied. Ninety percent of the academic and other types of libraries respondents were satisfied or completely satisfied. All three groupings, public, school, academic and others, said that the availability of the e-resources/databases broadens the range of services/resources their patrons can access.

RESOURCE SHARING

(20.41% of total LSTA expenditures and 34.38% of the Goal 2 amount)

In simple terms, without the support of LSTA funding for the Resource Sharing project, many, if not most of Oklahoma's libraries would not be able to participate in interlibrary loan/ resource sharing activities. The evaluators found strong evidence that this project represents an essential service.

The Resource Sharing project has several integrated components:

1. ODL purchases a statewide subscription to the WorldCat Database platform which allows all Oklahoma WorldCat libraries to save money by avoiding an individual purchase cost. The statewide subscription provides the platform for libraries to build a database of holdings for borrowing and lending. This subscription supported resource sharing in Oklahoma, and provided access to over 2.5 billion resources (and growing) and their locations worldwide.

2. ODL purchases the WorldCat WorldShare Inter-library Loan interface for 30 public libraries. This also included a subscription to CatExpress in order to enable these smaller libraries to add holdings to the WorldCat database.

3. ODL provides interlibrary loan services through the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' WorldCat WorldShare interface to 91 public libraries, 22 school libraries, 24 Institution libraries, a dozen special libraries and five small academic libraries. Illiad software is used to manage and track the requests.

However, it must be noted that ODL facilitated interlibrary loan activity is diminishing. This is consistent with national trends, however, the volume of use merits ongoing monitoring to determine whether changes to the current model or new models of resource sharing need to be considered.

Table 4 – ODL Facilitated Interlibrary Loans

	Items Circulated	ILL Transactions
FFY 2013	60,861	79,073
FFY 2014	64,948	69,287
FFY 2015	63,923	67,882

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries itself was a major resource for Interlibrary Loan, lending 9,340 items, and borrowing 4,272 in the period funded with FFY 2015 LSTA dollars. ODL purchased many materials not available in the state for small libraries, institutions, schools and special libraries.

Librarians participating in a focus group conducted by the evaluators underscored the importance of resource sharing support. One participant said,

> "Our usage would probably drop by 25% if we didn't have interlibrary loan through ODL."

Another said,

> "Interlibrary loan opens the world to our patrons. The books come from all over. We've gotten books from Fort Worth, Texas and one time we even got one from Japan!"

Focus group participants had high praise for ODL interlibrary loan staff.

> "David is always there when you need him to solve a problem."

This echoed a quote that was included in the State Program Report that said,

> "This is a brilliant system and support for our library. if there is a problem, question or concern I call ODL and talk to David and it gets solved. David is on top of things. He gets right to the need. Thank you, David!"

In the web survey conducted by the evaluators as part of this assessment, over eighty-five percent (87.9%) agree or strongly agree that their library receives the support it needs from ODL to offer the public an effective resource sharing/interlibrary loan system.

Perhaps the most touching account collected as part of the evaluators process came from the correctional facility librarian at the Mabel Bassett Women's Correctional Center who indicated that access to picture books through the interlibrary loan service had given incarcerated moms the opportunity to read to their own children.

OKCONNECT VIDEO CONFERENCE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE
(5.71% of total LSTA expenditures and 9.62% of the Goal 2 amount)

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) used FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 LSTA funds to purchase maintenance contracts on video conferencing equipment at thirty-six (36) public libraries. The video conferencing equipment was purchased through Okconnect, ODL's Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) funded project. A maintenance agreement for a second year was necessary to assure that all equipment functioned properly. Video conferencing equipment was still somewhat new to library staff, who did not have the technology background to troubleshoot or repair the equipment. Maintenance was provided through online communication, email, telephone, fax, and mail. Costs for maintenance on the teleconferencing equipment is now the responsibility of the individual host library.

E-MEDIA COLLECTION GRANT
(4.03% of total LSTA expenditures and 6.79% of the Goal 2 amount)
The E-Media project is a good example of ODL being driven by real needs. A report from the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) showed Oklahoma libraries had fallen behind in supplying e-content to their communities. Oklahoma had the worst situation with 99 out of 115 libraries (86 percent) not offering such services. Together, those 99 libraries served a population of 870,043. With the addition of the Oklahoma Virtual Library (OKVL), 74 libraries were able to combine efforts to provide e-media to patrons in smaller, mostly rural libraries.

OKVL has now grown to include 85 public libraries and two tribal libraries in communities with populations under 100,000. The Stillwater Public Library serves as the administrative library.

A survey that was conducted of the directors of libraries participating in OKVL found that 61 respondents (or 75.41%) strongly agreed that this "resource was meeting library staff/customer needs." Another 19.67% agreed with the statement.

This project has enabled Oklahoma to establish a basic framework for the delivery of e-content, and to whet the appetite of Oklahomans for digital books. However, the amount of digital content being offered is still somewhat limited and wait times are still too long to meet the needs of a public that is seeking instant gratification. Nevertheless OKVL has established a solid digital beachhead that represents a modest, but well-coordinated beginning. In spite of these good efforts, the Sooner state's libraries still have a long way to go before they can claim that an adequate level of e-content is being offered.

BRAINFUSE

(1.40% of total LSTA expenditures and 2.36% of the Goal 2 amount)
This project provided access to Brainfuse's HelpNow and JobNow databases. HelpNow was a suite of services designed to accommodate a range of homework needs, including live one-on-one homework help, live Oklahoma-aligned skills building, test preparation, and comprehensive writing assistance. JobNow consisted of resources for job seekers, including on-demand access to trained career experts who provided live, one-on-one interview coaching and resume assistance, as well as a library of career resources.

Although three face-to-face training sessions were held in early October of 2013 and three webinars were held in February and March of 2014 to provide training for the librarians at the 44 participating libraries, the service failed to live up to the high expectations ODL had for the project. Access to Brainfuse ended in July of 2014.

JobNow had 8,281 database usages, 1,229 unique visits, 5 coaching sessions, and 69 resume submissions in FFY2014. JobNow's average monthly usage ran as low as 231 in June 2014 to a high of 1,600 in February 2014. HelpNow had 22,484 database usages, 2,660 unique visits, 455 writing submissions, and 1,995 tutoring sessions in FFY2014. HelpNow's average monthly usage ran as low as 779 in March 2014 to a high of 4,789 in November 2013. Total usage of both databases was 30,765.

ODL VIDEO CONFERENCE MAINTENANCE
(1.12% of total LSTA expenditures and 1.89% of the Goal 2 amount)
This project ensures that the investment of LSTA funds in three video conferencing units, available at the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) continues to function at an optimal level. These units are critical to staff development and communications efforts. The project covers the cost of an annual contract to provide maintenance for the portion of the statewide videoconferencing system that is housed at ODL.

IMAGES OF OKLAHOMA
(1.06% of total LSTA expenditures and 1.79% of the Goal 2 amount)
In November 2015, a group of sixteen libraries and museums became participants in a project to digitize local collections, with training and guidance from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL). This group included nine public libraries, three museums, one public library and museum combined, two academic libraries and one tribal library.

ODL offered training and support to the sixteen libraries and museums to digitize materials relevant to Oklahoma's social, cultural, ethnic, and historical history employing high standards of practice.

Objectives
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries established three objectives for Goal 2. Following is a discussion of the degree to which these objectives have been met as a result of projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 2.

Objective 1: Provide resources and services that allow equal access to information for all residents.
The Oklahoma Digital Prairie project and the Resource Sharing project both serve to level the playing field for residents throughout the state. There is ample evidence that many libraries in Oklahoma simply would not be able to offer any licensed e-content or to participate in interlibrary loan activities if no LSTA support was offered for the Statewide Database and Resource Sharing projects. This objective has been met in a resounding way.

Objective 2: Assist libraries to provide ready access to information using technology to meet the demands of the public.
All of the projects undertaken under this goal serve to assist libraries in providing ready access to information using technology either directly (Statewide Databases, Brainfuse, E-Media Collection Grant, Images of Oklahoma, Resource Sharing) or indirectly (the two projects that support the Okconnect system). This objective has been met.

Objective 3: Develop online library resources on Oklahoma culture and history, to supplement educational requirements, facilitate learning, and preserve state and community historic content.
This objective is met primarily through activities undertaken in the Images of Oklahoma project.

These efforts are sufficient to conclude that ODL has achieved Goal 2. We conclude that Goal 2 has been ACHIEVED.

A-2. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 2 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?
The impacts of projects undertaken in support of Goal 2 can be seen in two Measuring Success focal areas; Information Access and Institutional Capacity. The Statewide Database program, Resource Sharing project, E-Media Collection Grants, Images of Oklahoma, and Brainfuse all address the "improve users' access to obtain and use information resources" intent of Information Access. The two video projects (Okconnect and ODL Videoconference Maintenance "improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure" (an intent in the Institutional Capacity area) and thereby increase the reach of library staff development efforts.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 2 activities? (Yes/No) NO
The two largest projects undertaken in support of this goal account (Statewide Databases and Resource Sharing) both serve the general public rather than targeted audiences. The fact that these programs together account for 46.04% of all LSTA funds expended during the three years covered by this evaluation also goes a long way in explaining why ODL's program directly impacts a limited number of targeted groups.

Individual projects such as Brainfuse do target specific audiences (individuals who are unemployed/ underemployed in the case of Brainfuse); however none of these programs rise to the 10% level of funding identified as constituting a substantial focus by IMLS.

GOAL 2 CONCLUSIONS
The evaluators find two compelling reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 2. They are:

1. The ongoing support for the Statewide Databases project (Oklahoma Digital Prairie) is probably sufficient in and of itself to qualify Goal 2 for an ACHIEVED rating.

2. ODL's considerable effort to support resource sharing among the state's libraries solidifies this rating. ODL goes above and beyond to ensure that small libraries with very limited resources can fully participate in interlibrary loan and other sharing activities

Goal 3 EVALUATION

Goal 3 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 3: Employment and Economic Development, Civic Engagement, and Human Services

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality.

Following is the title of the single project and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 3.

Projects & Expenditures

Immigration and Citizenship	$ 88,029.75
	$ 88,029.75

Goal 3 expenditures represent 2.13% of Oklahoma's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

As was noted above, only one project was undertaken that was specifically categorized by ODL as addressing Goal 3. However, it should be noted that many other projects, notably most of the projects included under Goal 4 exhibit the characteristics described in the Goal 3 statement. In fact, the evaluators believe that Oklahoma's partnership and collaboration with literacy organizations throughout the state are exemplary models worthy of replication by other SLAAs. The single Goal 3 project (Immigration and Citizenship) is exemplary in and of itself; however, the overall impact of the program is small and localized. It is obvious that the impacts on individuals in the communities participating are enormous (the attainment of U.S. citizenship). Nevertheless, the Immigration and Citizenship project must be viewed and assessed as a pilot project rather than an effort that has a broader effect.

Immigration and Citizenship
(2.13% of total LSTA expenditures and 100.00% of the Goal 5 amount)
Three library/literacy programs applied for and received LSTA funding. The three statewide partnerships were Great Plains Literacy Council and Southern Prairie Library System of Altus; Cleveland County Literacy Program and Pioneer Library System of Norman; and Bartlesville Public Library Literacy Services and Bartlesville Public Library. These groups expanded community awareness by involving law firms, churches, Community Action agencies, Latino Agencies and Chambers of Commerce in the project. Citizenship Corners were created in eight libraries and one partner location. Areas were marked with banners and displays and were equipped with computers with bookmarked websites, as well as United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) materials, and other materials of interest to potential citizens. Services varied from one location to another, but included citizenship classes, conversation classes, English/Spanish classes, study pairs, and one to one tutoring.

Real and measurable results have been reported by these programs. Among the three programs, several dozen individuals were reported to have attained citizenship. Other reported specific outcomes such as having greater confidence in conversing with doctors, teachers and other English speakers in their community, excitement by new citizens in participating in the voting process, increased satisfaction in giving back to their community by serving as volunteers and ambassadors for literacy, and developing the courage to start a business.

Objectives

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries established two objectives for Goal 3. Following is a discussion of the degree to which these objectives have been met as a result of projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 3.

Objective 1: Foster partnerships with other state and federal agencies, foundations, and the private sector which support comprehensive approaches to learning at the state and local levels.

While the Immigration and Citizenship project exhibits the characteristics described both in the Goal 3 statement and in Objective 1, most of the success in these areas can be seen in projects undertaken in support of Goal 4. The evaluators believe that this objective has been achieved (and continues to be achieved on an ongoing basis).

Objective 2: Instigate partnerships to address the learning needs of all people in a community. For example, senior citizens, early learners, teens, and people with special needs and realize cost efficiencies through resource sharing.

While there is some evidence that partnerships are developing beyond the literacy area (health and mental health are examples), less progress is apparent in institutionalizing partnerships and collaboration into the way in which libraries conduct their business on a daily basis. The evaluators believe that this objective has been addressed but that it has only been partially achieved.

These efforts, while important, are not sufficient to conclude that ODL has achieved Goal 3. We conclude that Goal 3 has been PARTLY ACHIEVED.

A-2. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?

The Immigration and Citizenship project is the only project undertaken that directly addressed the Civic Engagement focal area (specifically, the "improve users ability to participate in the community" intent. Projects undertaken in support of Goal 4 that generally embody the spirit of Goal 3 also have impact in the Lifelong Learning focal area.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities? (Yes/No) NO

Although the Immigration and Citizenship project has a unique focus on several of the target audiences (Immigrants/Refugees, Ethnic or Minority Populations, and Individuals with Limited Functional Literacy or Information Skills), none of the groups identified by IMLS as targeted audiences rise to the 10% level of funding identified as constituting a substantial focus.

GOAL 3 CONCLUSIONS

The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 3. They are:

1. The primary limiting factor in judging that Goal 3 has not fully been achieved is the fact that there has been limited activity under this goal. Only one project (Immigration and Citizenship) has been funded under this goal.

2. The evaluators' rationale for determining that the goal has been PARTLY ACHIEVED comes from the considerable evidence that the spirit of Goal 3 pervades many other areas of ODL's LSTA program. ODL's literacy efforts are exemplary in establishing mutually-beneficial alliances that deliver tremendous value to the public.

