

EVALUATION OF THE 2013-2017 LSTA FIVE YEAR PLAN: OREGON STATE LIBRARY

THE CONSULTING LIBRARIANS GROUP
Sandra Cooper, The Consulting Librarians
Group; Nancy Bolt, Nancy Bolt & Associates;
and Karen Strege |Principal Consultants
March 2017

Commissioned by the
Oregon State Library
MaryKay Dahlgreen,
State Librarian

Page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EVALUATION SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES: RETROSPECTIVE, PROCESS & METHODOLOGY QUESTIONS	4
BODY OF THE EVALUATION STUDY	6
STUDY BACKGROUND	6
IMLS METHODOLOGY QUESTIONS	6
IMLS RETROSPECTIVE AND PROCESS QUESTIONS	8
ANALYSIS OF MAJOR STATEWIDE PROGRAMS	13
OREGON SCHOOL LIBRARY INFORMATION SYSTEM (OSLIS)	13
STATEWIDE DATABASE LICENSING PROGRAM (SDLP)	15
CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE) PROJECTS	18
ANSWERLAND	20
YOUTH SERVICES	22
COMPETITIVE GRANTS	24
APPENDICES	29
APPENDIX A: STATEWIDE PROGRAMS: ACTUAL AND PROJECTED EXPENDITURES	29
APPENDIX B: ACRONYMS	32
APPENDIX C: PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	34
APPENDIX D: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	35
APPENDIX E: LIBRARY COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE	37
APPENDIX F: LSTA ADVISORY COUNCIL FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE	38
APPENDIX G: FOCUS GROUP REPORT	39
APPENDIX H: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	39
APPENDIX I: SURVEY REPORT	39

EVALUATION SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the federal agency responsible for implementing the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA), requires state recipients to conduct an independent evaluation of programs funded with grant funds. The Oregon State Library (OSL) is the state agency that manages LSTA in Oregon, and they engaged The Consulting Librarians Group (CLG) to conduct the evaluation.

OSL is an independent state agency governed by a nine-member Board appointed by the Governor. The OSL Vision states: *All Oregonians have the information essential to be engaged citizens, to strengthen our communities and to build a prosperous state.*¹

The Mission Statement reads:

*The State Library provides leadership and resources to continue growing vibrant library services for Oregonians with print disabilities, the Legislature and state government, and all Oregonians through local libraries.*²

The OSL Request for Proposals required the successful consultants to develop an evaluation based on IMLS requirements that focused on the following programs:

- Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)
- Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP)
- Continuing education projects
- Answerland, statewide virtual reference service
- Youth services
- Competitive grants

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These findings and recommendations summarize and highlight key conclusions from the evaluation process, which included reviewing the survey report, the focus group results, documents, and interview transcripts. They are organized into three sections: Programs, Process, and Future Directions.

PROGRAMS

Three Programs—Shared Goals.

- **Finding:** Three major statewide programs are viewed as separate entities, each in its own silo. They are the Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP), the Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS), and Answerland. The goals of the programs are overlapping with their emphasis on information access and information literacy. The 2014 Task Force that examined virtual reference identified one of the top reference and information needs of Oregonians as “raising awareness of statewide and collaborative library services (e.g., statewide databases, OSLIS, Library2Go, and shared catalogs).” **Recommendation:** Create a task force to step back and examine the three programs together with the goal of reimagining how they can work together and be used to reinforce and enrich each other. While each has unique value, better coordination among the three programs could enhance their value and use. The effort could also provide a thoughtful management and assessment process to provide an infrastructure of planning and outcome measures.
- **Finding:** The Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC) has recommended creation of a centralized portal that would supplement (not supplant) other ways to access the databases. The State Library Board approved the recommendation at its June 2016 meeting. **Recommendation:** A central portal could provide coordinated access to all three resources—the databases, OSLIS, and Answerland. Move forward with developing plans for a reimagined central portal.

¹ https://www.oregon.gov/osl/Pages/about_us.aspx. Accessed December 27, 2016.

² *Ibid.*

Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP). The survey and focus group results indicate that the SDLP is highly popular. Several areas emerge as challenges and opportunities for the future:

- **Finding:** The Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee 2013-2014 identified a need to reconsider the scope of the program; however, there is no further discussion of the issue in the available documentation. **Recommendation:** As part of an effort to reimagine the SDLP along with OSLIS and Answerland, clarify the scope of the database program.
- **Finding:** The State of Oregon's procurement office treats library and information resources as a commodity. The resulting cumbersome procurement process has been a barrier to the effectiveness of the SDLP, keeping the negotiating process from being nimble and responsive. **Recommendation:** OSL might investigate the process used by Oregon's university libraries to see if there are better strategies for procurement in that setting that could be transferred to the State Library. Another option might be giving a grant for the SDLP programs to another organization that has more negotiating flexibility, resulting in better terms and pricing.
- **Finding:** In both the survey and the focus groups, academic library staff bemoan the loss of EBSCO as an SDLP resource. Although they receive a subsidy to help pay the cost of licensing EBSCO or comparable resources, the loss is still a major concern. **Recommendation:** If financially feasible, seek opportunities to add content appropriate for an academic audience to SDLP.
- **Finding:** In the survey, 51% of those respondents who do not use the resources said "I don't know enough about these databases," which suggests inadequate training about the database program. **Recommendation:** Create a more robust training program for the databases, including in-person workshops that are not created by the vendor. Offer training tools and materials to help local library managers train their staff.
- **Finding:** A search using the Ocean Books catalog's Encore discovery solution returns results that include the Gale database resources, increasing database usage in that area. **Recommendation:** Offer grants, training, and support that encourage other libraries to add discovery tools to their search capability and enhance database use.

Answerland. In addition to the coordinated planning effort with SDLP and OSLIS, there are other steps that can be taken to monitor and improve the virtual reference service.

- **Finding:** Answerland usage has been dropping, which is attributed to the aging software that was in use until June 2016. **Recommendation:** Monitor usage closely to make certain that the assumptions about the drop in the number of questions are correct. Other states have made the decision to end their statewide service, and Oregon needs to make certain that usage does not continue to drop. At the same time, implement a communication and marketing plan to increase awareness of the service. Also, monitor other statewide cooperative reference services for ideas and best practices.
- **Finding:** The Oregon library community expressed concern about the quality of Answerland services. **Recommendation:** Develop a comprehensive training program with in-person and online training and tools for local libraries to use for staff training. Take advantage of opportunities to monitor transactions to make certain they meet quality expectations.
- **Finding:** In the staff interview, the Answerland coordinator said that creating a Spanish language service was one of her long-term goals. **Recommendation:** Many questions about the overall program need to be resolved before OSL moves forward with a Spanish-language version. The State Library should also determine the audience and evaluate the need before investing in the service. Educating the Spanish-speaking population about public libraries and library services may be a higher priority.

OSLIS. The school library service is innovative and considered valuable by people who know about it.

- **Finding:** There are two barriers to expanding use of OSLIS: (1) the trend toward eliminating teacher-librarians and school library services in the state's schools and (2) the lack of awareness about OSLIS among people outside the school library community. **Recommendation:** Continue efforts to create awareness of the program among school teachers and work cooperatively with the Youth Services Consultant to expand training and awareness efforts to include children's services staff in public libraries.

Competitive Grants. The grant program is strong, with excellent cooperative programs at the local level. In addition, people like the new one-step grant process.

- **Finding:** Community college librarians do not believe that the grants meet their needs or are accessible to them. **Recommendation:** Identify needs of community college libraries and those of the broader academic library population to include in the next Five-Year Plan.

- **Finding:** Representatives of small libraries believe the grant program is too complicated and cumbersome for them. **Recommendation:** Look for opportunities to make simple mini-grants available to small libraries. One option might be to identify a priority in the next Five-Year Plan that can be implemented with a simple mini-grant program.
- **Finding:** Some librarians find the time is too short between the notification that they received the grant and the project start date. **Recommendation:** If the new one-step process does not resolve this problem, review the grant schedule to allow six weeks between notification and the start of the grant period.

Continuing Education.