Goal 4 EVALUATION

Goal 4 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 4 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 4: Lifelong Learning, Human Services
Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills.

Following are the titles and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 4.

Projects & Expenditures

Health Literacy	$ 322,108.06
Summer Reading Program	$ 252,436.34
Literacy Development	$ 193,932.92
Institutions	$ 189,420.39
STEM	$ 170,171.31
Literacy Notes	$ 45,358.73
Oklahoma Community Health Grant	$ 6,500.00
State Organization Literacy Summit	$ 5,510.52
Read Harder Challenge Grant	$ 2,351.00
	$ 1,187,789.27

Goal 4 expenditures represent 18.89% of Oklahoma's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

ODL's literacy efforts are the most extensive that the evaluators have observed. The Literacy Resource Office's network of local literacy organizations, local librarians, volunteer tutors, and adult learners is truly impressive and is highly effective.

HEALTH LITERACY
(5.12% of total LSTA expenditures and 27.12% of the Goal 4 amount)
ODL has networked with the State Department of Health and Oklahoma Literacy Coalition to promote health literacy through its libraries and local literacy organizations.

This program is based on a recognized need. In 2015, Oklahoma was ranked as one of the five least healthy states in the country by the United Health Federation. The American Medical Association has stated that poor health literacy is a stronger predictor of a person's health than his age, education,

socioeconomic status, or ethnicity. The connections between poor health and low health literacy cannot be ignored. The Oklahoma Department of Health's State of the State's Health Report gives Oklahomans poor scores (D's and F's) for high rates of obesity, diabetes, and hypertension, and low rates of physical activity and consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables.

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL), in partnership with local libraries and community-based literacy programs, provided health literacy education, information, programming, and resources throughout the state. Fourteen sites received grants to initiate or expand local health and wellness efforts.

ODL also networked with the State Department of Health, the Oklahoma Health Equity Campaign, and the Oklahoma Literacy Coalition to promote health literacy beyond the grant sites. Together, ODL, the health literacy grantees, and numerous state and local partners provided health and wellness resources to Oklahoma adults, children, and families.

The program has collected an impressive array of "testimonials" of how the program has impacted individual lives. Furthermore, this is one of a very few sizeable LSTA projects of which the evaluators are aware nationally that address the Measuring Success Human Resources focal area's "improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health and wellness."

The project is also having some impact on how communities perceive their libraries. According to one of the project coordinators,

> "An unexpected benefit of the health literacy grant has been an overall increased awareness of health and fitness in the library. Because of this, we had a customer volunteer to offer weekly Tai Chi classes, and each class has averaged twelve participants. Another patron offered to teach Beginning Belly Dancing, and that class is filling up fast."

The Health Literacy project, like so many of ODL's other programs, also has a library staff development component. The Literacy Resource Office of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) hosted a six and one half hour training entitled "Advancing Health Literacy." The audience, comprised of health professionals, public health staff, librarians, literacy staff, tribal organizations, state agencies, social workers, educators, and public policy staff, were introduced to health literacy basics.

In evaluating the session, one librarian said,

> "I… can use the skills learned to improve our communication skills when we are helping patrons with health and wellness reference questions."

The Bartlesville Public Library Literacy Services launched a series of 25 health literacy programs. Topics included Improving Brain Health; Tobacco Prevention and Cessation; Early Detection of Breast Cancer; Eating for a Healthy Heart; and Avoiding Abuse of Prescription Medications. The Bartlesville program even incorporated an English as a Second Language (ESL) component into its programming. Twenty basic and ESL Learners participated in a special 4-week health and wellness series taught by literacy staff using real world materials and ESL curriculum. Additionally, adult learners and their tutors were invited to attend all library health and wellness programs. Many came together, and the Citizenship and Immigration classes would often attend as a group. One of the learners reported,

> "These classes taught me what to do in case of emergency and gave me information on how to help others."

In the evaluators' experience, ODL's Health Literacy project is truly unique and has had a broader impact than other health literacy efforts we have observed. The fact that the project has worked so

well also underscores the robust network that ODL has established with local literacy organizations in the state.

SUMMER READING PROGRAM
(4.02% of total LSTA expenditures and 21.25% of the Goal 4 amount)
There are multiple components to ODL's support for summer reading. It includes a robust staff development component, support for the purchase of Collaborative Summer Library Program materials such as reading logs, certificates, posters, etc., a Summer Reading Collection (to help with collection development the following year), podcasts, and support for the Sequoyah Children's Book Award.

Overall, summer reading program participation has fluctuated wildly. However, a major part of a significant drop in the Summer of 2015 was the result of a local decision by a library in one of the major metropolitan areas to require each child to have an individual library card. That decision resulted in 53% drop in that library system's summer reading enrollment (a decline of more than 15,000 participants). That number reportedly rebounded in the Summer of 2016.

Table 5 – Summer Reading Program Participation

	Ages 0-4	Ages 5-11	Ages 12-18	Number of Libraries Participating
2013		88,000	16,000	180
2014	22,706	196,926	15,631	150
2015	7,376	79,148	12,162	131

In the Summer of 2016 ODL made an effort to link overall Health Literacy efforts with the summer reading program and launched a "Wellness Summer Reading Program." The program featured many innovative programming efforts.

The web survey conducted as part of the evaluation revealed that the Summer Reading program isn't just about children anymore. Two-thirds (66.0%) of the public libraries responding indicated that they had a summer reading program that provided staff-led programs and/or events for teens and one-third (33.7%) indicated that staff-led summer reading events were provided for adults.

Table 6 – Age of Summer Reading Program Audiences

	Only self-help guides, reading lists and other resources provided without staff-led events or programs	Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs	No summer reading program offered for this group
Pre-school children	9 8.4%	90 84.1%	8 7.5%
School-aged children	9 8.4%	99 91.7%	0 0.0%
Teens	10 10.0%	66 66.0%	24 24.0%
Adults	14 14.7%	32 33.7%	49 51.6%

Summer Reading is obviously an important piece of the overall literacy picture in Oklahoma. While Oklahoma's efforts have been solid, and occasionally innovative (the linkage to Health Literacy), some other states (Idaho and Missouri for example) have managed to link early literacy more closely to outcomes and have managed to be more transformative in terms of youth services staff to a higher level in this area.

LITERACY DEVELOPMENT
(3.08% of total LSTA expenditures and 16.33% of the Goal 4 amount)
The effectiveness of library and community-based volunteer literacy programs largely depends on the experience and professionalism of their staff, board, and volunteers. Training and professional development for literacy personnel is very limited and often cost-prohibitive. The Literacy Resource Office of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries addresses this void by providing training and development for literacy directors and literacy trainers, and indirectly for volunteer tutors. Multiple training opportunities are provided for literacy directors, librarians, and adult learners.

Table 7 – Literacy Training Event Attendance

Year	Literacy Directors' Retreat	Adult Learners Meeting	Open Minds Tutor Training
FFY 2013	33	40	189
FFY 2014	29	50	158
FFY 2015	30	140 *(This session not funded by LSTA for 2015, but from the Oklahoma Literacy Coalition)*	221

A representative of the Okmulgee Literacy Council who, attended one of the Literacy Directors' Retreats summed, up the importance of the sessions by saying,

> "I thought it was brilliant. It was a wonderful experience for me as a new director of a very new program. It left me with an expansive view of what is possible, the challenge of translating the things I learned to fit with the specific needs of my community, and the realization that I am still a learner too."

Another said,

> "Thank you for providing us with this amazing retreat. The training was wonderful and it was a great opportunity for us (Federal Corrections Institute) to network. "

INSTITUTIONS
(3.01% of total LSTA expenditures and 15.95% of the Goal 4 amount)
The purpose of this LSTA grant was to provide library materials and services to the individuals incarcerated in the Oklahoma Department of Corrections' (DOC) facilities. There are few full-time library staff in any of the 17 adult prison libraries and the Department of Corrections did not allocate any funds for the libraries, despite a high demand for reading material. Additional materials were selected for three juvenile correction facilities' libraries to help build their basic collection. It was the belief of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) that providing funding for library books fulfilled a necessary cultural and practical service to correctional institutions.

LSTA monies during the review period were allocated as a one-time expense to help build the basic collections for three juvenile correction facilities. Approximately 2,000 new items per year are acquired

for the adult and juvenile correctional facilities. Reports on the impact of this investment, while not scientific, are heartening nevertheless. Included are reports of improved reading levels, increased vocabularies, and a decrease in depression among those using the resources. Perhaps the most touching account collected as part of the evaluators process came from the correctional facility librarian at the Mabel Bassett Women's Correctional Center who indicated that access to picture books through the interlibrary loan service had given incarcerated moms the opportunity to read to their own children.

STEM
(2.71% of total LSTA expenditures and 14.33% of the Goal 4 amount)
Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) competitive grant projects were offered using both FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 LSTA funds in combination with significant state funding. The program targeted children of all ages (ages 0-18). Thirty-six (36) grants were awarded in the first year and 29 grants were funded in the second year. The number of libraries applying in the first year was 48. Seventy-five libraries applied in the second year indicating a high level of interest in the topic.

STEM (and now STEAM [Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math]) continue to be a focus of children's programming in Oklahoma libraries. The efforts are now integrated into other efforts such as the Summer Reading program.

LITERACY NOTES
(0.10% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.55% of the Goal 4 amount)
LSTA was used to fund a long-running literacy newsletter entitled ***Literacy Notes***. The mission of the ODL's Literacy Resource Office (LRO) has been and continues to be providing leadership, resources, training, and information to Oklahoma's library and community-based literacy network. LRO published ***Literacy Notes*** from 1986 until the Summer of 2014 when a decision was made to end publication of the printed newletter in favor of online communication. The ODL/LRO web presence now serves this purpose and more. (http://libraries.ok.gov/literacy/literacy-resource-office/)

OKLAHOMA COMMUNITY HEALTH GRANT
(0.10% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.55% of the Goal 4 amount)
This demonstration project, which included a partnership of five organizations, focused on children who were members of the Ottawa County Boy & Girls Club who participated in the Together Raising Awareness for Indian Life (T.R.A.I.L.) Diabetes Prevention Program. The program for children offered a series of sessions on diabetes prevention. This is a very important topic for that area since one in eight adults in Ottawa County has diabetes. The Community Garden, a health literacy program and the Miami Public Library, which provided instruction were active partners in the effort. Also involved were the Northeastern Tribal Health Systems, and the Ottawa County Health Department.

STATE ORGANIZATION LITERACY SUMMIT
(0.09% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.46% of the Goal 4 amount)
The Literacy Resource Office (LRO) of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, a longtime member of the Council of State Organizations ([CSO] is a group of leaders from state literacy organizations throughout the country), took a leadership role in bringing the state literacy leaders together. The purpose of the meeting was to network, share resources, identify areas of expertise, and discuss the possibility of multi-state literacy collaborations. LSTA funds were used to host the meeting and defray travel expenses to Oklahoma City. The meeting took place on August 26-27, 2014 and was attended by representatives from nine states. These state organizations support 980 local literacy programs.

READ HARDER CHALLENGE GRANT
(0.04% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.20% of the Goal 4 amount)

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) Read Harder Challenge Grant was designed to impact the professional readers' advisory and literary criticism skills of Oklahoma librarians who provide services to children and young adults, 0 to 18. Ten participants received books from a list selected and purchased by the ODL Youth Services Consultant (YSC). The participants were selected "first-come, first-serve" when the grant opened. The participants were required to read between six and twelve titles from the list and to post reviews of the books they selected to the Children and Young Adult (CYA) Listserv on a timely basis. Criteria for evaluation and format for reviews was included in the grant and made available to all participants.

Objectives

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries established five objectives for Goal 4. Following is a discussion of the degree to which these objectives have been met as a result of projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 4.

Objective 1: Promote policies and services that improve access to information for underserved communities and help to remove barriers that prevent individuals from using these services effectively.

Concrete examples of action in this area have been difficult to identify. It may be that this objective is being addressed; however, evidence is lacking. The evaluators are uncertain as to whether or not this objective has been met.

Objective 2: Enhance the ability of library-based and community-based literacy programs to provide quality services for adult Oklahomans and their families.

ODL's efforts in this area are outstanding. The partnerships among ODL, local libraries, and a diverse mix of literacy providers throughout the state is exemplary. The evaluators sincerely believe that these efforts represent as fine an example of leveraging a relatively small amount of LSTA funding to achieve important results. This objective is being achieved on a daily basis!

Objective 3: Increase use of library services by Oklahomans whose primary language is not English or those who come from a diverse geographical, cultural or socioeconomic background, by training public library staff, supporting increased resources, and encouraging cooperation with community groups and agencies.

A number of efforts scattered throughout projects undertaken in support of a variety of goals indicate that this objective is being addressed. Spanish language content in the database program, the Immigration and Citizenship project, elements of content in staff development sessions are just a few examples. Although this objective has not been a major focus of ODL's efforts, the objective is nevertheless being achieved.

Objective 4: Provide consultation to state institution libraries.

Ongoing consultation is provided to Oklahoma's Institution libraries; in fact, the involvement of state institutions in focus groups, the web survey, and in a variety of grant projects demonstrates that ODL has very successfully engaged this audience in its work (both state-funded and LSTA-funded). This objective has been achieved.

Objective 5: Assist libraries in developing services for learning, access to information, and expanding library services to underserved members of the library community (or population).

ODL has provided encouragement to libraries to expand their services to reach underserved members of the population. Perhaps the most vivid demonstration of this comes in the integration of efforts under the Health Literacy project and the unique Wellness Summer Reading program. While never completely accomplished, this objective is being met on a daily basis.

A-2. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 4 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?
Goal 4 projects and activities address a number of Measuring Success focal areas. The Health Literacy and Oklahoma Community Health Grant projects focus on Human Resources; specifically, the "improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health and wellness" intent. The Institution project addresses Information Access, and several projects address the Lifelong Learning "improve users' general knowledge and skills" intent.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 4 activities? (Yes/No) NO
The activities undertaken in support of Goal 4 have the broadest reach in terms of targeted audiences. However, none of the audiences represent a substantial focus as defined by IMLS (10% level of funding over a sustained period). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that individual activities are touching the lives of individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills, families, preschoolers and school-aged children, and individuals living below the poverty level.

GOAL 4 CONCLUSIONS
The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has ACHIEVED Goal 4. They are:

1. As has already been mentioned, the evaluators find that Oklahoma's efforts in the area of literacy are truly exceptional. In fact, based on experience working with more than two dozen SLAAs and being aware of the activities of most of the rest, we would venture to say that Oklahoma is THE model among SLAAs in this field. Given that literacy is such an essential part of success in most life pursuits, ODL's projects and activities qualify for an ACHIEVED rating.

2. The other compelling factor for assigning an ACHIEVED rating to Goal 4 is the exceptional degree to which ODL integrates its LSTA-funded program. The combination of literacy, health literacy and summer reading in ODL's implementation of its Summer Reading project is both intriguing and a model worthy of replication.

Goal 5 EVALUATION

Goal 5 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 5 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 5: Capacity Building
ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to ensure they have the resources, tools, and methods necessary to deliver effective services to communities.

Following are the titles and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 5.

Projects & Expenditures

Computer Lab	$ 108,231.96
Continuing Education for Public Librarians	$ 95,802.00
Certification for Public Librarians	$ 73,689.88

Research in Public Libraries (RIPL)	$ 1,354.77
	$ 279,078.61

Goal 5 expenditures represent 4.44% of Oklahoma's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

COMPUTER LAB
(1.72% of total LSTA expenditures and 38.78% of the Goal 5 amount)
This project provided a computer training lab located at the Oklahoma Department of Libraries to meet the need for training on software, mobile apps, online information, and hardware. Participants included public, system, institutional, school, academic, medical and tribal librarians, as well as literacy staff and volunteers throughout the state of Oklahoma.

ODL's Computer Lab is an extraordinary project that offers Oklahoma's library workers access to hands-on training in a broad range of highly relevant topics. Using Excel for financial management purposes, the development of websites using WordPress, and the effective use of various social media outlets are just a small sample of what is covered. Perhaps even more impressive is the excellent data that is collected from participants that documents the real progress that is achieved by attendees. Not only are general impressions of the quality of sessions and the quality of instruction tracked (to the extent that data on standard deviation from the norm is available); pre and post testing determines whether real gains have been made in knowledge and skills.

Although there is some frustration on the part of ODL in regard to relatively low attendance, the evaluators believe that the impact on those who do attend is very real and justifies the effort.

Table 8 – Computer Lab Attendance

Year	Number of Classes	Number of Students
2013	48	393
2014	46	321
2015	56	377

CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIANS
(1.52% of total LSTA expenditures and 34.33% of the Goal 5 amount)
It should be noted that this project reflects only a small portion of ODL's staff development efforts. Most continuing education (CE) takes place either through the Computer Lab project or is embedded as an activity in other projects.

This specific Continuing Education for Public Librarians project enables library workers to attend a state, regional or national conference that introduces new ideas, programs, authors, technologies and resources that can be utilized at the local level. Most Oklahoma library directors and library staff, especially those in rural locations, do not have a Master's of Library Science degree, nor do they have the opportunity to connect with other librarians. For example, FFY 2015 LSTA funds enabled 35 library directors to learn crucial skills, to become exposed to new program ideas, and to expand their horizons by networking with others in a similar situation or entirely different circumstances.

CERTIFICATION FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIANS
(1.17% of total LSTA expenditures and 26.40% of the Goal 5 amount)

The goal of the Certification project was to develop skills and improve attitudes among Oklahoma public library staff for the purpose of improving library services to Oklahoma citizens. Most public library employees in Oklahoma, especially directors of municipal libraries in small towns, do not have a Master's level education in Library and Information Science, although they are expected to perform the duties of a traditional public librarian. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) program, with the active participation and support from the Oklahoma Library Association (OLA), organized the Institute of Public Librarianship and created a curriculum designed to develop a base level of library skills Certification program. For example, with FFY 2015 LSTA funds, the Institute offered eight basic in-person classes in 31 locations throughout the state. The Certification program encouraged continuing education through a renewal process, allowing those who have obtained certification to remain certified as long as they have completed 40 continuing education hours over three years. The renewal process's goal was to encourage public library staff to continue learning and to provide innovative library service to the public.

RESEARCH IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES (RIPL)
(0.02% of total LSTA expenditures and 0.49% of the Goal 5 amount)
This project subsidized the costs for the participation of one ODL staff member and two practicing library directors to attend the Research in Public Libraries (RIPL) in Colorado Springs July 2015. This grant provided the funds for travel expenses. RIPL's mission was to engage participants in three days of hands-on, intensive workshops about evaluation, design and implementation; data collection and use for strategic planning; measures for reporting library impact; and tips for aligning research efforts with national initiatives like Edge Benchmarks and the Impact Survey.

Objectives
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries established three objectives for Goal 5. Following is a discussion of the degree to which these objectives have been met as a result of projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 5.

Objective 1: Ensure that all Oklahoma public library staff, and literacy staff have convenient, low-cost or free continuing education opportunities to competently assist the information and service needs of library customers of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills; and targeting persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural populations, including children, and families with incomes below the poverty line.
The staffing capacity of the ODL has limited the ability of the SLAA to accomplish as much as it would like to achieve in regard to staff development. However, several efforts demonstrate that this objective is, at least in part, being met. The Computer Lab project is a remarkable project. Although the location of the lab at ODL does constrain the ability of some to attend sessions, the breadth and quality of training does enable the program to have a statewide impact. The OK Connect Video Conferencing equipment has been an attempt to extend the reach of ODL to more rural areas; however, its acceptance and use has been limited. The Certification for Public Librarians project pushes training out into the state in an effective way. Finally, good efforts have been underway to update and refine the curriculum for library CE. Overall, this objective has been partially met.

Objective 2: Offer leadership, continuing education, training to librarians to drive high quality service, effective use of resources, and successful library operations.
A variety of good efforts have been undertaken to address this objective. Annual certification sessions, support for conference attendance and staff development efforts imbedded in individual projects all serve to address this objective. Overall, this objective has been met.

Objective 3: All Oklahomans have access to well-managed library services through qualified staff and modern facilities.
This objective is highly aspirational in nature, is hard to measure, and is not likely to ever be fully achieved. That said, the evaluators believe that LSTA-funded efforts have enabled libraries in Oklahoma to improve and to offer enhanced levels of service to the public. This objective has been partially achieved.

The efforts undertaken in support of Goal 5 are substantial, but are not sufficient to conclude that ODL has achieved Goal 5. We conclude that Goal 5 has been PARTLY ACHIEVED.

A-2. To what extent did the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 5 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?
Project undertaken in support of Goal 5 have primarily impacted the Institutional Capacity focal area, specifically the "improve the library workforce" intent. Projects such as support for attendance of the RIPL conference impact the "improve users' general knowledge and skills" in the Lifelong Learning focal area if library workers are defined as "users."

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' Five-Year Plan Goal 5 activities? (Yes/No) NO
The activities undertaken under Goal 5 focus on the library workforce; however, expenditures are well below the 10% level of funding identified by IMLS as constituting a substantial focus. None of the other groups identified by IMLS as targeted audiences are directly impacted by Goal 5 activities

GOAL 5 CONCLUSIONS

The evaluators find two reasons to conclude that the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 5. They are:

1. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries finds itself in a time of transition in regard to staff development and continuing education. Staff losses have placed practical limits on what can be achieved in an environment where constant change means that standing still is going backwards. ODL is quite aware of the ways in which in-house capacity has been diminished. Staff development efforts are ongoing, but are not as robust as they once were. However, ODL is doing several things right. They have expanded opportunities for virtual participation in staff development activities and they are close to completing the redevelopment of a staff development curriculum that will guide them in the coming years.
2. A real bright spot in staff development efforts is the Computer Lab project. While this effort is also impacted by staffing limitations, the range of topics covered and the responsiveness of the program to the needs of local libraries is very good. There is real achievement on this front.

B. Process Questions

B-1. How has the State Library Administrative Agency used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan?
New and old State Program Report (SPR) data is used annually by the State Librarian to add to the annual presentation and budget submittal to the state legislature. The Oklahoma Department of Libraries has used SPR data to adjust and refine programs and to make decisions regarding priorities among projects.

B-2. Specify any changes you made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred. No formal changes or amendments were made to the 2013-2017 state plan.

B-3. How and with whom has ODL shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources?
Annual report and project data have been shared with public librarians, members of the Public Library's Director's Council (PLDC) and the Oklahoma Legislature. Bill Young, ODL PIO administrator uses the numbers and many of the examples or stories in the fliers that are done for Susan McVey to give the Oklahoma legislators. ODL has used data from the LSTA project evaluations reported in the SPR to prepare performance reports for state and federal elected officials and the library community as noted in the response to question B-1..

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.
To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' (ODL) implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, ODL issued a Request for Quotes (RFQ) on inviting qualified parties to submit a proposal in July 2016 for carrying out the evaluation. As a result of the competitive bid process, Carson Block Consulting, a library consulting firm, was awarded the contract to conduct the independent evaluation. Carson Block Consulting does not have a role in carrying out LSTA-funded activities and is independent of those who are being evaluated or who might be favorably or adversely affected by the evaluation results. Carson Block Consulting has in depth evaluation experience and demonstrated professional competency in that associate consultant, Bill Wilson of Himmel & Wilson Library Consultants, has implemented evaluation studies for the three previous cycles of LSTA evaluation starting in 2003. The associate is experienced in both quantitative and qualitative methods. Bill Wilson is one of the evaluators and has conducted more than 29 LSTA evaluations. Carson Block is a well-known library consultant who is highly experienced in the areas of library technology, planning, facilities, and operations.

C-2. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation.
Carson Block Consulting deployed a mixed methods protocol for data collection that is multi-faceted and rigorous. Our firm conducted a site-visit to the state library administrative agency (SLAA), in person interviews with key staff engaged in the projects carried out under the LSTA Five-Year Plan, and a series of focus groups. The site visits, focus groups and interviews provided qualitative evidence and context and was grounded in the observations of the local context. An additional survey was deployed collecting data from libraries in the state regarding key programmatic areas. The survey was reviewed for representativeness to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additional corroborative evidence from comments collected in the survey served to triangulate the evidence gathered. The State Program Reports (SPR) were reviewed in detail and additional reports, documentation, fliers, newspaper articles, and social media feeds were consulted selectively as corroborating evidence.

C-3. Describe the stakeholders involved in the various stages of the Five-Year Evaluation and how you engaged them.
Oklahoma Department of Libraries staff were engaged through personal interviews during a site visit to the agency, via telephone calls, and through frequent e-mail exchanges. A web-based survey as well as on-site focus groups and interviews were used to collect information from the Oklahoma library community.

C-4. Discuss how ODL will share the key findings and recommendations with others.
The Oklahoma Department of Libraries will share the findings of the evaluation with a variety of partner agencies in Oklahoma (governmental, other public, and non-profit) and with the larger public by alerting the libraries in Oklahoma of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website.

Annual report and project data have been shared with public librarians, members of the Public Library Director's Council (PLDC) and the Oklahoma Legislature. Bill Young, ODL PIO administrator uses the numbers and many of the examples or stories in the fliers that are done for Susan McVey to give the Oklahoma legislators. ODL has used data from the LSTA project evaluations reported in the SPR to prepare performance reports for state and federal elected officials and the library community.

Appendices

Appendix A: Evaluation Methodology

Briefly describe the evaluation methodology, referencing the four methodology questions below

The consultant team employed a variety of methods to assess the progress that Oklahoma has made in pursuing its LSTA Grants to States 2013 - 2017 goals. The evaluation began with a telephone conference call between the evaluators and key ODL staff to discuss the evaluation process and to establish a timeline for the various evaluation tasks. Some key background documents were also identified during the call.

An initial three-day site visit was made to Oklahoma September 13-15 2016 by evaluators Carson Block and Bill Wilson, with site visits performed in Clinton and Claremore, and two days of staff meetings and focus groups at the ODL offices in Oklahoma City. Prior to the visit, the evaluators reviewed the State's 2013 - 2017 LSTA Plan and created an expenditure summary based on information contained in State Program Reports (SPRs) submitted to IMLS by ODL covering FFY 2012, FFY 2013, and FFY 2014. The SPR for FFY 2012 was examined to provide historical context since that year is not included in the five-year assessment. Looking at FFY 2012 was also helpful since FFY 2015 data was not yet available and examining three years provided a longitudinal view of financial priorities not afforded by analyzing only two years of data.

Consultant activities performed during the September 13-15, 2016 site visit included:

- Agenda review with LSTA Coordinator Judy Tirey
- "Big Picture" review of LSTA programs and efforts with State Librarian Susan McVey
- Databases review with ODL Deputy Director Vicki Sullivan, Administrator Kitty Pitman, & Supervisor Arlene Paschel
- Review of Annual Report, Brainfuse, Continuing Education activities, Certification, & Network Assessment & Remediation with Library Development Consultant Cathy Van Hoy
- Literacy program review with Administrator Leslie Gelders, & Rebecca Barker ODL staff member
- Review of Web Development with Melissa Askew, Consultant, Library Development
- Edge review with ODL Administrator Vicki Mohr, Library Development Consultant Melissa Askew, & PIO (Public Information Office) Manager Bill Young
- Review of Computer Lab with Kathy O'Donnell, Computer Lab Coordinator
- Review of Interlibrary Loan program with Administrator Kitty Pittman, Administrative Librarian David Hankey & Library Technician Shalalah Saunders
- Images of Oklahoma project review with Supervisor Jan Davis, & Administrator Kitty Pittman
- Summer Reading & STEM review with Children's Consultant Adrienne Butler
- Wrap-up meeting with State Librarian Susan McVey & LSTA Coordinator Judy Tirey

To answer the key evaluation questions throughout the evaluation process, the consultant team used a multifaceted research protocol, including examination of existing documents, interviews with key ODL personnel and library community leaders, and focus groups with library representatives from around the state. The evaluators also conducted two online surveys; one directed toward key ODL staff and a second targeting the broader Oklahoma library community.