- **Finding:** The Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute for non-MLS library staff won high praise from library directors and staff. Many people believe the Focus Institute model should be expanded to include other areas of library programs and services. **Recommendation:** Explore the opportunity to expand the Focus Institute model for training non-MLS library staff.
- **Finding:** OSL’s continuing education activities seem to lack focus, giving the appearance of being “hit and miss” in many cases. **Recommendation:** Create a more systematic approach to continuing education. Options include creating a statewide plan for continuing education and/or, as a matter of policy, include continuing education as a key component in implementing priorities in the new Five-Year Plan.

PROCESS

Outcome-Based Evaluation (OBE). Overall, OSL has done a good job of modeling and encouraging the use of OBE.

- **Finding:** Oregon has taken the first steps to encourage OBE for its LSTA programs. **Recommendations:** Here are a series of recommendations for continuing to strengthen OBE in Oregon libraries:
 - Continue efforts to use OBE of the Summer Reading Program through coaching from the Youth Services Consultant and use of the Project Outcome tools.
 - Continue training in OBE and use the data in decision making. Encourage libraries to participate in Project Outcome and the Edge Initiative—both programs with tools to help libraries with assessment.
 - Work with OSL staff to set realistic goals and outcomes for statewide programs, including a method of outcome measurement. Encourage staff to incorporate those goals and outcomes as they do annual planning for their programs.
 - Monitor work done at other state library administrative agencies (SLAA) for models for using OBE for statewide programs, and encourage IMLS to undertake efforts to identify OBE strategies for statewide programs that are common among SLAAs (e.g., statewide database licensing).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Education and Awareness.

- **Finding:** Telling the library’s story and educating stakeholders about the value of libraries in today’s environment was very much “top of mind” for focus group participants. **Recommendation:** Develop a comprehensive initiative to help libraries communicate their value to their communities with tools, training, and grants to support the effort.
- **Finding:** There is broad concern about the loss of teacher-librarians and school libraries in the state. **Recommendation:** Continue the work being done by the School Library Consultant to communicate the importance of professionally staffed school libraries for student achievement to the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and other education groups and agencies.

Serving Diverse Populations.

- **Finding:** Focus groups discussed the challenge of serving an increasingly diverse population—with a growing Hispanic population in many parts of the state and large, diverse immigrant populations in the Greater Portland Area. **Recommendation:** If the environmental scan confirms the impressions of the focus group participants, make serving the new residents a priority in the next plan and use training and grants (including mini-grants) to help local libraries reach out to the growing immigrant populations.

Civic Engagement and Inclusion.

- **Finding:** The concept of the library being an active partner in the community, offering a non-judgmental place for everyone, and serving as a venue for the discussion of civic issues rose to the top of the list for future priorities in four focus groups. **Recommendation:** Make community engagement a priority in the next Five-Year Plan and establish grants,

training, and other programs—including continuing support for the Edge Initiative—to support achieving the priority. The effort could also support education efforts by raising libraries' profiles in their communities.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES: RETROSPECTIVE, PROCESS & METHODOLOGY QUESTIONS

RETROSPECTIVE QUESTIONS

A-1. To what extent does your Five-Year Plan activities make progress toward each goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors contributed. OSL's 2013-2017 Plan has five goals and associated outcomes. All the outcomes were achieved or partially achieved. The chart that begins on page 9 indicates whether each outcome was achieved during the evaluation period. Some activities associated with the outcomes in the plan were modified or ended. For example, Answerland, the virtual reference service, was modified; and Plinkit, a content management system that enabled smaller libraries to have websites, was ended.

A-2. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents? On page 10 of the full report, the table shows the grants awarded in the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents. Those areas that received funding were: Lifelong Learning: Formal education, General knowledge and skills; Information Access: Discover information resources, Obtain and/or use information; Institutional Capacity: Improve library's workforce, Improve physical and technological infrastructure, Improve library operations; and Economic and Employment Development: Use resources for employment support.

A-3. Did any of the following groups³ represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? One group represented a substantial focus for Oregon's Five-Year Plan activities—School-aged youth (aged 6-17). Expenditures to provide services to that group totaled \$1,171,963 out of the \$6,382,000 of LSTA funds Oregon received in FFY 13-15. The money primarily supports the Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS) access to the Statewide Database Licensing Program. Through OSLIS, students learn information literacy skills, use the statewide databases for research, and create bibliographies. The balance of the funds support the School Library Consultant, who assists library staff and helps with the development and promotion of OSLIS, and the Oregon Battle of the Books (OBOB), a statewide voluntary reading motivation and comprehension program sponsored by the Oregon Association of School Libraries.

Details of the extent to which school-aged youth were reached are in the body of the report, but here are some average annual statistics for FFY 2013-2015 for the target group: OSLIS annual visits—865,925; Learning Express Library sessions—17,847; Gale searches—9,306,702; and OBOB participants—675 teams from 529 schools.

PROCESS QUESTIONS

B-1. How have you used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan? OSL staff, the LSTA Advisory Committee, the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee, and periodic task forces recommended changes to the State Librarian and the State Library Board when data and changing circumstances indicated they were necessary. Examples are described in the response to Question B-2.

B-2. Specify any changes you made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred. These are changes made in the three-year period covered by the evaluation:

- Answerland was continued and moved under the State Library's management after the former managing library declined to continue in that role. A task force made recommendations regarding the future of Answerland that helped guide the final decision.
- Use of Plinkit, the content management system that hosted small library websites, was discontinued due to changing circumstances and needs.
- A subsidy was implemented to help academic libraries pay for licensing resources to meet their patrons' needs that are not met by the current Statewide Database Licensing Program.
- Another program—scholarships to aid students pursuing a graduate degree in library science—was eliminated after a recommendation by the LSTA Advisory Council which was approved by the OSL Board.
- The Competitive Grants program application process was reduced from two steps to one in response to feedback from the Oregon library community.

³ See page 10 for a complete list of groups.

B-3. How and with whom have you shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources? The information from the SPRs and other evaluation resources is published and made available electronically through websites and listservs as well as reports to the State Library Board and formal presentations at library conferences. The information from a variety of evaluation resources was shared with the State Librarian, the Library Support and Development Program Manager, relevant Support and Development Division staff, the LSTA Advisory Council, the Statewide Database Licensing Committee, and the State Library Board. Library Support and Development consulting staff also share data with local librarians and with any state or other partner agencies in informal conversations.

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. OSL developed a Request for Proposal with details of the project and requirements for the evaluator. After the solicitation ended on September 6, 2016, OSL staff reviewed the submissions to judge the evaluators' ability to implement the project in a manner consistent with IMLS requirements. OSL selected The Consulting Librarians Group team of Sandra Cooper, Nancy Bolt, and Karen Strege based on their professional knowledge and expertise.

C-2. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation. Assess their validity and reliability. The CLG consulting team used multiple data collection methods, including document review, interviews, a survey, and focus groups. The methods were selected because they were most likely to answer the research questions and because the team has expertise in their planning, implementation, and analysis. The ability to triangulate data from the multiple methods is the primary strength of this approach. Further details about the validity and reliability of the methods are in the body of the report.

C-3. Describe the stakeholders involved in the various stages of the Five-Year Evaluation and how you engaged them. Multiple stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process. Representatives of Oregon's library community from all sizes and types of libraries participated in the survey and the focus groups. There was a special focus group for the LSTA Advisory Council, and the Council had the opportunity to review the draft report and provide feedback and questions prior to the completion of the evaluation. The State Library Board also reviewed the draft prior to completion. OSL staff members were actively involved in the process of planning for the survey and focus groups, many participated in the interviews, and several interacted with the consulting team via email. Staff also reviewed the draft report prior to its completion.

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

OSL will share the evaluation results widely with the state's library community—announcing its availability through notices on a variety of e-mail lists and by posting it on the State Library's website. The report will be reviewed by the LSTA Advisory Council, which will recommend its approval to the State Library Board. OSL staff will share the report and its results as they work with local library representatives statewide, and the staff and LSTA Advisory Council will use the results to develop the new Five-Year Plan.

BODY OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

STUDY BACKGROUND

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

In most cases, only three years of data (FY 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016) are used because of the deadlines set by IMLS. When available, data for the FY 2016-2017 year is included; and Appendix A includes projected expenditures for 2016-2017 along with actual expenditures for the other three years.

USERS AND USE OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The Oregon State Library Board, Oregon's LSTA Advisory Council, the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC), staff of Library Support and Development Services, and members of the state's library community will all be users of this report.