The strengths of the evaluation methodology derive from:

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

Methodological weaknesses are associated with several factors:

- Ex post facto evaluation design, which only allowed for review of program data after the fact, resulting in inconsistent data in some areas and sometimes unrecoverable gaps in information.
- Difficulty in identifying trends, with only three full years of data available at the time of this evaluation.
- The online survey dissemination method did not allow collection of responses from a random sample of library staff in the state (it was a self-selected sample); consequently results are biased toward individuals most interested in LSTA.

Review of existing documents.
The evaluators conducted an extensive review of background documents, including the ***Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5 Year Evaluation 2008-2012*** and the Oklahoma 2013 - 2017 LSTA Five-year Plan entitled the **Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5-Year Plan, 2013-2017.**

State Program Reports (SPRs) submitted to IMLS by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2013, 2014, and 2015 were also used extensively and, in addition, the evaluators reviewed the FFY 2012 SPR to provide baseline information even though that Federal Fiscal Year is not covered by the evaluation.

Interviews with key ODL personnel.
Consultant Bill Wilson and Carson Block visited ODL on September 14 - 15, 2016 and interviewed sixteen ODL staff members. A list of individuals interviewed is provided as an appendix.

Web-based input on key questions from ODL personnel
Himmel & WIlson created a web-based tool to solicit comments from the state library agency head and the LSTA Coordinator regarding the SLAA's performance in implementing their plan. The web-survey asked the key ODL staff to provide a self-assessment of the agency's performance in pursuing each of the goals in their plan (little or no progress toward goal, progressing toward goal, met goal, surpassed goal). Respondents were also asked to indicate why they believed that assessment was accurate.

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

Focus Groups

Four in-person focus groups were held.

- Claremore, September 13, 2016 (afternoon)
    - General LSTA Services - public perspective
    - 6 Participants

- Oklahoma Department of Libraries, September 14, 2016 -- 10:30 - 12:00 p.m. CST
    - Interlibrary Loan
    - 5 Participants

- Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Thursday, September 15, 2016 -- 10:30 - 12:00 p.m. CST
    - State Aid
    - 11 Participants

- Oklahoma Library for the Blind, Thursday, September 15, 2016 -- 12:30 - 2:00 p.m. CST
    - Literacy
    - 6 Participants

A summary of select focus group findings is included as Appendix L.

Interviews with key stakeholders
Consultants Bill Wilson and Carson Block conducted interviews with Oklahoma library leaders, including ODL staff members. The interviews were conducted during the September 2016 site visit. A list of participants are attached as Appendix G.

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

Survey results are provided in Appendix I.

Qualitative methods
Evaluators included two qualitative methods – individual interview and focus group – in order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the context and descriptions from stakeholders about successes and challenges related to the projects undertaken.

Qualitative methods excel at providing detailed descriptions of how individuals use a product or service and add information that helps evaluators understand the quantitative data included in usage statistics, surveys, etc. Because these qualitative methods involve individuals, they are susceptible to bias in selection of participants, as well as in interpretation. In order to minimize bias in analysis, the consultants carefully designed open-ended questions that would not lead participants in interviews and focus groups and used standard content analysis techniques to guide analysis.

Development of evaluation report.

- The consultant team analyzed notes from focus groups and personal interviews using content analysis techniques.
- Team members Ethel Himmel and Bill Wilson collated and analyzed results from the web-based survey.
- Block, Himmel and Wilson reviewed other documents (both print and web-based) and State Program Reports. Wilson & Block synthesized the data and information collected and created a draft report in the format provided by IMLS in the “Guidelines for Five-Year Evaluation Report” document.
- Block and Wilson revised and added content to the draft report and shared it with ODL State Librarian Susan McVey & LSTA Coordinator Judy Tirey to make sure that it would fully meet the expectations of ODL and comply with IMLS requirements. After incorporating feedback, they provided the resulting document to the ODL in print and digital formats.
- Finally, the evaluators submitted the evaluation report in a format suitable for IMLS.

Appendix B: List of Acronyms

CE	Continuing Education
CRLS	Chickasaw Regional Library System
CSLP	Collaborative Summer Library Program
DOC	Oklahoma Department of Corrections
ILL	Interlibrary Loan
IMLS	Institute of Museum & Library Services
IPL	Institute of Public Libraries or Certification for Public Librarians
Lit Tracker	Literacy Tracker or Literacy Management System
LSTA	Library Services & Technology Act
Metro	Oklahoma County Library System
Network A&R	Network Assessment & Remediation
NIE	News in Education
ODL	Oklahoma Department of Libraries
OKVL	Oklahoma Virtual Library Consortium
OLA	Oklahoma Library Association
OMES	Oklahoma Office of Management & Enterprise Services
Open Minds	Oklahoma's Tutor Training Model
PLDC	Public Library Director's Council
RIPL	Research in Public Libraries
SPLS	Southern Plains Library System
SRP	Summer Reading Program
TCCL	Tulsa City-County Library System
CYA	Children & Young Adult

OK Youth Services on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/YSCOK
OK Youth Services on Twitter: https://twitter.com/okcya
OK Performers Showcase: http://showcase.oklibraries.org/
CYA Wiki: http://cyawiki.oklibraries.org
CYA Podcast: http://yalitlovers.oklibshare.org
CYA Podcast on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/cyapodcast
CYA Podcast on Twitter: https://twitter.com/cyapodcast

Oklahoma Department of Libraries

Appendix C: LSTA FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	LSTA Administration		$ 32,580.06	1.59%	$ 27,614.81	1.30%	$ 19,348.66	0.91%	$ 79,543.53	1.27%
3	Immigration and Citizenship	3	$ -	0.00%	$ 47,672.00	2.25%	$ 86,500.00	4.09%	$ 134,172.00	2.13%
4	Small Library Technology Grant	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 59,500.00	2.81%	$ 59,500.00	0.95%
5	Literacy Management System	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 57,776.00	2.73%	$ 75,683.00	3.58%	$ 133,459.00	2.12%
6	Literacy Notes	4	$ 16,975.00	0.83%	$ 28,383.73	1.34%	$ -	0.00%	$ 45,358.73	0.72%
7	State Organization Literacy Summit	4	$ 5,510.52	0.27%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 5,510.52	0.09%
8	Summer Reading Program	4	$ 75,417.35	3.68%	$ 79,733.57	3.76%	$ 97,285.42	4.60%	$ 252,436.34	4.02%
9	STEM	4	$ 71,012.37	3.46%	$ 99,158.94	4.68%	$ -	0.00%	$ 170,171.31	2.71%
10	Edge	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 528.93	0.02%	$ 59,225.02	2.80%	$ 59,753.95	0.95%
11	Resource Sharing	2	$ 412,616.24	20.12%	$ 411,054.39	19.40%	$ 459,447.09	21.71%	$ 1,283,117.72	20.41%
12	Annual Report	1	$ 6,000.00	0.29%	$ 7,500.00	0.35%	$ 6,923.09	0.33%	$ 20,423.09	0.32%
13	Certification for Public Librarians	5	$ 34,657.46	1.69%	$ 21,547.87	1.02%	$ 17,484.55	0.83%	$ 73,689.88	1.17%
14	Continuing Education for Public Librarians	5	$ 36,155.44	1.76%	$ 23,883.73	1.13%	$ 35,762.83	1.69%	$ 95,802.00	1.52%
15	Computer Lab	5	$ 20,975.48	1.02%	$ 36,760.61	1.73%	$ 50,495.87	2.39%	$ 108,231.96	1.72%
16	E-Media Collection Grant	2	$ 113,500.00	5.53%	$ 40,000.00	1.89%	$ 100,000.00	4.72%	$ 253,500.00	4.03%
17	Health Literacy	4	$ 106,016.56	5.17%	$ 78,472.37	3.70%	$ 137,619.13	6.50%	$ 322,108.06	5.12%
18	Images of Oklahoma	2	$ -	0.00%	$ 33,711.20	1.59%	$ 33,133.34	1.57%	$ 66,844.54	1.06%
19	Insttutions	4	$ 62,000.00	3.02%	$ 41,464.00	1.96%	$ 85,956.39	4.06%	$ 189,420.39	3.01%
20	Literacy Development	4	$ 72,598.56	3.54%	$ 46,969.38	2.22%	$ 74,364.98	3.51%	$ 193,932.92	3.08%
21	Network Assessment & Remediation	1	$ 162,901.50	7.94%	$ 270,295.23	12.76%	$ 137,651.19	6.50%	$ 570,847.92	9.08%
22	ODL Video Conference Maintenance	2	$ 21,360.65	1.04%	$ 24,107.21	1.14%	$ 24,992.95	1.18%	$ 70,460.81	1.12%
23	Okconnect Video Conference Equipment Maintenanc	2	$ 145,545.58	7.10%	$ 213,579.62	10.08%	$ -	0.00%	$ 359,125.20	5.71%
24	Research in Public Libraries	5	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 1,354.77	0.06%	$ 1,354.77	0.02%
25	Video Conference Training	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,871.00	0.14%	$ 2,871.00	0.05%
26	Website Development	1	$ 6,705.48	0.33%	$ 7,377.67	0.35%	$ 12,998.46	0.61%	$ 27,081.61	0.43%
27	Statewide Databases	2	$ 560,478.00	27.33%	$ 521,473.74	24.61%	$ 529,004.26	24.99%	$ 1,610,956.00	25.63%
28	Brainfuse	2	$ 88,029.75	4.29%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 88,029.75	1.40%
29	Oklahoma Community Health Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 6,500.00	0.31%	$ 6,500.00	0.10%
30	Read Harder Challenge Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,351.00	0.11%	$ 2,351.00	0.04%
31			$ 2,051,036.00	100.00%	$ 2,119,065.00	100.00%	$ 2,116,453.00	100.00%	$ 6,286,554.00	100.00%
32										
33	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
34										
35			$ -		$ -		$ -			

Appendix D: LSTA FFY 2013 -FFY 2015 Expenditures (Detail)

All Programs

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	LSTA Administration		$ 32,580.06	1.59%	$ 27,614.81	1.30%	$ 19,348.66	0.91%	$ 79,543.53	1.27%
3	Immigration and Citizenship	3	$ -	0.00%	$ 47,672.00	2.25%	$ 86,500.00	4.09%	$ 134,172.00	2.13%
4	Small Library Technology Grant	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 59,500.00	2.81%	$ 59,500.00	0.95%
5	Literacy Management System	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 57,776.00	2.73%	$ 75,683.00	3.58%	$ 133,459.00	2.12%
6	Literacy Notes	4	$ 16,975.00	0.83%	$ 28,383.73	1.34%	$ -	0.00%	$ 45,358.73	0.72%
7	State Organization Literacy Summit	4	$ 5,510.52	0.27%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 5,510.52	0.09%
8	Summer Reading Program	4	$ 75,417.35	3.68%	$ 79,733.57	3.76%	$ 97,285.42	4.60%	$ 252,436.34	4.02%
9	STEM	4	$ 71,012.37	3.46%	$ 99,158.94	4.68%	$ -	0.00%	$ 170,171.31	2.71%
10	Edge	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 528.93	0.02%	$ 59,225.02	2.80%	$ 59,753.95	0.95%
11	Resource Sharing	2	$ 412,616.24	20.12%	$ 411,054.39	19.40%	$ 459,447.09	21.71%	$ 1,283,117.72	20.41%
12	Annual Report	1	$ 6,000.00	0.29%	$ 7,500.00	0.35%	$ 6,923.09	0.33%	$ 20,423.09	0.32%
13	Certification for Public Librarians	5	$ 34,657.46	1.69%	$ 21,547.87	1.02%	$ 17,484.55	0.83%	$ 73,689.88	1.17%
14	Continuing Education for Public Librarians	5	$ 36,155.44	1.76%	$ 23,883.73	1.13%	$ 35,762.83	1.69%	$ 95,802.00	1.52%
15	Computer Lab	5	$ 20,975.48	1.02%	$ 36,760.61	1.73%	$ 50,495.87	2.39%	$ 108,231.96	1.72%
16	E-Media Collection Grant	2	$ 113,500.00	5.53%	$ 40,000.00	1.89%	$ 100,000.00	4.72%	$ 253,500.00	4.03%
17	Health Literacy	4	$ 106,016.56	5.17%	$ 78,472.37	3.70%	$ 137,619.13	6.50%	$ 322,108.06	5.12%
18	Images of Oklahoma	2	$ -	0.00%	$ 33,711.20	1.59%	$ 33,133.34	1.57%	$ 66,844.54	1.06%
19	Insttutions	4	$ 62,000.00	3.02%	$ 41,464.00	1.96%	$ 85,956.39	4.06%	$ 189,420.39	3.01%
20	Literacy Development	4	$ 72,598.56	3.54%	$ 46,969.38	2.22%	$ 74,364.98	3.51%	$ 193,932.92	3.08%
21	Network Assessment & Remediation	1	$ 162,901.50	7.94%	$ 270,295.23	12.76%	$ 137,651.19	6.50%	$ 570,847.92	9.08%
22	ODL Video Conference Maintenance	2	$ 21,360.65	1.04%	$ 24,107.21	1.14%	$ 24,992.95	1.18%	$ 70,460.81	1.12%
23	Okconnect Video Conference Equipment Maintenanc	2	$ 145,545.58	7.10%	$ 213,579.62	10.08%	$ -	0.00%	$ 359,125.20	5.71%
24	Research in Public Libraries	5	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 1,354.77	0.06%	$ 1,354.77	0.02%
25	Video Conference Training	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,871.00	0.14%	$ 2,871.00	0.05%
26	Website Development	1	$ 6,705.48	0.33%	$ 7,377.67	0.35%	$ 12,998.46	0.61%	$ 27,081.61	0.43%
27	Statewide Databases	2	$ 560,478.00	27.33%	$ 521,473.74	24.61%	$ 529,004.26	24.99%	$ 1,610,956.00	25.63%
28	Brainfuse	2	$ 88,029.75	4.29%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 88,029.75	1.40%
29	Oklahoma Community Health Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 6,500.00	0.31%	$ 6,500.00	0.10%
30	Read Harder Challenge Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,351.00	0.11%	$ 2,351.00	0.04%
31			$ 2,051,036.00	100.00%	$ 2,119,065.00	100.00%	$ 2,116,453.00	100.00%	$ 6,286,554.00	100.00%
32										
33	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
34										
35			$ -		$ -		$ -			

Goal 1: Assist libraries to identify and to adopt innovative technology and to incorporate these services into library operations	**Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 1** **13.90%**
Goal 2: In order to participate globally, Oklahoma citizens must have access to vital and cost effective resources available through the library. Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) will assist communities obtain these resources.	**Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 2** **59.37%**
Goal 3: The Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma's public libraries, as well as library-based and community-based literacy programs will foster partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and the private sector to support libraries as strong community anchors which enhance civic engagement, cultural opportunities, and economic vitality	**Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 3** **2.13%**
Goal 4: Oklahomans at risk due to educational, economic, physical, and social conditions will be provided resources and opportunities to acquire basic information skills	**Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 4** **18.89%**
Goal 5: ODL will assist Oklahoma librarians obtain increased competencies to enable them to deliver effective service to their communities.	**Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 5** **4.44%**

Goal 1

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	Small Library Technology Grant	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 59,500.00	16.77%	$ 59,500.00	6.81%
3	Literacy Management System	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 57,776.00	16.82%	$ 75,683.00	21.33%	$ 133,459.00	15.27%
4	Edge	1	$ -	0.00%	$ 528.93	0.15%	$ 59,225.02	16.69%	$ 59,753.95	6.84%
5	Annual Report	1	$ 6,000.00	3.42%	$ 7,500.00	2.18%	$ 6,923.09	1.95%	$ 20,423.09	2.34%
6	Network Assessment & Remediation	1	$ 162,901.50	92.76%	$ 270,295.23	78.69%	$ 137,651.19	38.79%	$ 570,847.92	65.32%
7	Video Conference Training	1	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,871.00	0.81%	$ 2,871.00	0.33%
8	Website Development	1	$ 6,705.48	3.82%	$ 7,377.67	2.15%	$ 12,998.46	3.66%	$ 27,081.61	3.10%
9			$ 175,606.98	100.00%	$ 343,477.83	100.00%	$ 354,851.76	100.00%	$ 873,936.57	100.00%
10										
11	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
12										
13			$ 1,875,429.02		$ 1,775,587.17		$ 1,761,601.24			

Goal 2

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	Resource Sharing	2	$ 412,616.24	30.76%	$ 411,054.39	33.04%	$ 459,447.09	40.07%	$ 1,283,117.72	34.38%
3	E-Media Collection Grant	2	$ 113,500.00	8.46%	$ 40,000.00	3.22%	$ 100,000.00	8.72%	$ 253,500.00	6.79%
4	Images of Oklahoma	2	$ -	0.00%	$ 33,711.20	2.71%	$ 33,133.34	2.89%	$ 66,844.54	1.79%
5	ODL Video Conference Maintenance	2	$ 21,360.65	1.59%	$ 24,107.21	1.94%	$ 24,992.95	2.18%	$ 70,460.81	1.89%
6	Okconnect Video Conference Equipment Maintenance	2	$ 145,545.58	10.85%	$ 213,579.62	17.17%	$ -	0.00%	$ 359,125.20	9.62%
7	Statewide Databases	2	$ 560,478.00	41.78%	$ 521,473.74	41.92%	$ 529,004.26	46.14%	$ 1,610,956.00	43.17%
8	Brainfuse	2	$ 88,029.75	6.56%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 88,029.75	2.36%
9			$ 1,341,530.22	100.00%	$ 1,243,926.16	100.00%	$ 1,146,577.64	100.00%	$ 3,732,034.02	100.00%
10										
11	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
12										
13			$ 709,505.78		$ 875,138.84		$ 969,875.36			

Goal 3

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	Immigration and Citizenship	3	$ -	0.00%%	$ 47,672.00	100.00%	$ 86,500.00	100.00%	$ 134,172.00	100.00%
3	Total		$ -	0.00%%	$ 47,672.00	100.00%	$ 86,500.00	100.00%	$ 134,172.00	100.00%
4										
5	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
6										
7			$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,071,393.00		$ 2,029,953.00			

Goal 4

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	Literacy Notes	4	$ 16,975.00	4.14%	$ 28,383.73	7.59%	$ -	0.00%	$ 45,358.73	3.82%
3	State Organization Literacy Summit	4	$ 5,510.52	1.35%		0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 5,510.52	0.46%
4	Summer Reading Program	4	$ 75,417.35	18.42%	$ 79,733.57	21.31%	$ 97,285.42	24.08%	$ 252,436.34	21.25%
5	STEM	4	$ 71,012.37	17.34%	$ 99,158.94	26.50%	$ -	0.00%	$ 170,171.31	14.33%
6	Health Literacy	4	$ 106,016.56	25.89%	$ 78,472.37	20.97%	$ 137,619.13	34.06%	$ 322,108.06	27.12%
7	Insttutions	4	$ 62,000.00	15.14%	$ 41,464.00	11.08%	$ 85,956.39	21.27%	$ 189,420.39	15.95%
8	Literacy Development	4	$ 72,598.56	17.73%	$ 46,969.38	12.55%	$ 74,364.98	18.40%	$ 193,932.92	16.33%
9	Oklahoma Community Health Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 6,500.00	1.61%	$ 6,500.00	0.55%
10	Read Harder Challenge Grant	4	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 2,351.00	0.58%	$ 2,351.00	0.20%
11			$ 409,530.36	100.00%	$ 374,181.99	100.00%	$ 404,076.92	100.00%	$ 1,187,789.27	100.00%
12										
13	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
14										
15			$ 1,641,505.64		$ 1,744,883.01		$ 1,712,376.08			

Goal 5

1		Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage of FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditure	Percentage of FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of Total FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
2	Certification for Public Librarians	5	$ 34,657.46	37.76%	$ 21,547.87	26.22%	$ 17,484.55	16.64%	$ 73,689.88	26.40%
3	Continuing Education for Public Librarians	5	$ 36,155.44	39.39%	$ 23,883.73	29.06%	$ 35,762.83	34.03%	$ 95,802.00	34.33%
4	Computer Lab	5	$ 20,975.48	22.85%	$ 36,760.61	44.73%	$ 50,495.87	48.05%	$ 108,231.96	38.78%
5	Research in Public Libraries	5	$ -	0.00%	$ -	0.00%	$ 1,354.77	1.29%	$ 1,354.77	0.49%
6			$ 91,788.38	100.00%	$ 82,192.21	100.00%	$ 105,098.02	100.00%	$ 279,078.61	100.00%
7										
8	LSTA Allotment		$ 2,051,036.00		$ 2,119,065.00		$ 2,116,453.00		$ 6,286,554.00	
9										
10			$ 1,959,247.62		$ 2,036,872.79		$ 2,011,354.98			

Appendix E: Oklahoma LSTA Target Population Summary

	STATE GOAL	Library Workforce (current and future)	Individuals Living Below the Poverty Line	Individuals who 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)	School-aged Youth (aged 6-17)
Small Library Technology Grant	1	YES									
Literacy Management System	1										
Edge	1	YES									
Annual Report	1	YES									
Network Assessment & Remediation	1	YES									
Video Conference Training	1	YES									
Website Development	1	YES									
Resource Sharing	2										
E-Media Collection Grant	2	YES									
Images of Oklahoma	2	YES									
ODL Video Conference Maintenance	2	YES									
Okconnect Videoconference Equipment Maintenance	2										
Statewide Databases	2	YES									
Brainfuse	2			YES							
Immigration and Citizenship	3				YES	YES		YES			
Literacy Notes	4										
State Organization Literacy Summit	4										
Summer Reading Program	4									YES	YES
STEM	4										
Health Literacy	4		YES					YES	YES	YES	YES
Institutions	4							YES			YES
Literacy Development	4	YES									
Oklahoma Community Health Grant	4				YES						YES
Read Harder Challenge Grant	4	YES									
Certification for Public Librarians	5	YES									
Continuing Education for Public Librarians	5	YES									
Computer Lab	5	YES									
Research in Public Libraries (RIPL)	5	YES									
		GOAL 1		GOAL 2		GOAL 3		GOAL 4		GOAL 5	

Appendix F: Oklahoma - Measuring Success Table

	Lifelong Learning			Information Access			Institutional Capacity			Economic & Employment Development			Human Resources			Civic Engagement		
	Improve users' formal education	Improve users' general knowledge and skills	Improve users' ability to discover information resources	Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources	Improve the library workforce	Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure	Improve library operations	Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support	Improve users' ability to use and apply business resources	Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family or household finances	Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health & wellness	Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills	Improve users' ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern
Small Library Technology Grant						Yes							
Literacy Management System				Yes									
Edge					Yes								
Annual Report							Yes						
Network Assessment & Remediation							Yes						
Video Conference Training							Yes						
Website Development			Yes										
Resource Sharing				Yes									
E-Media Collection Grant				Yes									
Images of Oklahoma				Yes									
ODL Video Conference Maintenance							Yes						
Okconnect Videoconference Equipment Maintenance							Yes						
Statewide Databases			Yes	Yes									
Brainfuse				Yes									
Immigration and Citizenship												Yes	
Literacy Notes				Yes									
State Organization Literacy Summit													Yes
Summer Reading Program		Yes											
STEM		Yes											
Health Literacy										Yes			
Institutions				Yes									
Literacy Development		Yes											
Oklahoma Community Health Grant										Yes			
Read Harder Challenge Grant					Yes								
Certification for Public Librarians					Yes								
Continuing Education for Public Librarians					Yes								
Computer Lab					Yes								
Research in Public Libraries (RIPL)		Yes											
	GOAL 1		GOAL 2		GOAL 3		GOAL 4		GOAL 5				

Appendix G: List of People Interviewed

ODL Staff
Judy Tirey, LSTA Coordinator
Susan McVey, ODL Director
Vicki Sullivan, ODL Deputy Director
Arlene Paschel, Circulation & Reference Manager, Library Resources
Kitty Pitman, Library Resources Administrator
Cathy Van Hoy, Consultant, Library Development
Leslie Gelders, Administrative Programs Officer,Literacy Resource Office
Rebecca Barker, Administrative Programs Officer, Literacy Resource Office
Melissa Askew, Consultant, Library Development
Vicki Mohr, Administrator, Library Development
Bill Young, Public Information Manager
Kathy O'Donnell, Computer Lab Coordinator, Library Development
David Hankey, Administrative Assistant
Shalalah Saunders, Library Technician
Jan Davis, Administrative Archivist
Adrienne Butler, Children & Youth Consultant Library Development

Claremore Library Site Visit
Staff

- Tena Cassity, Children's Services
- Leslie Rogers, Assistant Director
- Meg Espey, Circulation Services and Young Adult Programming
- Teresa Forbes, Circulation Clerk and Interlibrary Loan
- Sherry Beach, Library Director

Focus Group Participants

- Ida Fay Winters, Great Plains Literacy Council
- Jane Smithey, Western Oklahoma Learning Center
- Angela Spindle, Oklahoma Literacy Coalitions
- John G Amicars, Literacy Luck
- Adriana Chavez, McClain County Literacy
- Patricia Kelley, OLC

Clinton Library Site Visit
Staff

- Tim Miller, Director, Western Plains Library System
- Kathy Atchley, Clinton Public Library
- Jackie Kropp

Oklahoma Department of Libraries - Interlibrary Loan Focus Group

- Jack Bowers, Principal (James Crabtree Correctional Center)
- Gena Suson (Walters Public Library)
- Marcina Overman, Director (Newkirk)
- Kathy Spenser, Circulation Clerk (Mustang PL)
- Jacqueline King (Mabel Bassett Correctional Center)

Oklahoma Department of Libraries - State Aid Focus Group

- Kathy Hale, Director (Altus Public Library -Southern Prairie Library System)
- Daniel Gibbs, Director (Ardmore Public Library)
- Lee Ann Barnes, Director (Okeene Public Library)
- Marcia Johnson, Director (Miami Public Library)
- Lynda Reynolds, Director (Stillwater Public Library)
- Ann Masters, Director (Pioneer Library System)

Oklahoma Department of Libraries - Literacy Focus Group

- Ida Fay Winters, Great Plains Literacy Council
- Jane Smithey, Western Oklahoma Learning Center
- Angela Spindle, Oklahoma Literacy Coalitions
- John G Amicars, Literacy Luck
- Adriana Chavez, McClain County Literacy
- Patricia Kelley, Oklahoma Literacy Coalition

Appendix H: Web Survey Instrument

Oklahoma LSTA Survey

WELCOME

LIBRARY DESCRIPTION

1) Please provide the name of your library.

2) Please describe the type of Library you represent.
Public library
School library
Academic library
Other (Please specify below.)

If you responded "other" in the question above, please indicate the type of library or other organization you represent in three words or less in the text box provided below.

LIBRARY AND RESPONDENT DESCRIPTION

3) Please indicate the name of the county in which your library is located.

4) Please select the category that most closely describes your role/responsibilities in your library.
Library director
Manager/ Department Head
Other library administrator
Children's/youth services librarian
Reference/information services librarian
Interlibrary loan/document delivery librarian
Technical services librarian
Library technology specialist
Other library staff
Library trustee or library friend
Other (Please specify below.)

If you responded "other" to the question above, please indicate your role in the library or other organization you represent in three words or less in the text box provided below.

5) Please indicate the size of the community served by the library you represent.
Fewer than 250
250 - 499

500 - 2,499
2,500 - 4,999
5,000 - 9,999
10,000 - 24,999
25,000 - 49,999
50,000 - 99,999
100,000 -249,999
250,000 - 499,999
500,000 - 999,999
1 Million or more
DON’T KNOW

6) Please estimate the overall annual operating budget (excluding capital expenses) of the library you represent.