OSL intends to use the information in this report for two purposes:

1. To serve as the final evaluation report required by the IMLS document *Guidelines for Evaluation of LSTA Five-Year Plans*
2. To inform the development of the new Five-Year Plan

VALUES OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The CLG consulting team adhered to the principles of neutrality, thoroughness, and confidentiality throughout the study. Team members remained neutral during every stage of data collection, analysis, interpretation, and writing. They reminded focus group participants and interviewees that they were not affiliated with the State Library, IMLS, or any other interested party. They attempted to eliminate any personal bias by reviewing each other's conclusions. They sought and reviewed major documents covering LSTA projects during the evaluation cycle. They conducted interviews and focus groups in confidence, reminding study participants their responses would not be individually identified but would be aggregated with other responses.

IMLS METHODOLOGY QUESTIONS

This section provides a description of the evaluation methodology using the questions in the IMLS guidelines for the five-year evaluation.

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. OSL developed a Request for Proposal with details of the project and requirements for the evaluator. After the solicitation ended on September 6, 2016, OSL staff reviewed the submissions to judge the evaluators' ability to implement the project in a manner consistent with IMLS requirements. OSL selected The Consulting Librarians Group team of Sandra Cooper, Nancy Bolt, and Karen Strege based on their professional knowledge and expertise.

C-2. Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation. Assess their validity and reliability. The CLG consulting team used multiple data collection methods, including document review, interviews, a survey, and focus groups. The methods were selected because they were most likely to answer the research questions and because the team has expertise in their planning, implementation, and analysis. The ability to triangulate data from the multiple methods is the primary strength of this approach.

PROCESS

The project began with two members of the consulting team visiting OSL to conduct a project kick-off meeting that resulted in agreement about the project process and time line; plans for the focus groups; and initial plans for the survey. The two-member team interviewed multiple OSL staff and collected documents from them for review. During the following weeks, the team members designed and tested the survey in consultation with the OSL staff. The survey was distributed widely in the Oregon library community during October 2016. The team members designed the focus group discussion guides in consultation with the OSL staff. Two team members facilitated an online focus group on November 7, 2016; and one member conducted six onsite focus groups November 8-16, 2016. In late November and December, the consulting team analyzed

survey and focus group results, completed a thorough review of all documents and interview transcripts, and developed a draft report. OSL staff and the LSTA Advisory Council reviewed the draft report.

With feedback in hand, the CLG consulting team reviewed additional data and documentation provided by the OSL staff and prepared the final evaluation report document.

TOOLS AND METHODS

Document Review. The team reviewed the OSL website prior to the kickoff meeting and prepared an initial request for documents. During interviews with staff, team members identified additional documents, which staff quickly provided. The document review was ongoing throughout the project as the team identified additional information needs. Team members reviewed the documents to determine if the described activities and results were consistent with desired outcome and target results as well as if and how each project related to LSTA priorities and to OSL's goals.

Interviews. The consulting team developed an interview guide prior to their site visit and shared the guide with the interviewees to allow each ample time to prepare answers and documents to share. Two CLG team members participated in each interview and recorded the responses. After the interviews, the team members shared and compared their transcripts. The transcripts were analyzed for relevant information regarding outcomes, targets, and relationships to LSTA priorities and to OSL's goals.

Survey. Oregon State Library employees vetted the survey questions, and the CLG consulting team used this feedback to finalize the questions and the sequence of the survey. Members of the Oregon library community, including public library trustees, were invited to complete the LSTA Evaluation Survey between October 18 and November 1, 2016.

Completion rate for the survey was 86.7 percent, with 445 people starting the survey and 386 of those completing it. The consultants analyzed the survey's overall results, considering all respondents as one group. In addition, the team identified statistical differences among responder groups.

The survey contained many questions that asked respondents to rate a service or identify their level of agreement with a statement. The ratings were translated into a five-point scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 is the extreme negative, 3 is neutral, and 5 is the extreme positive. A score above 4.20 is very positive, a score between 4.19 and 2.71 is good/fair, and a score under 2.70 is poor or very poor.

Focus Groups. The consulting team worked with the OSL staff to develop and refine the focus group guides to provide relevant information for the evaluation process. One guide was tailored for and used with a GoToMeeting focus group with available members of the LSTA Advisory Council. A second guide was used by the one CLG team member who conducted onsite focus groups for a self-selected group of library community representatives in six locations in Oregon.

The facilitating consultant recorded the discussions on flip charts during the focus groups, asking participants to be certain that the recording reflected their intent. The flip charts were transcribed, with the answers to each question entered in a separate Excel spreadsheet. Each separate response was coded for location and topic. The spreadsheets were then sorted to determine the predominant topics and the number of groups that had discussed the topic. Only those topics discussed in four or more of the seven groups were included in the report.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The evidence is valid or measures what it proposes to measure in the following ways.

Document Review. Multiple OSL staff members, LSTA project managers, and others created and reviewed the documents the team examined. For example, multiple OSL staff vetted annual reports before sending them to IMLS staff, who also reviewed them for errors and omissions.

Interviews. The consulting team assumes that those people we interviewed did not provide false information and that the information is both valid and reliable.

Survey. Consultants ensured that the survey’s questions, answers, and format possessed both face and content validity by working with State Library staff to determine if the survey would measure what it intended to measure. In addition, consultants tested the survey with a select group of typical survey recipients to avoid problems with internal validity. These testers provided feedback on any confusing aspects of the survey. The consultants used the results of this test to change, when necessary, the original survey language and format. To further help meet face and content validity standards, the consulting team provided survey recipients with contact information should they have questions or concerns about the survey. Survey recipients did not submit any questions.

Because the survey did not use a random, stratified sample of Oregon library employees and trustees, the consulting team cannot say that the survey’s findings are true of or can be generalized to all library employees and trustees. Therefore, the survey lacks external validity.

The consultants assume that other researchers could use our survey in Oregon and would receive the same general results and the same statistical significance findings. Therefore, the survey is assumed to have reliability.

Focus Groups. Because focus group research collects and analyzes the interaction among participants, the format diminishes the ability to replicate results; therefore, focus group research is inherently weak on reliability. However, focus group results are valid. The facilitating consultant ensured focus group participants understood the questions and observed that participants provided responses based on their own experiences, values, and beliefs. The facilitator provided process guidance only, and recorded the participants’ comments in their own words.

Because focus group participants, in a face-to-face setting, may be reluctant to provide negative comments, the survey provided anonymity. Using both methods provides greater overall validity for the report. State Library staff members did not attend focus groups to avoid influencing the discussions.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The CLG consulting team maintained confidentiality of survey respondents. Although the OSL staff knows the names of focus group participants and interviewees, their comments are not matched with individual names in any of the reports. The team does not present any piece of evidence outside of its context to promote our conclusions or recommendations. Working together, team members questioned each other for any bias or subjectivity in this research and analysis.

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

Multiple stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process. Representatives of Oregon’s library community from all sizes and types of libraries participated in the survey and the focus groups. There was a special focus group for the LSTA Advisory Council, and the Council had the opportunity to review the draft report and provide feedback and questions prior to the completion of the evaluation. The State Library Board also reviewed the draft prior to completion. OSL staff members were actively involved in the process of planning for the survey and focus groups, many participated in the interviews, and several interacted with the consulting team via email.

C-4. Discuss how you will share the key findings and recommendations with others. OSL will share the evaluation results widely with the state’s library community—announcing its availability through notices on a variety of e-mail lists and by posting it on the State Library’s website. The report will be reviewed by the LSTA Advisory Council, which will recommend its approval to the State Library Board. OSL staff will share the report and its results as they work with local library representatives statewide, and the staff and LSTA Advisory Council will use the results to develop the new Five-Year Plan.

IMLS RETROSPECTIVE AND PROCESS QUESTIONS

This section provides responses to a series of retrospective and process questions posed in the IMLS guidelines for the five-year evaluation.

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

- ***Organize findings around each goal of the state’s 2013-217 Five-Year Plan***
- ***Categorize each goal as either 1) achieved, 2) partially achieved, or 3) not achieved***

The following table provides information to answer this question.

Goals & Outcomes	Achieved, Partially Achieved, Not Achieved
Goal #1: Provide access to information resources and library services.	
Library services are extended to those who are currently unserved.	Partially achieved
Library services are enhanced for those who are currently underserved.	Partially achieved
Libraries expand access to multimedia material.	Partially achieved
Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.	Achieved
Libraries partner with community organizations to create programming or information resources.	Partially achieved
Goal #2: Use technology to increase capacity to provide library services and extend access.	
Libraries create efficient ways to extend library services to Oregonians (e.g., Answerland, OSLIS).	Partially achieved
Libraries create efficient ways to share information resources (e.g., Sage, suggestion of a shared ILS).	Partially achieved
Patrons can access information. Libraries make available information resources across multiple platforms.	Partially achieved
Technology increases use and accessibility of library services.	Partially achieved
Goal #3: Develop a culture in libraries that promotes evaluation and use of evaluation results.	
Create learning opportunities for library staff that provide training in assessing the value of services including financial viability, community needs assessment, or other evaluation that furthers the ability of libraries and librarians to better serve their respective communities.	Partially achieved
Libraries establish a process to assess community needs.	Partially Achieved
Libraries evaluate and prioritize services by community needs and financial viability.	Partially achieved
Libraries back up budget requests with data from service assessment.	Partially achieved
Goal #4: Develop information literacy skills.	
Create programs for development of information literacy skills at all ages.	Achieved
Libraries offer services for children and young adults that prepare them for lifelong success.	Partially achieved
Libraries offer lifelong learning activities for Oregonians.	Achieved
Goal #5: Foster the joy of reading	
Libraries offer programs that encourage and enhance reading ability in children.	Achieved
Libraries provide access to material in different media formats that encourage or enhance literacy.	Partially achieved
Libraries provide access to materials and/or programming that encourage or enhance ESL literacy.	Partially achieved
Libraries strive to engage young adults in learning, teaching and other volunteer activities related to reading.	Partially achieved

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

The following shows the dollar amounts awarded in grants for each of the Measuring Success focal areas and intents.

FOCAL AREA/INTENT	2013-2014 Actual	2014-2015 Actual	2015-2016 Actual	2016-2017 Budgeted
Lifelong learning: Formal education	0 Awards	0 Awards	1 Award \$29,067	1 Award \$39,619
Lifelong learning: General knowledge and skills	3 Awards \$227,818	5 Awards \$258,561	6 Awards \$418,005	5 Awards \$200,000
Information Access: Discover information resources	3 Awards \$912,399	5 Awards \$1,000,438	4 Awards \$806,593	2 Awards \$39,851
Information Access: Obtain and/or use information	9 Awards \$554,527	6 Awards \$429,915	6 Awards \$347,310	9 Awards \$1,325,283
Institutional Capacity: Improve library's workforce	2 Awards \$139,029	3 Awards \$167,311	3 Awards \$206,106	5 Awards \$310,500
Institutional Capacity: Improve physical and technological infrastructure	2 Awards \$91,725	2 Awards \$148,511	2 Awards \$134,297	2 Awards \$75,000
Institutional Capacity: Improve library operations	1 Award \$71,111	2 Awards \$79,179	1 Award \$75,564	2 Awards \$96,350
Economic and Employment Development: Use resources for employment support	1 Award \$61,920	1 Award \$68,343	0 Awards	0 Awards
Economic and Employment Development: Apply business resources	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards
Human Services: Personal finances	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards
Human Services: Personal health and wellness	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards
Human Services: parenting and family skills	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards
Civic Engagement: Participate in the community	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards
Civic Engagement: Participate in community conversation	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards	0 Awards

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No)

- **Library workforce (current and future)**
- **Individuals living below the poverty line**
- **Individuals that are unemployed/underemployed**
- **Ethnic or minority populations**
- **Immigrants/refugees**
- **Individuals with disabilities**
- **Individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills**
- **Families**
- **Children (aged 0-5)**
- **School-aged youth (aged 6-17)**

School-aged youth (aged 6-17) were a substantial focus, which is defined as being “at least ten percent of the total amount of resources committed by the overall plan across multiple years.” For Federal Fiscal Years 2013-2015, the Oregon State Library received \$6,382,000 in LSTA funds, so 10% is \$638,200. A total of \$1,171,963 was targeted to meeting the needs of

school-aged youth: Statewide Database Licensing⁴, \$615,333; OSLIS, \$147,721; School Library Consultant, \$172,744; and OBOB, \$63,000.

The Oregon Battle of the Books (OBOB) is a statewide voluntary reading motivation and comprehension program sponsored by the Oregon Association of School Libraries (OASL) with an LSTA grant. Students in 3rd-12th grades, regardless of ability, are exposed to quality literature representing a variety of literary styles and viewpoints. OBOB's mission is to encourage and recognize students who enjoy reading, to broaden reading interests, to increase reading comprehension, promote academic excellence, and to promote cooperative learning and teamwork among students. Here is the data on participation over the three years: 2013-2014 school year, 559 teams representing 441 schools; 2014-2015 school year, 691 teams representing 537 schools; and 2015-2016 school year, 776 teams representing 609 schools.

Data describing relevant usage is reported under the detailed descriptions of OSLIS and the Statewide Database Licensing Program in the *Analysis of Major Statewide Programs* section of this report.

B-1. How have you used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan? The Oregon Five-Year Plan assigns primary direct responsibility for monitoring the plan's implementation to the Federal Programs Coordinator and the Library Development Program Manager.⁵ The LSTA Advisory Council also monitors plan activities and reports.

Ultimately, the State Librarian and the State Library Board are responsible for LSTA implementation. Typically, the LSTA Advisory Council makes recommendations to the Board regarding changes to be made in the plan.

There are two ongoing advisory groups for major statewide programs—the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC) and the Answerland Advisory Committee—that provide regular recommendations for changes and modifications to those two programs. Other task forces may be established to help gather input and make recommendations about changes in plan implementation. During the most recent cycle, a task force made recommendations for the future of the Answerland program (formerly L-Net), the statewide virtual reference program.

More information about how data is used to guide changes to specific programs appears below and in the *Analysis of Major Statewide Programs*.

B-2. Specify any changes you made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred. Two major changes were made since the plan's adoption:

- The Plinkit project was discontinued. Plinkit was a content management system that enabled small public libraries that otherwise could not afford one to have a quality website. It formerly served 60 libraries in Oregon and provided public access to Answerland virtual reference service and the statewide databases. LSTA funds covered its hosting, development, maintenance, and improvement. Several factors led to the decision to end the project: staff time involved to maintain Plinkit as a statewide project; the availability of cost-effective, easy-to-use alternatives; and the legislative directive that the State Library reorganize its resources and services.
- When Multnomah County Library notified the State Library it would no longer manage the Answerland virtual reference service, the State Librarian appointed a task force to make recommendations about the need for virtual reference and how to provide cooperative reference service. The resulting report eventually led to the State Library taking over the Answerland program at a reduced cost. More details about this change are in the narrative description of Answerland in the *Analysis of Major Statewide Programs* section of this report.

Other changes included:

- A subsidy was implemented to help academic libraries pay for licensing resources that meet their patrons' needs that are not met by the current Statewide Database Licensing Program.
- Another program—scholarships to aid students pursuing a graduate degree in library science—was eliminated after a review by the LSTA Advisory Council and action by the OSL Board.

⁴ Pro-rated based on percentage used by K-12 students.

⁵ Under the re-organized staffing structure the position is now Library Support and Development Program Manager.

- The Competitive Grants program application process was reduced from two steps to one in response to feedback from the Oregon library community.

B-3. How and with whom have you shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources? The information from the SPRs and other evaluation resources is published and made available electronically through websites and listservs as well as reports to the State Library Board and formal presentations at library conferences. The information from a variety of evaluation resources was shared with the State Librarian, the Library Support and Development Program Manager, relevant Support and Development Division staff, the LSTA Advisory Council, the Statewide Database Licensing Committee, the Answerland Advisory Committee, and the State Library Board. Library Support and Development consulting staff also share data with local librarians and with any state or other partner agencies in informal conversations.

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR STATEWIDE PROGRAMS

OSL asked The Consulting Librarians Group to focus its evaluation on LSTA-funded statewide programs implemented by the Oregon State Library and competitive subgrant programs implemented by local libraries or partner organizations of local libraries. The statewide programs included:

- Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)
- Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP)
- Continuing education projects
- Answerland, statewide virtual reference service
- Youth services
- Competitive grants

OREGON SCHOOL LIBRARY INFORMATION SYSTEM (OSLIS)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

OSLIS, a project of the Oregon Association of School Libraries (OASL) in partnership with the State Library, is a multifaceted website that supports information literacy skill development for K-12 students. The website includes resources for elementary and secondary students and teachers in three areas: guidance about the research process plus information literacy resources; Citation Maker, a tool used nationwide to help students prepare bibliographies in standard formats; and access to the LSTA-funded statewide databases.