Less than $10,000
$10,000 - $49,999
$50,000 - $99,999
$100,000 - $199,999
$200,000 - $299,999
$300,000 - $399,999
$400,000 - $499,999
$500,000 - $999,999
$1,000,000 - $1,999,999
$2,000,000 - $2,999,999
$3,000,000 - $4,999,999
$5,000,000 or more
DON'T KNOW

7) Please indicate the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff employed in the library which you represent.

Less than 2
2 - 4
5 - 9
10 - 19
20 - 34
35 - 49
50 - 99
100 - 249
250 - 499
500 - 999
1,000 or more
DON’T KNOW

SERVICE MODULE INTRODUCTION

SUMMER READING PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

8) Did your library offer a summer reading program in 2016

Yes
No

9) If you responded "yes" to the question above, did your library use the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) program manual and/or other CSLP materials provided through ODL?

Yes
No

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - NONE

10) What was the main reason your library did not offer a summer reading program in 2016?

Limited resources to purchase materials
Insufficient staff to manage a summer reading program
Lack of physical space to support a summer reading program
Other (Please explain below.)

If you answered "other" in the question above, please explain in the text box provided below.

11) Are there services that ODL could provide that would help your library mount a successful summer reading program in the future?

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - BASIC

12) Please identify the summer reading program services you provided to each of the following targeted groups in 2016.

	Only self-help guides, reading lists, and other resources provided without staff led events or programs	Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs	No summer reading program offered for this group
Pre-school children			
School-aged children			

Teens			
Adults			

13) My staff have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

14) Briefly describe the types of skills or training you feel would help your staff plan and conduct an effective summer reading program.

15) My library receives all of the support it needs from ODL to conduct an effective summer reading program.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

16) Briefly describe the types of additional support you feel would help your library plan and conduct an effective summer reading program.

17) Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) Program Manual

1 - Poor
2 - Fair
3 - Good
4 - Excellent
Not aware of this resource
Did not use this resource

18) The "Performers' Showcase"

1 - Poor
2 - Fair
3 - Good
4 - Excellent
Not aware of this resource
Did not use this resource

19) General summer reading program advice and consultation

1 - Poor

2 - Fair
3 - Good
4 - Excellent
Not aware of this resource
Did not use this resource

20) If you have any additional feedback for ODL regarding its support for your library's summer reading program, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

EDGE ASSESSMENT

21) My library has participated in the EDGE assessment program.

Yes
No

If you responded "No" to the question above, what is the primary reason your library hasn't participated in EDGE?

EDGE - NON-PARTICIPANT

22) Please indicate the most important way(s) in which the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL) could assist your library in providing better public access to the Internet and electronic/ digital resources.

EDGE NETWORK ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION - PARTICIPANT

23) The Oklahoma Department of Libraries uses LSTA funds to pay for the EDGE assessment program. Please indicate the importance of this investment to your library.

1 - Very unimportant
2 - Unimportant
3 - Neither unimportant nor important
4 - Important
5 - Very important
6 - Unable to rate

24) The EDGE assessment program has provided useful information about the strengths and weaknesses of my library's technological infrastructure.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree

3 - Neither disagree nor agree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree
6 - Did not participate

25) The EDGE assessment program has provided my library with a valuable opportunity to have a conversation with community leaders and decision-makers about the importance of the library in providing the public with access to the Internet and electronic/digital resources.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither disagree nor agree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree
6 - Did not participate

26) ODL has assisted my library in addressing deficiencies in my library's technological infrastructure.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither disagree nor agree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree
6 - Did not participate

27) If you have any additional feedback for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries investment in the EDGE assessment and in the remediation program, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN/ RESOURCE SHARING

28) ODL supports resource sharing in a number of different ways. Please indicate whether or not your library participates in each of the following activities:

	YES, my library participates	NO, my library does not participate	I was not aware of the program
My library lends materials to other libraries			
My library borrows materials from other libraries			
My library uses WorldCat			

My library uses the ILLiad interlibrary loan system			

29) My library has the technological resources it needs for the effective sharing of resources.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

30) How does the availability of interlibrary loan affect your ability to serve your patrons? (Select the response that represents the greatest impact on your library.)

Reduces the overall cost of services to patrons
Improves the quality of service we can provide to patrons
Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access
Increases the ability of my staff to serve the public
Other (Please specify below.)

31) My library receives the support it needs from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries to offer the public an effective resource sharing/ interlibrary loan system.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

32) If there was one thing ODL could do to improve resource sharing, what would it be?

33) Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following resource sharing services provided through ODL, which are partially or wholly supported with LSTA funds.

	1 - Completely dissatisfied	2 - Mostly dissatisfied	3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4 - Mostly satisfied	5 - Completely satisfied	6 - Unable to rate
WorldCat Discovery						
ILLiad Interlibrary Loan System						

Access to the resources of other libraries						

34) If you have any additional feedback for ODL regarding resource sharing services, please insert your comments in the text box provided below.

OKLAHOMA DIGITAL PRAIRIE (Licensed Online Databases/ Resources)

35) Please describe your satisfaction with each of the following e-resources.

	1 - Completely dissatisfied	2 - Dissatisfied	3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4 - Satisfied	5 - Completely Satisfied	6 - NOT FAMILIAR WITH THIS RESOURCE/ UNABLE TO RATE
Academic Search Premier						
Britannica School Elementary						
Britannica School Middle						
Britannica Spanish Reference Center						
Business Source						
Consumer Health						

Complete						
EBSCOhost Espanol						
Explora Educators' Edition						
Explora Elementary Student Research						
Explora High School/ Public Library Search						
Explora Middle School Student Research						
Health Research						
MasterFILE Premier						
Professional Development for Teachers						
Small Business Reference Center						

36) Which three of the e-resources offered through the Oklahoma Digital Prairie do you believe are of the greatest importance to your patrons/ users? (Please select only three.)

Academic Search Premier
Britannica School Elementary
Britannica School Middle

Britannica Spanish Reference center
Business Source
Consumer Health Complete
EBSCOhost Espanol
Explora Educators' Edition
Explora Elementary Student Research
Explora High School/ Public Library Search
Explora Middle School Student Research
Health Research
MasterFILE Premier
Professional Development for Teachers
Small Business Reference Center

37) Please explain the reason that your first choice is of the greatest importance.

38) Are there e-resources/databases that you wish that Digital Prairie included that are currently not available?

Yes
No

39) If you answered "yes" to the question above, indicate which e-resources you would like to see added in order of importance to your patrons/ users. (List most important first.)

40) Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: My staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the Digital Prairie resources.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

41) Please indicate your overall satisfaction with ODL's database licensing program.

1 - Completely dissatisfied
2 - Dissatisfied
3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 - Satisfied
5 - Completely satisfied

42) How does the availability of these e-resources/databases affect your ability to serve your patrons? (Select the response that represents the greatest impact on your library.)

Reduces the overall cost of services to patrons

Improves the quality of service we can provide to patrons
Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access
Increases the ability of my staff to serve the public
Other (Please specify below.)

If you responded "other" to the question above, please specify in the text box provided below.

43) If you have any additional feedback for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries regarding the Digital Prairie program, please insert that feedback below.

OKLAHOMA DIGITAL PRAIRIE (Licensed Online Databases/ Resources) - ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

44) Please describe your satisfaction with each of the following e-resources.

	1 - Completely dissatisfied	2 - Dissatisfied	3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4 - Satisfied	5 - Completely Satisfied	6 - NOT FAMILIAR WITH THIS RESOURCE/ UNABLE TO RATE
Academic Search Premier						
Britannica School Elementary						
Britannica School Middle						
Britannica Spanish Reference Center						
Business Source						
Consumer Health Complete						

EBSCOhost Espanol						
Explora Educators' Edition						
Explora Elementary Student Research						
Explora High School/ Public Library Search						
Explora Middle School Student Research						
Health Research						
MasterFile Premier						
Professional Development for Teachers						
Small Business Reference Center						

45) Which three of the e-resources offered through the Oklahoma Digital Prairie do you believe are of the greatest importance to your patrons/ users? (Please select only three.)

Academic Search Premier
Britannica School Elementary
Britannica School Middle

Britannica Spanish Reference center
Business Source
Consumer Health Complete
EBSCOhost Espanol
Explora Educators' Edition
Explora Elementary Student Research
Explora High School/ Public Library Search
Explora Middle School Student Research
Health Research
MasterFILE Premier
Professional Development for Teachers
Small Business Reference Center

46) Please explain the reason that your first choice is of the greatest importance.

47) Are there e-resources/databases that you wish that Digital Prairie included that are currently not available?

Yes
No

48) If you answered "yes" to the question above, indicate which e-resources you would like to see added in order of importance to your patrons/ users. (List most important first.)

49) Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: My staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the Digital Prairie resources.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neither agree nor disagree
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

50) Please indicate your overall satisfaction with ODL's database licensing program.

1 - Completely dissatisfied
2 - Dissatisfied
3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 - Satisfied
5 - Completely satisfied

51) How does the availability of these e-resources/databases affect your ability to serve your patrons? (Select the response that represents the greatest impact on your library.)

Reduces the overall cost of services to patrons
Improves the quality of service we can provide to patrons
Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access
Increases the ability of my staff to serve the public
Other (Please specify below.)

If you responded "other" to the question above, please specify in the text box provided below.

52) If you have any additional feedback for the Oklahoma Department of Libraries regarding the Digital Prairie program, please insert that feedback below.

OTHER LIBRARY TYPE THANK YOU

53) This survey is designed to be a survey of public, school, and academic libraries. You have been directed to this question because you did not select a type of library or you indicated "other" as your type of library. If you represent a public library, school library, or academic library, please restart the survey and respond "public library," "school library," or academic library. We are still interested in your feedback even if you don't represent one of those types of libraries. Please register your thoughts and comments about the Oklahoma Department of Libraries' use of Library Services and Technology Act funds in the text box provided below or contact Bill Wilson at libraryconsultant@icloud.com to set up a personal telephone interview.

THANK YOU!

Appendix I: Web Survey Summary

Oklahoma LSTA Evaluation Web Survey Summary

Two hundred seventy-seven people responded to the Oklahoma LSTA web survey. One hundred ten represented public libraries, one hundred twenty-six school libraries, and thirty-two academic and other types of libraries (prison libraries, tribal libraries, and state agencies).

A major portion of the survey was directed at public library participants with school and academic library respondents joining into the evaluation at the point where questions were directed toward e-resources offered through the Oklahoma Digital Prairie.

Fifty-eight percent of the public library respondents were library directors. Twenty-five percent, the largest group, were in libraries serving community populations of 500 to 2,499.

Summer Reading

Only one public library respondent said their library had not offered a summer reading program in 2016. Ninety-five percent of those who had a summer reading program had used the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) program manual and/or other CSLP materials.

Ninety-one percent of the respondents said their library had provided resources including staff or other presenters leading events of programs for school-aged children; eighty-four percent had provided this level of support for pre-school children; sixty-five percent had provided this level for teens; and thirty-three percent had provided it for adults.

Seventy-seven percent agreed with the statement: my staff have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program.

Seventy-seven percent agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from ODL to conduct an effective summer reading program. Eighty-two percent rated the CSLP program manual as good or excellent. Fifty-two percent rated the “Performers’ Showcase” as good or excellent. Seventy-three percent rated general summer reading program advice and consultation as good or excellent.

Seventy-five percent said their library has participated in the EDGE assessment program. Seventy-three percent rated the importance of the investment of LSTA funds to pay for the EDGE assessment program as important. Eighty-one percent agreed that the EDGE assessment program has provided useful information about the strengths and weaknesses of their library’s technological infrastructure. Seventy-two percent agreed that ODL has assisted their library in addressing deficiencies in their library’s technological infrastructure.

Resource Sharing

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents said their library borrows materials from other libraries; eighty-two percent said their library uses WorldCat; sixty-four percent said their library lends materials

to other libraries; and sixty-six percent said their library uses the ILLiad interlibrary loan system. Seventy-six percent agreed that their library has the technological resources it needs for the effective sharing of resources. Eighty-five percent agree that their library receives the support it needs from ODL to offer the public an effective resource sharing/interlibrary loan system.

Seventy-two percent are satisfied with access to the resources of other libraries. Seventy percent are satisfied with WorldCat Discovery. Sixty-two percent are satisfied with the ILLiad Interlibrary Loan System.

Oklahoma Digital Prairie

Among the one hundred ten public library respondents, the top five e-resources in terms of satisfaction were Britannica School Elementary, Britannica School Middle, Health Research, Consumer Health Complete, and Academic Search Premier. The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Academic Search Premier, Britannica School Elementary, and Health Research.

Among the one hundred twenty-six school library respondents, the top five e-resources in terms of satisfaction were Britannica School Elementary, Academic Search Premier, Britannica School Middle, Explora Middle School Student Research, and Explora Educators' Edition. The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Britannica School Middle, Britannica School Elementary, and Academic Search Premier.

Among the thirty-two academic and other types of libraries respondents, the top five were Academic Search Premier, Business Source, Masterfile Premier, Professional Development for Teachers, and Small Business Reference Center. The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Academic Search Premier, Business Source, and Health Research.

Eighty-one percent of the academic and other types of libraries respondents agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the Digital Prairie resources. Fifty-four percent of the school library respondents agreed. Forty-three percent of the public library respondents agreed.

Seventy percent of the public library respondents said they were satisfied with ODL's database licensing program. Seventy-six percent of the school library respondents were satisfied. Ninety percent of the academic and other types of libraries respondents were satisfied.

Appendix J: Oklahoma LSTA Evaluation Web Survey Report

Two hundred seventy-seven people responded to the Oklahoma LSTA web survey. One hundred ten represented public libraries, one hundred twenty-six school libraries, and thirty-two academic and other types of libraries (prison libraries, tribal libraries, and state agencies). Participants were in fifty-three of Oklahoma's seventy-seven counties.

A major portion of the survey was directed at public library participants with school and academic library respondents joining into the evaluation at the point where questions were directed toward e-resources offered through the Oklahoma Digital Prairie.

Fifty-eight (58.6) percent of the public library respondents were library directors, another eleven (11.7) percent were managers/department heads, and another eight (8.1) percent were children's/youth services librarians. Twenty-five (25.5) percent, the largest percentage group, were in libraries serving 500 to 2,499 community populations. Three respondents were in communities under 500 in population and three were in communities of 500,000 to 999,999 people. Thirty-one (31.9) percent reported their annual operating budgets as between $10,000 and $99,999. Four had budgets of under $10,000 and five had budgets of $5,000,000 or more.
The largest percent (34.2 percent) had full-time equivalent (FTE) staff of less than two. Sixty-two (62.1) percent had four or less FTE staff. Two respondents said their libraries had 500 to 999 FTE staff members.

Summer Reading

Only one public library respondent reported that their library had not offered a summer reading program in 2016. Ninety-five (95.5) percent of those who had a summer reading program had used the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) program manual and/or other CSLP materials provided through the Oklahoma Department of Libraries (ODL).

Ninety-one (91.7) percent of the respondents said their library had provided resources including staff or other presenters leading events of programs for school-aged children; eighty-four (84.3) percent had provided this level of support for pre-school children; sixty-five (65.3) percent had provided this level for teens; and thirty-three (33.3) percent had provided it for adults. While all the libraries had provided some summer reading program for school-aged children, seven (7.4) percent had not offered a summer reading program for pre-school children. Twenty-four (24.8) percent had not offered a summer reading program for teens and fifty-two (52.1) percent had not offered a summer reading program for adults.

Seventy-seven (77.7) percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: my staff have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Ten (10.1) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Fifty-nine participants answered the question: briefly describe the types of skills or training you feel would help your staff plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* The responses were quite varied. They ranged from not needing more help: "I choose

educators from the community to volunteer. It has been a wonderful help and the children like the programs" to "I think my staff would benefit from seeing examples of how other libraries hold their summer reading program. We do it the way it has always been done because that is the way it was done" to "improvisation training to encourage enthusiastic creativity in modeling fun read aloud." Several mentioned specific types of training: "access to lesson plans and ideas…access to an online database of program ideas in the form of lesson plans." "Developmental and reading level training for school age children." "publicity creation." Some listed specific skills needed: "customer service skills, primarily," "being organized, creative, able to work with people, multitasking, communication skills."

Seventy-seven (77.8) percent agreed or strongly agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from ODL to conduct an effective summer reading program. Five (5.6) percent strongly disagreed. Forty-four provided descriptions of the types of additional support that would help their library plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Several mentioned financial support, "money for part time help," "financial, so our small library could have a program presented. Lots of the presenters are appealing, but we do not have funds." Several comments were very positive: "We get a great amount of support from ODL with the workshops and all the printed materials." Some participants would like the workshops to be held in closer (to them) locations "I do wish that the trainings that ODL provides were located more towards the EDGES of the state. YES the central part of the state is a good idea too—but not every training needs to be held there. It would be ok to hold some in the corners too." Another theme in the responses to open ended questions relating to the summer reading program is requests for more craft ideas.

Eighty-two (82.4) percent rated the CSLP program manual as good or excellent. Fifty-two (52.3) percent rated the "Performers' Showcase" as good or excellent. Twenty-six (26.6) percent said they did not use this resource. Seventy-three (73.1) percent rated general summer reading program advice and consultation as good or excellent. Thirteen (13.0) percent said they did not use this resource. Thirty-five participants provided additional feedback regarding ODL support for the summer reading program. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Most were complimentary: "For many years, ODL has generously provided instruction and materials for children and young adults during summer reading. This support is invaluable to our library staff on the front lines." "I think ODL is doing an excellent job helping libraries, especially small libraries, with summer reading. My staff and I don't have to spend time or money to make and print reading logs, we don't have to make many promotional items, and we have the support of ODL if we need to ask questions. I'm so happy to be working with ODL on summer reading." However, "In my opinion the manual is becoming less of an essential item when planning SRP crafts and activities. My children's librarian almost exclusively uses Pinterest and other social websites to find ideas. I do think the professional graphics are essential to have for promotional materials."

Seventy-five (75.5) percent said their library has participated in the EDGE assessment program. Nineteen participants who had not participated gave their primary reason for not participating. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Most did not know why their library had not participated. Two said their system did not participate.

Eleven responded to the question of how the ODL could assist their library in providing better public access to the Internet and electronic/digital resources. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Five were uncertain. Training seemed to be the answer for some. "Training on what to do and how to do it. We have a good IT department here for the entire compound but they are also very busy."

Seventy-three (73.4) percent rated the importance of the investment of LSTA funds to pay for the EDGE assessment program as important or very important. Eighty-one (81.0) percent agreed or strongly agreed that the EDGE assessment program has provided useful information about the strengths and weaknesses of their library's technological infrastructure. Sixty-two (62.0) percent agreed or strongly agreed that the EDGE assessment program has provided their library with a valuable opportunity to have a conversation with community leaders and decision-makers about the importance of the library in providing the public with access to the Internet and electronic/digital resources. Thirty-two (32.9) percent neither disagreed nor agreed with the statement.

Seventy-two (72.1) percent agreed or strongly agreed that ODL has assisted their library in addressing deficiencies in their library's technological infrastructure. Twenty-four (24.1) percent neither disagreed nor agreed. Nineteen participants provided additional feedback regarding the investment in the EDGE assessment and in the remediation program. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* "EDGE is a useful tool that forced me to think about the services we are currently offering, and those that we should/want to offer. I'm guilty of not using it to its potential." "I really can't get community leaders to buy in to the importance of the library. They tend to purchase their own books and technology and take pride in 'not needing' the library's services. We keep trying!" "Personally EDGE Program was very difficult to understand. If someone hadn't called me and helped fill everything out I would never have gotten it done. Too difficult! Still don't totally understand it." "The technological support ODL provides to our state libraries is very greatly appreciated. We could not participate in many tech advances without ODL's assistance. The EDGE assessment lets us review where our library tech services are in relation to services offered by area libraries. EDGE lets us measure progress and helps us set goals. With a small staff it is difficult to implement some of the EDGE suggestions."

Resource Sharing

Eighty-nine (89.9) percent of the respondents said their library borrows materials from other libraries; eighty-two (82.1) percent said their library uses WorldCat; sixty-four (64.6) percent said their library lends materials to other libraries; and sixty-six (66.2) percent said their library uses the ILLiad interlibrary loan system. Twelve (12.2) percent said they were unaware of the ILLiad system.

Seventy-six (76.3) percent agreed or strongly agreed that their library has the technological resources it needs for the effective sharing of resources. Eight (8.8) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Fifty-seven (57.0) percent believe the availability of interlibrary loan broadens the range of services/resources their patrons can access. Another twenty-one (21.5) percent believe it improves the quality of service they can provide to patrons.

Eighty-five (85.9) percent agree or strongly agree that their library receives the support it needs from ODL to offer the public an effective resource sharing/interlibrary loan system. Nineteen provided comments in response to the question of what one thing ODL could do to improve resource sharing. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* The major concern seems to be cost. "Again it comes down to funding, helping with shipping cost would be great…" "…prepaid return labels!" "Offer funding for postage? The cost of mailing borrowed materials back to loaning libraries can add up. We currently don't charge our customers for ILL services, because we don't want it to be prohibitive for them." "Pay for postage between libraries."

Seventy-two (72.8) percent are mostly or completely satisfied with access to the resources of other libraries. Seventy (70.9) percent are mostly or completely satisfied with WorldCat Discovery. Sixty-two (62.4) percent are mostly or completely satisfied with the ILLiad Interlibrary Loan System. Eleven participants gave additional feedback regarding resource sharing. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Most were pleased. "Again, a huge thanks." "The Stillwater Public Library greatly appreciates ODL paying for our OCLC subscription for ILL."

Oklahoma Digital Prairie

In this final section of the survey respondents from all types of libraries were asked questions regarding the Digital Prairie program. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with each of fifteen e-resources using a five-point scale in which one indicated complete dissatisfied and five indicated completely satisfied. They were also able to indicate that they were not familiar with the resource or were unable to rate it. The table below lists the e-resources in descending order of the overall responses, adding the satisfied and completely satisfied ratings for each.

E-Resource	**% Satisfied**	**% Unable to Rate**
Britannica School Elementary	64.1%	28.1%
Britannica School Middle	61.0%	31.2%
Academic Search Premier	59.3%	32.5%
Health Research	47.2%	45.4%
Explora Middle School Student Research	44.1%	43.2%
Explora High School/Public Library Search	43.0%	45.6%
Consumer Health Complete	42.6%	48.7%
MasterFILE Premier	42.6%	51.1%
Explora Elementary Student Research	41.0%	46.3%

Explora Educators' Edition	38.5%	49.1%
Business Source	33.1%	57.3%
Professional Development for Teachers	33.1%	55.1%
Small Business Reference Center	27.2%	61.2%
Britannica Spanish Reference Center	26.7%	61.6%
EBSCOhost Espanol	20.9%	68.1%

Overall Britannica School Elementary, Britannica School Middle, and Health Research received the highest percents of satisfaction. The highest percents of respondents were unfamiliar with EBSCOhost Espanol and Britannica Spanish Reference Center. Overall respondents said the three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Britannica School Elementary (44.3 percent), Academic Search Premier (41.4 percent), and Britannica School Middle (41.4 percent).

Among the one hundred ten public library respondents the top five e-resources in terms of their levels of satisfaction were Britannica School Elementary (64.1 percent), Britannica School Middle (62.3 percent), Health Research (61.9 percent), Consumer Health Complete (59.4 percent), and Academic Search Premier (54.7 percent). The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Academic Search Premier (45.3 percent), Britannica School Elementary (37.2 percent), and Health Research (36.0 percent).

Among the one hundred twenty-six school library respondents the top five e-resources in terms of their levels of satisfaction were Britannica School Elementary (64.5 percent), Academic Search Premier (63.7 percent), Britannica School Middle (60.5 percent), Explora Middle School Student Research (45.9 percent), and Explora Educators' Edition (45.1 percent). The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Britannica School Middle (50.4 percent), Britannica School Elementary (49.6 percent), and Academic Search Premier (39.0 percent).

Among the thirty-two academic and other library respondents the top five were Academic Search Premier (100 percent), Business Source (85.7 percent), Masterfile Premier (81.9 percent), Professional Development for Teachers (68.2 percent), and Small Business Reference Center (68.2 percent). The three e-resources of greatest importance to their patrons/users were Academic Search Premier (95.5 percent), Business Source (59.1 percent), and Health Research (31.8 percent).

One hundred sixty-nine participants explained the reason for their first choice of e-resource of greatest importance. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* The most frequent reasons were usage "This is the one source we use most often for projects" and reliability "Patrons are often seeking a reliable source for health information."

Examples of public library responses include "all levels of students use the digital prairie resources for school assignments." "Helps us support our primary role as the community's educational hub." "Broad range of subjects, lack of print encyclopedia in library." Several indicated lack of awareness or usage.

"I am not familiar with this resource." "I have not looked at all of these and I'm not sure how many of our patrons access them."

Examples of school library responses include "Academic Search Premiere—Most helpful to prepare high school students for college level work." "Britannica is current and easy to use." "I have young students so it is one of the few databases for them. I also pay for Pebble Go because it is even easier to use than these resources."

Examples of academic and other types of libraries responses include "These are multidisciplinary databases that provide comprehensive choices for almost all of our subject area research." "We supplement this resource to subscribe to Academic Search Complete. ASC is our largest and most widely used database."

Seventy (70.8) percent of the total respondents did not have additional e-resources/databases that they wished were available through Digital Prairie. Public library responses most frequently cited genealogy resources: ancestry.com, for example. School library respondents varied, probably along lines defined by the student level they served. Pebble Go and Gale resources were most often cited. Academic and other types of libraries responses included a variety of resources: JSTOR, Newsbank, "a comprehensive video streaming databases like Alexandria street press or FFH.

Overall forty-nine (49.1) percent agreed or strongly agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the Digital Prairie resources. This varied widely by different types of libraries involved. Eighty-one (81.8) percent of the academic and other types of libraries respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fifty-four (54.4) percent of the school library respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Forty-three (43.2) percent of the public library respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Among the public library respondents twenty-five (25.0) percent neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, but thirty-one (31.7) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Seventy (70.0) percent of the public library respondents said they were satisfied or completely satisfied with ODL's database licensing program. Seventy-six (76.8) percent of the school library respondents were satisfied or completely satisfied. Ninety (90.4) percent of the academic and other types of libraries respondents were satisfied or completely satisfied. All three groupings, public, school, academic and others, said that the availability of the e-resources/databases broadens the range of services/resources their patrons can access. A second choice was that it improves the quality of service we can provide.

Fifty-one participants chose to provide additional feedback regarding the Digital Prairie program. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to this question.)* Examples include "Digital Prairie is vital to the continued education of Oklahoma students. Resource costs continue to climb while budgets decrease and our students must have access to quality resources." "Digital Prairie is way too difficult to get to now…too many links you have to go through to get to it. Not very user friendly." "I would like some training please." "Our patrons tend to do their own Internet subject searches rather than going through the databases." "Thank you for this wonderful service!" "The provision of the databases is so valuable. It makes critical information available to all Oklahomans. Many would not have these resources otherwise. Also the training made available is first class and

greatly improves the library services the citizens receive. ODL utilizes the LSTA money very wisely and provides great services." "The offenders here have benefitted greatly from the help of the ODL. They are great supporters of our offenders in that they loan many educational products and give in any way allowed to educate and assist our inmates. I believe that their efforts help to lower our recidivism rates, which eases the burden on taxpayers and state government."

Appendix K: Bibliography of all documents reviewed

The evaluators conducted an extensive review of background documents, including:

- The ***Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5 Year Evaluation 2008-2012***

- The Oklahoma 2013 - 2017 LSTA Five-year Plan entitled the **Oklahoma Department of Libraries LSTA 5-Year Plan, 2013-2017.**

- State Program Reports (SPRs) submitted to IMLS by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2013, 2014, and 2015 were also used extensively and, in addition, the evaluators reviewed the FFY 2012 SPR to provide baseline information even though that Federal Fiscal Year is not covered by the evaluation.