The OSLIS long-range plan has three goals: 1) improve the content of the information literacy section; 2) keep Citation Maker current; and 3) increase awareness of OSLIS. Recent activities included renewed publicity targeted to school library staff, outreach to home schooling organizations, creation of information literacy videos, and updates to the Learn to Research section of the website.

The School Library Consultant's other work helps promote OSLIS and its goals. The consultant worked closely with the OASL Board to have the Oregon State Board of Education at the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) adopt the Oregon School Library Standards, meaning the standards are endorsed by ODE but not mandatory. The consultant and the OASL Board also worked to add two school library indicators to the continuous improvement plans that districts submit to ODE, which are supported by OSLIS. In the first, school districts are to provide "equitable access to a comprehensive library program which provides instruction in information literacy and research proficiencies, promotes integration of digital learning resources, advances reading engagement, and creates collaborative learning opportunities with teachers." The second asks that school districts provide access to a "collection of current and diverse print and electronic resources...."

IMLS Focal Areas.

- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' formal education
- Information Access—Improve users' ability to discover information resources
- Information Access—Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library workforce

IMLS Process Questions. Most of the information is anecdotal and informal feedback. Staff collect Google Analytics data for the website and use that information to consider changes in the OSLIS website. No changes were made in the Five-Year Plan. Data is shared with the State Library and the Oregon Association of School Libraries Board. The School Library Consultant also writes articles about OSLIS and school libraries.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Objectives.

Goal 1: Provide access to information resources and library services.

- Library services are extended to those who are currently unserved.
- Library services are enhanced for those who are currently underserved.
- Libraries expand access to multimedia material.
- Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.

Goal 2: Use technology to increase capacity to provide library services and expand access.

- Libraries create efficient ways to share resources to extend library services to Oregonians.

- Libraries create efficient ways to share information resources.
- Goal 4: Develop information skills.
- Create programs for development of information literacy skills at all ages.
 - Libraries offer services for children and young adults that prepare them for lifelong success.
 - Libraries offer lifelong learning activities for Oregonians.

Budget Allocation. Information on funds allocated to OSLIS and school library activities is in Appendix A.

Usage, Training, and Participation. Google Analytics provides the data about OSLIS usage. The narrative reports, however, describe a decline in usage after the 2013-2014 school year with a partial increase in 2015-2016. Several potential reasons are given: more schools are learning how to link to the statewide database options directly instead of going through OSLIS; some school districts are eliminating the professional school librarian positions (known as teacher-librarians in Oregon); and, since most students learn about OSLIS from their school librarian, this could also contribute to the decline in usage. Staff provided the following data to document usage:

Activity	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Total annual visits (sessions)	942,497	808,374	846,904
Total annual page views	1,903,782	1,603,582	1,667,649
Total annual average daily visits (sessions)	2,582	2,215	2,320
Total annual unique visitors	609,989	535,379	565,843
Total annual LearningExpress Library visits (sessions)	13,369	21,906	18,266
Total annual LearningExpress Library eBooks, Tests, & Courses accessed	66,772*	21,635	17,070
Total annual Gale visits (sessions)	3,173,976	2,872,581	2,483,599
Total annual Gale searches	11,449,129	10,218,310	6,252,722
Total training sessions	12	13	5

**LearningExpress resources figures for 2013-14: The third quarter statistics seem too high; however, the data is what was reported by LearningExpress, which upgraded the interface during that period. Representatives from other states with statewide contracts reported that statistics seemed high during the transition, too.*

Findings

Survey. Of the survey respondents, 51.7% did not use OSLIS. They gave two primary reasons: “not knowing enough about OSLIS” (38.5%) and “resources were not relevant” (36.9%). An additional 10% said they would use OSLIS if they had training. For those who reported using OSLIS, school librarians knew the most about OSLIS and used it more than academic or public librarians. Over 71% of the users said there was a link on their website for OSLIS, and 85.7% used OSLIS to link to databases. The overall satisfaction rate for OSLIS was 4.25 (excellent) on a five-point scale.

Focus Groups. Only three teacher-librarians could participate in the focus groups, which were held while school was in session. Despite this, OSLIS was discussed in five of the focus groups. For those who were aware of OSLIS, there was praise of the service, access to the databases, and Citation Maker. There was acknowledgement that use would increase if there were more teacher-librarians. The LSTA Advisory Council focus group praised OSLIS, the access to databases it provides to schools, and the services of the School Library Consultant.

Document Review. Documents reviewed included the OSL website; SPRs for three years; results of the survey, focus groups, and interviews; and additional documentation sent by staff.

Interviews. In discussing OSLIS, staff acknowledged usage is going down, partially due to the decline in the number of teacher-librarians. The program coordinator suggested reaching out to teachers and the English Language Arts Specialist at the Oregon Department of Education to involve them in publicizing the program, particularly considering the ODE Board’s adoption of the new School Library Standards. OSLIS assists school libraries in meeting these standards. The School Library Consultant also discussed the challenge of obtaining outcome data. The best outcome data would be from individual students at schools, but the State Library does not have access to data on that audience of users.

Output/Outcome Evaluation. Extensive output data is available. In the spring of 2015, OSLIS conducted a survey of school library staff asking them several questions about OSLIS. They found that, after receiving materials from OSLIS, 88% agreed or strongly agreed that their understanding of OSLIS had improved; 50% had shared materials with other staff and felt their understanding had also improved; and 86% felt better equipped to share information about OSLIS.

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. OSLIS can demonstrate its cost benefit in one area. The information literacy e-books would have cost a total of \$1,512,405 if every school had purchased them individually; but the total cost to OSLIS was approximately \$20,000.

Observations

While OSLIS is highly valued and appreciated, its use is declining. The OSLIS coordinator should consider ways to publicize OSLIS to teachers directly, to public librarians in cooperation with the Youth Services program, and to the ODE subject specialist as a way of helping school libraries meet the School Library Standards, recently adopted by ODE, and achieve the indicators required for the district improvement plans.

STATEWIDE DATABASE LICENSING PROGRAM (SDLP)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

LSTA funds subsidize the purchase of basic electronic resources for Oregon libraries under the Oregon Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP). Funds pay directly for access to an array of Gale/CENGAGE databases and LearningExpress Library and Job and Career Accelerator.

School libraries are automatically enrolled and have access to the databases through the Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS), which is also LSTA-funded. To participate, eligible academic (public and private non-profit), public, and tribal libraries must sign a terms of use agreement and endorse and abide by the Oregon Library Association (OLA) Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Code.

Access to the databases is multifaceted. There is centralized access through the Libraries of Oregon portal as well as through OSLIS and individual library websites.

In recognition of the belief that Gale/CENGAGE's content does not meet the needs of academic libraries to the extent EBSCO and ProQuest do, the State Library provides an LSTA subsidy to 35 college and university libraries through a grant to the Orbis Cascade Alliance.

IMLS Focal Areas.

- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' formal education
- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' general knowledge and skills
- Information Access—Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources
- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' general knowledge and skills
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library workforce
- Economic & Employment Development—Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support
- Human Services—Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health and wellness

IMLS Process Questions. The Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee advises the LSTA Advisory Council and includes representatives of the program's key stakeholder group. The SDLAC provides ongoing evaluation information on the program. Because of SDLAC's advice, the State Library established the subsidy to academic libraries to reduce their costs for EBSCO or ProQuest since Gale/CENGAGE is argued to be better suited to users of public and school libraries. Also because of SDLAC's work, the State Library has worked proactively to forge a partnership with the Oregon Department of Education to advocate for the needs of school libraries, including the potential for future joint funding of a K-12 encyclopedia product.

The SDLAC conducts periodic surveys of the library community to set priorities for the database procurement process, and its most recent survey was conducted in April-May 2016 to get information about resource priorities. The survey results are

shared with the LSTA Advisory Council and the State Library Board and are posted on the OSL website to make it generally available to the library community.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Objectives.