- ODL Public Library Webserver Webmetrics Reports (fy2014stats-publibs.xls), FY 2009 - July 2013

- OK Virtual Library eBook & AudioBook Survey (eMedia 2015 comments (1).pdf), October 2014 - September 2015

- 2016 Britannica Scavenger Hunt (From Vicki Sullivan), 2016

- Willert, Tim "Oklahoma State School Boards Association launches Library of digital resources for schools." *The Oklahoman* 9 Sept. 2016. Web. 26 Sept. 2016. http://newsok.com/going-digital/article/5517198

- ODL Computer Lab Course Evaluation Summaries from 2013, 2014, and 2015

Appendix L: Select Focus Group Summaries

The consultants conducted four focus groups / individual interviews:

- Claremore Library - General LSTA Service Focus Group (9/13/2016)
- Oklahoma Department of Libraries - Interlibrary Loan Focus Group (9/14/2016)
- Oklahoma Department of Libraries - State Aid Focus Group (9/15/2016)
- Oklahoma Department of Libraries - Literacy Focus Group (9/15/2017)

Notes from select focus groups are presented below.

Claremore Library - General LSTA Service Focus Group

(9/13/2016)

Introduction
The consultant conducted a focus group comprised of interested community members. The following introduction was provided as an outline to the participants at the beginning of the focus group. The actual conversation was rich, dynamic, and free-flowing.

Oklahoma received $ 2,119,065 in Federal funding for libraries through the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States program last year (Federal Fiscal Year 2014); this represents a little over 50 cents per person residing in Oklahoma.

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries has used this money for a combination of major projects that have a statewide impact (statewide database licensing, infrastructure/network improvement, interlibrary loan and resource sharing systems) and smaller programs that improve and extend the capacity of libraries to serve their public closer to home (continuing education and training, assistance with summer reading programs, literacy initiatives).

These programs and projects include:
- Digitization - Will Rogers Museum
- Literacy Training – Will Rogers Library
- Network Assessment and Remediation – Will Rogers Library
- OkConnect Video Conference Equipment Maintenance – Will Rogers Library (equipment was purchased with BTOP $
- In addition – Resource Sharing – WorldCat, ILLiad
- Access to Databases
- Technology Training
- Literacy Training
- Summer Reading Program

Questions asked of Focus Group Participants included:
- Which, if any of these programs are you familiar with?
- Do you use Interlibrary Loan (borrowing materials from other libraries)?

- The electronic databases (full-text magazines and journals, information resources, etc.) are available to users of all types of libraries (public, school, academic). Are you aware of these resources? Do you use them personally? Are they important to students in your family?
- Introducing children to books and reading at an early age and keeping them reading over the summer are vitally important. What can you tell us about the importance of the summer reading program in your community?
- Changes in technology make it very difficult for library staff to keep up! The training offered through ODL with LSTA funds helps staff stay abreast of the evolving world of technology and of new technological resources and tools. How important is it to you that your library keeps up to date in the area of technology?

Claremore Focus Group Transcription

Carson Block: "Oklahoma spends the most LSTA funding (27%) on state-wide databases, followed by ILL/Resource-sharing (20%), then by virtual-library (eBooks/audiobooks), video conferencing."

Which, if any of these programs are you familiar with?

- Focus group consensus: customers don't know about offerings—could advertise these services better:
    - Virtual Library/Overdrive
    - Video conferencing—didn't know we could do that!
    - Interlibrary loan

- What would be the best way to get the word out about library services and offerings?
    - Library website (leaves a lot to be desired)
    - Library website (under the city website) is hard to find; need one-click access (to library resources) instead of being on the city website until you go to the catalog. The website should be more user-friendly and should promote the library better.
    - Facebook
    - Moreclaremore.com is a great community clearinghouse for "what's going on" –would be a great place for residents to find out about library offerings.

- Reaching out to non-users of the library—current advertising/promotions (events, etc.) only reaches current library users.
    - Resources that talk about library tend to talk to the same people (those who already use the library)
    - Many kids at schools don't have a library card…
    - Encourage business use—for example, one participant's husband never had a library card until a year ago, but he got one after she suggested he take his office work to the library when his workplace was too hectic to focus.
    - Market library as a place to go, a place to "do"
        - Market other non-book services
    - Opportunities for adult learners, business users
        - WiFi (important for students - including both kids adult students)
        - Professional meeting place
        - Use of internet (rural area, not everyone has the Internet at home)

        - Audiobooks (appeal even to those who don't read physical books—very popular for road trips)
    - Friends of the Library members tend to be senior citizens, some young women—how to involve other demographics?

Makerspaces—maker discussion

- It would be wonderful if the library could provide a workspace for community members to work on projects
- Great idea to offer this, just be cautious not to step on the toes of local artisans, makers, etc. (could hurt their livelihood by offering things at the library for free that people would otherwise pay to learn, or expect them to put on classes for free).
    - Focus on clubs (e.g. crochet circle—learning from peers)
    - Collaborative environment
- Open-source technology and software are important
    - Lulzbot = open-source 3D printers
- Library can offer technology that would otherwise be out-of-reach (expense, expertise needed) for patrons
- Have a space with a floor drain, etc., for low-tech making. Ideally, might have a partner to help establish maker space programming.

Future:

- The purpose of the library: "an uneducated populace is in danger of being cowed by tyrants."
    - Gain back the role of educating and enlightening the populace—promote reading, literacy (reading, but also technology…)
    - Educational vs. recreational (light reading, clubs)
    - Information literacy component—perception that library is focusing on entertainment value rather than formal literacy, understanding sources, etc.

- Rogers County Literacy Council
- Have a 5k run as a fundraiser
- Provides donated books to community
- Provides literacy tutoring, learning opportunities
- Folks don't hear about opportunities except in the library
- Opportunity: local parochial school system is collapsing
    - Public schools are referred to as "Government Schools"
    - Many parents choosing homeschooling over public school
    - Online schools
- Education continuum
    - Starting to see more high school grads choosing trade- or discipline-training over 4-year college
    - Library can serve full education spectrum—from public, private, or homeschool K-12 and beyond. More than just lifelong learning

When you're thinking about the library being the perfect place for learning, what resources do you need?

- "The Internet!!!" (Instant access to current information)
- "Authoritative lead: need direction and dedication to educational value over entertainment value"—gave an example of TV, popular content is often entertainment-only, but PBS exists (largely because it is subsidized) for those who seek it.
    - Curriculum development
    - Credibility
- Spaces—quiet areas, private areas, group work areas (small and large)—especially necessary for tutoring purposes.
    - Study rooms could be reserve-able, lockable (to keep teens from using unoccupied rooms for non-educational purposes)
- Teens: need to feel like the library is theirs.
    - Idea: school credit for volunteering
    - Encourage teens to have a sense of ownership—channel into volunteering (unfortunately volunteers have to be 16+ to volunteer unsupervised by a parent/guardian).

E-resources/databases (called "websites for library customers," EBSCO, HeritageQuest, etc.) are the highest-cost items covered by LSTA funding for OK libraries. The electronic databases (full-text magazines and journals, information resources, etc.) are available to users of all types of libraries (public, school, academic). Are you aware of these resources? Do you use them personally? Are they important to students in your family?

- There are strong feelings among library users that these are wonderful resources, but not many people (including several participants in the focus group) are aware they are available.
- Marketing of databases should be a priority.

Summer reading program?

- "The summer reading program is vital for everyone, even those without kids, because it increases literacy, which benefits the community as a whole."
- Kids are extremely motivated to earn the prizes—love being rewarded. "Acknowledgment that you succeeded" is a priority.
- The program could use improvement for older kids—offering drawings instead of giving everyone a prize doesn't provide enough reinforcement for lots of kids. Also, one year did a raffle for younger kids too—that was not good since many were too young to understand/care—need a direct reinforce/prize.
- "Sometimes prizes are food coupons—great except for when they are to restaurants that don't exist in this area (Applebee's, etc.)"
- Offer the restaurant coupons to older kids—more valuable to teens than to 5-8-year-olds.
- "Offer summer reading for adults, too!"
    - One City/One Book is a good idea
    - Book clubs

Changes in technology make it hard for staff to keep up—even those with library degrees—so some LSTA funding goes to staff technology training and infrastructure—how important is it to you to have staff trained on tech?

- Very important—"when I came here to use Overdrive a few years ago, I didn't know how to use it and neither did the staff. It was trial and error to figure it out—it's easy to learn if someone can show you a couple of things."
- For patrons, expertise and guidance on technology from staff is a priority
- "I would love to see training labs for staff teach tech classes to public"
- What is the best way the state library can spend LSTA dollars to help you/your community?
- "They should focus on marketing what they already have rather than adding yet more services that no one knows about. After that, use what funding is left to add new services."
- "Promote patronage! If you don't have people in here, you have no reason to offer services. Also need to reach people who aren't already using the library."
- "We need to make sure reading is fun at the library in order to counter the AR standardized testing in schools that makes reading boring or stressful for kids."
- "Makerspaces are exciting—and again it is very important to promote the services/programming. It is also important to provide well-trained, knowledgeable staff, and perhaps charge a fee for materials to help fund maker space programming."
- Strong emphasis on marketing—"get the word out."

Literacy Focus Group

9/15/2017 12:30 - 2:00 pm CST at the Oklahoma Library for the Blind

Attendees to this focus group included a mix of partner agencies, funded agencies, and embedded entities, including:

- Ida Fay Winters, Great Plains Literacy Council
- Jane Smithey, Western Oklahoma Learning Center
- Angela Spindle, Oklahoma Literacy Coalitions
- John G Amicars, Literacy Luck
- Adriana Chavez, McClain County Literacy
- Patricia Kelley, OLC

During the introductory moments the facilitator grounded the group in LSTA funding and purposes. Before before the facilitator raised specific questions, the group discussed general impressions on Oklahoma's literacy landscape, and the conversation turned towards High-School Equivalency (GED) training and testing.

Literacy training in OK is typically geared to specific community needs, including:

- Tutoring and one to one
- ESL
- GED
- Driver's License
- Citizenship
- Learn to read to their children

Participants noted that the high school dropout rate in OK and other factors have created more demand for GED programs and less-expensive GED test options:

- Court mandates for drug abusers, drinking—mandated counseling GED completion

- More flexible time options are in demand, including one-on-one teaching with option to take the the test on paper instead of computer. This approach was cited as a good alternative to meet the court mandate, versus the other options with only one set time opportunity, and a computer-only option.

Those most interested in/needing GED training and testing include the following groups:

- Court mandated(for drug/alcohol offenders)
- Daycares, and daycare workers (GED is required for employment)
- Housekeeping in hotels (GED is required for employment),
- Public school paraprofessionals(GED is required for employment)

English as a Second Language (ESL) is also a need in Oklahoma, with the most common first non-English languages being:

- Spanish
- Vietnamese
- Farsi (Iranians)

The facilitator posed three questions in the context of literacy efforts in Oklahoma, and encouraged participants to answer the questions as broadly or as specifically as they liked, in any order and (if they wish) touch on all three questions in the course of their responses.. The questions were:

1. **What is working really well?**
2. **What can be improved?**
3. **What hopes and dreams do you have for the future?**

Actions and items noted as "working really well" included:

- ODL is highly accessible to other agencies—assisting with grant applications and other parts of the grant process, assisting with quarterly reports and other activities, and they also act as a good sounding board.
- ODL staff keep us up-to-date with changes
- Rebecca and Leslie (of ODL) are exceptional —"they're go getters." They've found and made different trainings available even in the context of a very tight state budget.
- ODL has placed a priority for literacy—even with drastic cuts they have tried to keep the program strong. Last year ODL took a 12% cut-- they did their best to take the brunt of the cuts to "save us" (various literacy efforts in the state).
- ODL uses the monthly director's program to help us 'think right' (in terms of funding strategies) and help us come up with ideas for other funding resources.
- ODL sponsored a 2-day program to support creative funding—providing not just inspiration but a plan that participants could take back to their agencies and put into action.
- "As only employee of my agency, with ODL's training and assistance I've been able to develop my own agency ."
- OLD extends training opportunities to partner agencies, even if they are not libraries
- ODL "plusses" include hosting a literacy website, and providing tech support & IT resources
- Video conferencing equipment has been helpful
- ODL encourages local libraries to make space for community literacy efforts

Actions or efforts that could be improved included:

- The 12% budget cut was difficult (even though ODL tried to shield literacy programs from the brunt)
    - 'When there is a lack of funds it's hard to plan for the year' - it delayed annual planning for some but "it was totally out of ODL's control."

Hopes and Dreams included:

- A renewal of the 2010 Tech Grants—to replace outdated technology
- New campaigns (like ''Read y'all'')—statewide literacy campaign—large-scale, statewide awareness to to promote health literacy
- Help with increased marketing (in various forms) to raise awareness of literacy needs and programs
- Launch a capital campaign to gain public support
- Raise awareness by joining with a "cool partner" like Starbucks
- Build on the success of OK's Health Literacy efforts
    - OK has gotten 'Fs and Ds' on our health report card—need more veggies, fruits, any physical activity in our lives
    - 5-different ESL classes are focused on health and wellness
    - Tai Chi and high intensity interval program
    - 'Family fitness' (free swim night)
    - Library opportunity:
        - Partner with national grocers
        - Classes on nutrition
        - Waiting in neighborhoods
        - Health literacy fair
        - Cooking lab
    - Written lessons to help our learners read and communicate with healthcare professionals
    - Partnering with professionals is key
    - Instruction on 'when to call the doctor'
    - Reading nutritional labels
    - Partnered with OSU extension services (9 week class targeting money management in term of food and health choices)
    - OK Healthy Aging Initiative partnership (experienced great community buy in)
    - Video conferencing held in OKC
    - Transformation Programs (one citizenship student lost 34 pounds!)
    - Coalition has partnered with other orgs—'there's not enough (ODL staff—"Leslies and Rebeccas")' —need more partnership with other State agencies staff person/liaison from other agencies to help engage more resources

What did I not ask?

- We need help to get our messages in the media—better, more-prominent placement of messaging about literacy
- Good messaging and better impact
- Need to get younger generation inspired, We've had success with subjects like the history of canning, brewing beer, walking homeless dogs to promote interest in literacy programs.