Goal 1. Provide access to information resources and library services. Outcomes:

- Library services are extended to those who are currently unserved.
- Library services are enhanced for those who are currently underserved.
- Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.

Goal 2. Use technology to increase capacity to provide library services and expand access. Outcomes:

- Technology increases use and accessibility of library service.

Budget Allocation. Information on funds allocated to this program is in Appendix A.

Usage, Participation, and Training.

Gale Databases

Library Type	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Database Sessions	Percent of Total	Database Sessions	Percent of Total	Database Sessions	Percent of Total
Academic	1,079,733	21.8%	1,147,463	21.6%	978,617	23.6%
Public/Tribal	1,392,307	28.1%	1,302,863	24.5%	683,979	16.5%
OSLIS/K-12	2,276,869	50.0%	2,872,581	54.0%	2,483,599	59.9%
Total	4,948,909	100.0%	5,322,907	100.0%	4,146,189	100.0%

LearningExpress Library

Library Type	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Database Sessions	Percent of Total	Database Sessions	Percent of Total	Database Sessions	Percent of Total
Academic	13,010	26.4%	21,069	39.4%	17,316	39.4%
Public/Tribal	22,895	46.4%	10,545	19.7%	8,122	18.5%
OSLIS/K-12	13,369	27.1%	21,903	40.9%	18,472	42.1%
Total	49,274	100.0%	53,517	100.0%	43,910	100.00%

Findings

Survey. The survey asked respondents to indicate how often they use at least one of the databases, and the most frequent response was 2-3 times a month (30.0%). Only 13.8% people reported using at least one database daily. People representing school libraries were more likely to say that they used it daily. Of the non-users, 51% said “I don’t know enough about these databases” when asked why they do not use the resources. In addition, academic library representatives added comments saying they were happier with products from EBSCO.

When asked whether they had participated in training on one or more of the resources, 66.1% (171 respondents) had attended in-person training and gave it the following satisfaction ratings: “Improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features,” 4.22 (Excellent); “Overall training,” 4.13 (Good); and “Improved my ability to teach library staff and users how to use the databases,” 4.13 (Good). Time and distance were two of the most frequent responses when people had not attended the in-person training.

Ninety-six respondents (56.5% of those participating in training) had attended online training sessions. They rated their satisfaction as follows: “Improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features,” 4.03 (Good); “Overall training,” 3.89 (Good); and “Improved my ability to teach library staff and users how to use the databases,” 4.01 (Good). Time was the primary reason people said they had not participated in online training.

Focus Groups. There was strong support for the program among the focus groups, with five groups indicating they value the statewide database licensing. One group agreed it is “the best thing ever.” Five groups discussed how much they like LearningExpress, with one group agreeing it “is fabulous.”

In an issue that reflected the survey comments, four groups discussed the decision to change from EBSCO to Gale. Academic librarians believe EBSCO is better suited to the needs of their students, and one public library director commented public libraries also buy EBSCO for NovelList and other resources.

Document Review. The primary source of documentation about the program is the annual report, which is submitted by the Chair of the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee (SDLAC). One thread that runs through various reports is the challenge of the database procurement process.

On other topics, the 2013-14 report contains a statement on the need to refine the scope of SDLP:

It is clear that the SDLP has reached a crossroad while trying to accommodate several constraining factors:

- *Oregon libraries have distinct content needs (Academic, Public, School) resulting in some needs being met while others are not.*
- *The current proprietary information environment is ill-suited to meeting such distinct needs because the information that would meet all needs sits with multiple vendors.*
- *Given the resources currently allocated to the SDLP, the Program has few options outside of taking advantage of vendors [sic] “can’t miss” deals which do meet the SDLP budget and some content needs.*

While last year’s RFP effort attempted to break out of the single-vendor mold, the constraining factors resulted in an approach that only partially addresses the true scope of Oregonians’ information needs. SDLAC will discuss ways to expand the SDLP budget or consider redefining the programs [sic] scope.

There is discussion in the 2014-2015 report of creating a central portal to make the databases more visible. Currently centralized access is through the Libraries of Oregon portal, which was created to provide library resources to underserved Oregonians, rather than to promote databases. The potential negative impact on local library usage statistics was cited as one drawback of a centralized portal.

The 2015-2016 report indicates there is a need to create a centralized portal for all Oregonians that would supplement, not supplant, other methods to access the databases. The report recommends (1) that OSL staff develop a project plan and budget (with input from SDLAC) to clarify the role of Libraries of Oregon portal and lays out a path towards central portal development, management, and upkeep and (2) that the plan be presented to the LSTA Advisory Council in the Federal FY2017 budget cycle. The State Library Board approved that recommendation at its June 2016 meeting.

The 2015-2016 SDLAC annual report noted the number of user sessions declined in FY2016, adding it is a trend that has also been reported in other states. In response, they reported much more extensive data indicating that usage had been increasing over the past three years and questioned whether FY2016 was an anomaly. The data shows usage is consistently higher during times when schools and academic institutions are in session and that usage is primarily driven by educational activity. The analysis of usage by region showed high usage in the Northern Coast region, which was attributed to the configuration of the Ocean Books discovery tool to search Gale databases with every catalog search.

Interviews. Two members of the consulting team interviewed the Electronic Services Consultant who works with the SDLP. She noted that the database licensing is done through the state procurement office and that it is a very difficult process. She said part of the challenge is developing the expertise and educating the procurement staff about the nature of the product.

The consultant also said the SDLP “meets a basic need in the library community.” She indicated that the goal is to build everyone up to a base level of use and that to keep increasing usage is not realistic with the available resources. She went on to say that a central portal is a key to success and that she would like to see more resources committed to marketing, training, and a central portal.

Output/Outcome Evaluation. Available data is primarily output data. The survey did ask respondents to rank the impact of the SDLP, and the two highest-ranking responses were “Could not offer the equivalent information resources,” 4.11 (Good) and “Databases are an essential part of my library’s service,” 4.01 (Good). The focus groups yielded an impact anecdote: After

the library director made a presentation at the local Rotary Club about the business databases available through the SDLP, she returned to the library to find six Rotarians in line to get library cards.

The Electronic Services Consultant also identified one challenge in trying to measure outcomes/impact data for statewide programs—that libraries are the State Library’s customers, not the end users. She went on to say she hopes the State Library can get national assistance to help measure outcomes for this type of program. She suggested they are not doing everything to understand the true cost benefit of programs such as the SDLP. She also indicated the more state library agencies have national standards to measure services like the SDLP, the better it is.

The consultant went on to suggest that she believes long-standing statewide programs do not have the infrastructure of planning and outcome measures. She suggested it would be helpful to go through a project planning process to help tailor the program to IMLS reporting needs. She believes a thoughtful management and assessment piece has not been built into the process.

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. There are three assumptions made about the SDLP financial benefits: (1) there are economies of scale from having a single license that serves the entire state; (2) many libraries could not afford the resources on their own; and (3) having procurement handled once by OSL saves time for local staff.

Observations

Procurement. The State of Oregon’s procurement office appears to have difficulty understanding why information resources should not be treated as a commodity. This has led to a cumbersome process that has been a barrier to the effectiveness of the SDLP, keeping the negotiating process from being nimble and responsive. OSL might investigate the process used by Oregon’s university libraries to see if there are better strategies and models for procurement in that setting that could be transferred to the State Library. Another option might be giving a grant for the SDLP program to another organization with more negotiating flexibility, resulting in better terms and pricing.

General Information Discovery. The Ocean Books’ Encore, the Innovative Interfaces discovery solution, supports single searching that retrieves Gale resources as well as books and other information sources when a patron executes a search. The State Library might help other libraries explore using discovery search tools that would retrieve database resources for users, which could result in expanded use of the databases.

Defining SDLP Scope. Statements made in the FY 2013-2014 report raised the issue of redefining the program’s scope, which does not appear to have been done. In the recent interview with staff, the OSL staff member said the scope was to meet basic information needs. Nowhere in the information-gathering process did the consulting team see a single adopted statement of the scope of the SDLP. At the same time, there are multiple programs with some overlap—Answerland, OSLIS, and SDLP. Finally, the OSL SDLP manager has suggested the program might benefit from renewed planning that provides a clear path for measuring outcomes and impact.

CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE) PROJECTS

Program Description

During the evaluation period, the Oregon State Library used LSTA funds to support professional education and continuing education in the state in several areas: (1) scholarships to assist students in completing their graduate library education with the goal of increasing the number of professional librarians in rural areas; (2) enhancement of a collection of library literature in serial and book form; (3) subscriptions to various services (e.g., Lyris, WebJunction) primarily to gain access for Oregon library staff to discounted online webinars and training; (4) development of web resources that support individual learning on topics such as fund development, strategic planning, and financial literacy programming; and (5) maintenance of online calendars of education opportunities.

Other continuing education offered by OSL is part of one of the statewide programs such as Answerland, OSLIS, the Statewide Database Licensing Program, and Youth Services Program. CE offered as part of statewide programs is discussed under the specific program.

One workshop offered during this period was not presented in conjunction with a statewide program. The Electronic Services Consultant attended the Research Institute for Public Libraries (RIPL) Training, an immersive, boot camp-style event, where

participants learn practical strategic methods of gathering, analyzing, and using outcome data for planning, managing, and communicating impact. She distilled the information into a one-day workshop titled *Using Data to Tell Your Library's Story*, offered for the State Library staff and for members of the library community at three locations around the state.

IMLS Focus Area.

- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library workforce

IMLS Process Questions. During the project period, two changes were made in the Five-Year Plan: the scholarships offered in FY 2013-2014 were discontinued upon the recommendation of the LSTA Advisory Council; and with the increase in staff time devoted to continuing education, funds were allocated to pay a small percentage of staff costs.

Information about the continuing education program is routinely shared using a variety of electronic means: website, blogs, listservs, Facebook, and Twitter.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Objectives.

Goal 3. Develop a culture in libraries that promotes evaluation and use of evaluation results. Outcome:

- Create learning opportunities for library staff that provide training in assessing the value of services including financial viability, community needs assessment, or other evaluation that furthers the ability of libraries and librarians to better serve their respective communities.

Budget Allocation. Information about the allocation of funds for continuing education are in Appendix A.

Usage, Participation, and Training. Information on the participation and usage of the activities described here is limited.

- In the period that scholarships were offered, 99% completed their degrees, and 90% stayed in Oregon.
- Ten learning guides were created and maintained online during the evaluation period.
- In 2014-2015, 145 items were added to the LIS collection, and most of the items circulated one time. In 2015-2016, 91 items were added to the collection; 68% of those items circulated at least one time; and a total of 289 items were checked out.
- Twenty-seven people attended *Using Data to Tell Your Library's Story*.
- In 2013-2014, 20 Oregon library staff signed up for classes available through Lyrisis.

Findings

Survey: In the survey, respondents asked for more online training (40.4%); more workshops in person (37.7%), and more information about CE opportunities (31.6%). They did not indicate the topics on which they wanted training.

When asked if they use the LIS collection, 71.6% of 331 respondents replied that they do not use it. Of those respondents, 51.9% (123 people) said they did not know about the collection. Of those who did know about the collection, 72% said that they heard about the collection through email messages or listservs.

Focus groups. Discussion of the continuing education program was limited during the focus groups, and the primary feedback was about the success of the Focus Institute on Children and Youth and recommendations that it be replicated for training in other areas of library service.

Document Review. The document review included SPRs for the evaluation period and a review of resources available on the website. The OSL website has an impressive list of CE resources that are available in Oregon and from other states as well as information on the holdings in the Library and Information Science Collection and digital resources on specific topics.

Interviews. The CE program is coordinated by the Program Manager for Library Support and Development, who provided an overview of the CE program.

Output/Outcome Evaluation. Output data is reported in the earlier *Usage, Participation, and Training* section. Some outcome data was collected:

- An example of feedback on the LIS collection: “I really appreciate the Library & Information Science collection. It’s really helpful just to get the Libs-OR emails letting me know about new books that are out there—I use those emails to help with collection development for my library’s collection, as well as to identify books for my own professional reading.”
- The SPR also notes the “Using Data” participants “recognize the value of outcome-based evaluation and data for promotion and advocacy and welcome suggestions and resources that help them improve the use of these tools in their local activities. Several participants indicated intent to immediately apply concepts to promotional materials and reports already in preparation.”

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. The LIS collection provides equitable access to materials to help local library staff stay current on best practices and is especially important to staff of smaller libraries without the financial resources to acquire professional materials.

Observations

The overall continuing education program does not appear to be planned and implemented in a systematic manner with clear goals and outcomes. Except for the Focus Institute, events appear to be presented because they are available—not because they meet an identified need or support an LSTA priority.

ANSWERLAND

Program Description

Answerland is a cooperative information service available to Oregon residents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (24x7). Librarians from participating libraries and volunteers (primarily graduate library school students) help find answers to questions and provide research guidance. Questions are accepted through email, chat, and text.

The purpose of the program is three-fold: provide a collaborative statewide service; encourage knowledge and resource sharing among Oregon’s libraries; and offer an opportunity for Oregon library staff to learn digital reference skills.

IMLS Focal Areas.

- Lifelong Learning—Improve users’ formal education
- Lifelong Learning—Improve users’ general knowledge and skills
- Information Access—Improve users’ ability to discover information resources
- Information Access—Improve users’ ability to obtain and/or use information resources
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library workforce
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure

IMLS Process Questions. Multnomah County Library (MCL) managed the service until June 30, 2015, using open source software. In 2013, MCL notified the State Library that it intended to terminate its role as the contracting organization. As a result, the State Librarian convened a task force to determine the future of statewide cooperative reference services in Oregon. The task force found that a virtual reference service was still the best method of providing statewide cooperative reference service.

After exploring options for a new fiscal agent/contractor, the State Librarian recommended that the service be moved to the State Library, which resulted in cutting back staffing and procuring a commercially hosted chat service (OCLC’s QuestionPoint). The transition from Multnomah County to the State Library was slowed by two challenges: getting legislative approval for the staffing and completing the procurement process. As a result, the program continued to use the aging Multnomah software through June 30, 2016, and was totally offline between July 1 and October 10, 2016.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Outcomes.

Goal 1. Provide access to information resources and library services. Outcomes:

- Library services are extended to those who are currently unserved.
- Library services are enhanced for those who are currently underserved.
- Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.

Goal 2. Use technology to increase capacity to provide library services and expand access. Outcomes:

- Libraries create efficient ways to share resources to extend library services to Oregonians.

- Technology increases use and accessibility of library service.

Budget Allocation. Information on funds allocated to this program is in Appendix A.

Usage, Participation, and Training.

Use and Participation			
State Fiscal Year	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
People Served	34,460	26,835	22,545
Participating Libraries	44	45	40

Training				
State Fiscal Year	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017 ⁶
Training Events	8	6	0	9
Attendees	180	92	0	90

Findings

Survey. Two hundred of 420 respondents (47.6%) indicated that they participate in Answerland in at least one of three ways—by using the service; by offering the local chat version called Answerland Local; or by partnering to provide the service. Overall satisfaction among people who use the service is 4.02 (Good); among those using Answerland Local, 3.96 (Good), and with their role as a partner, 3.75 (Good).

When survey participants ranked their priorities among current programs, Answerland was second among academic library respondents; however, it was last for school and public library representatives.

Focus Groups. All seven focus groups discussed Answerland, and members of six groups expressed concern about the quality of the service, including comments about the poor quality of the out-of-state service. Four groups expressed skepticism about the level of usage. In contrast, members of five of the groups said they appreciate Answerland, and people in five groups said that they value the 24x7 availability of the service. Those who expressed support for the 24x7 service were primarily academic librarians who said that they would not be able to offer “round the clock” service without Answerland.

Several participants suggested ending the program if LSTA funding were reduced.

Document Review. In 2013, the State Librarian appointed a task force to look at statewide collaborative reference services and make recommendations to the LSTA Council. In addition to recommending the continuation of Answerland, the Task Force report shares information on the following:

- The Oregon State Library has statutory responsibility to provide for statewide cooperative reference services (ORS 357.206 and 357.005(2)(d)).
- The task force members made the following statement about trends in reference service: “While there is a shared sense that demand for reference traditional services have [sic] decreased in recent years, state and national data demonstrates that demand for reference is growing in smaller public libraries (of which Oregon has many) and in community colleges.”
- The group identified the most important reference and information needs of Oregonians as: information literacy skills; support for and access to government information; and raising awareness of statewide and local collaborative library services (e.g., statewide databases, OSLIS, Library2Go, and shared catalogs⁷).

Interviews. Consultants interviewed the State Library’s Answerland program coordinator, and her comments included:

- Her intent is to take a hard look at the services after January 1, 2017, to clarify its focus and priorities.

⁶ Data is for the first six months of 2016-2017.

⁷ Library2Go and shared catalogs are financed with local funds.

- Concern that being a partner has no advantage
- The statement that, if the volume of questions falls below the FY2006 level (i.e., just over 15,000), the State Library will need to re-evaluate the service.
- Potential plans: define partners; add a Spanish language interface; create a DIY section; integrate more effectively with other statewide programs.

Output/Outcome Evaluation. The project summary for federal fiscal year 2015 reports the following:

- Ninety percent (90%) of the questions were through chat, and 73% of those chats were sent through partner library widgets.
- Every Answerland patron is given the opportunity to complete a user satisfaction survey. Of those self-selecting to respond, 81% said that the services were either Excellent, Very Good, or Average. Comments included being thankful for 24x7 access to a librarian, valuing the time saved, and appreciating the expertise available. Negative comments from the remaining 19% indicated frustration with software glitches and wait times.
- The report speculated that the 16% drop in usage was due to deteriorating software, which made the service “clunky” to use, and the suspension of marketing and training during most of the year.

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. The program cost was cut more than 50% with the move to the State Library. Thus, although the number of patrons served decreased, the cost per patron served also decreased.

Observations

Goals, Planning & Evaluation. The stated goals of Answerland are not only to answer questions but also to build library staff skills in providing digital reference. The 2013 Task Force envisions a service that builds information literacy skills, provides access to government information, and raises awareness of online services and resources. These broader goals raise these questions:

- Are all the services viewed holistically to create greater synergy between Answerland, the Statewide Database Licensing Program, OSLIS, and other services (e.g., Library2Go, shared catalogs)?
- Do library staff members who work with Answerland improve their skills?
- Do Answerland users learn about databases and become users because of Answerland? Is there a correlation between the lower database use during the last fiscal year and Answerland use?
- Is there a way to evaluate whether the three programs (Answerland, SDLP, and OSLIS) are having a beneficial effect on awareness and use of each other?

Impact of Service Disruption. The deteriorating software and the shutdown of the service for more than three months in summer-fall 2016 all make evaluating the long-term value of Answerland difficult now.

Library Staff Attitudes. There is a perception among some Oregon library staff that Answerland is not valuable and that the service quality is questionable. Staff should consider actively working to identify and overcome quality issues and to communicate about the status and future priorities for the development of Answerland.

YOUTH SERVICES

Program Description

The OSL Youth Services Program is fully funded by LSTA funds, including the Summer Reading Program (SRP) collaborative membership fee and manual, the Focus Institute, and the Youth Services Consultant position. Oregon is a member of the National Collaborative Summer Reading Program (CSLP), which provides a common theme and professionally-designed support materials for all member libraries. Local libraries can choose whether to use the national theme and graphics or plan a program on their own. The Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute is a biennial training opportunity for paraprofessional public library staff working in youth services.

In addition to managing the SRP and the Focus Institute, the Youth Services Consultant has a range of responsibilities that include:

- Partnering with state agencies on issues related to children (e.g., working with the Oregon Department of Education Child Nutrition Program to encourage local libraries to become Summer Food Service Program sites serving lunch).
- Being active in youth services programs of the Oregon Library Association

- Making site visits to local libraries as a consultant
- Providing youth services information and resources directly to librarians in the field and on the OSL website

IMLS Focal Areas.

Institutional Capacity – Improve the library workforce

Human Services – Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills.

IMLS Process Questions. The Youth Services Consultant uses the evaluations from one Focus Institute to plan the next one. The Consultant also shares data on the OSL website about participation in the Summer Reading Program. The introduction to the SRP data on the website states:

In 2011, due to requests from libraries, the State Library began publishing the Oregon Summer Reading Statistics Spreadsheet which breaks down participation statistics by individual library and includes the estimated number of children 0-14 years old served by each library. Libraries are encouraged to use this data to evaluate and set goals for their summer reading programs.

The Youth Services Consultant has also assisted local library staff in their effort to collect more outcome data about their youth programs, especially the Summer Reading Program. This was confirmed in the focus groups as one contribution of the Youth Services Consultant.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Objectives.

Goal 1: Provide access to information resources and library services. Outcome:

- Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.

Goal 5: Foster the joy of reading. Outcome:

- Libraries offer programs that encourage and enhance reading ability in children.

Budget Allocation. Information on the funds allocated for these programs is in Appendix A.

Usage, Participation, and Training. The State Library collects an impressive amount of output data about the Summer Reading Program. Unfortunately, the data collected and published on the website varies in content and format from year to year, so it is difficult to make specific comparisons. The 2013-2014 data shows that over 30% of youth age 0-14 were participating in the SRP, a very impressive number. However, that statistic was not repeated in subsequent years. The type of output data collected in various years includes: number of children and teens who sign-up for SRP; the percent of the state’s population; number who sign up for reading logs; percent who finish program; hours, pages, and number of books read; programs for children and teens; attendance at programs; adult participation; outreach to schools, daycares, afterschool programs, and summer food programs; translation into Spanish; and number of entries into the sweepstakes for a donation to a college fund. The number of children completing the program in each of the last three years is shown here:

State Fiscal Year	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Total Completing Program	69,060	68,725	75,027

Fifty-seven public libraries participate in the Public Library Association’s (PLA) Project Outcome and are currently or planning to administer outcome surveys for different library programs. One of the available surveys relates to the outcomes of the Summer Reading Program, and 19 of the participating public libraries list a youth services staff member as one of the staff administering the program. It is reasonable to conclude that some of these libraries evaluated their Summer Reading Program using this survey.

Findings

Survey. The survey asked about the Focus Institute and the Summer Reading Program. The Focus Institute received very high ratings with a ranking of 4.39 (excellent) on “learned valuable information and received good resources that I plan to use in the future” and 4.11 (good) on “changed the way I served children and teens.” When the question was about the impact on staff, the scores were equally as high. One person commented “Terrific information, inspiration, and lots of great resources. Thank you for such an excellent program.”

Over 90% of the survey participants said their library participated in the SRP. Respondents were asked their satisfaction with the program overall and the materials. Both received a high rating: satisfaction was 4.37 (excellent) and materials was 4.17 (good). Participants appreciated that OSL paid for the state to participate in the national collaborative program. When asked if they would have a Summer Reading Program without the national collaborative, 39.9% said they would not have a program; 56.1% said they would have a program but it would be significantly reduced in scope.

When asked about the impact of SRP on users, the rankings were all at the excellent level. Respondents strongly agreed participants had a lot of fun and read many books; parents appreciated the SRP; more children used the library over the summer; participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer; and teachers appreciated the SRP.

Focus Groups. Six of the seven focus groups discussed the youth program. There was praise for the SRP, for the Focus Institute, and for the consulting services. Participants felt the SRP was critical for small libraries, the Focus Institute energized staff, and the Youth Services Consultant's work was well done and accessible to libraries. Changes suggested included having institutes on a broader range of topics for paraprofessional staff.

Document Review. The Youth Services Consultant provided documents for review including SRP overviews, links to data on the OSL website, and individual program evaluations. The consultants also reviewed the focus group and survey reports.

Interviews. Two consulting team members interviewed the Youth Services Consultant, who indicated that she feels her contact with the library community helps her anticipate and fill their needs. She is now tracking the questions she gets and sharing the answers on her webpage to help other libraries. She also commented that there is "real value in the state-level partnerships." She feels she gets "leverage from state-level support of cooperation."

Output/Outcome Evaluation. Most of the documents and data reviewed were output data; however, the number of potential youth services staff involved in Project Outcome makes it possible to collect and use more outcomes. In her interview, the Youth Services Consultant indicated that, while IMLS wants more outcome data for library users, the State Library's users are library staff. She has tried to help local libraries understand the benefit and value of outcome-based data and to provide them with data that they might be able to use.

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. The Youth Services Consultant collects an enormous amount of data about the programs she offers. Most of the documents examined were output data. See below under observations for other ways to use this data.

Observations

The Youth Services Program was praised in all the evaluation's data collection activities. People view it as an outstanding program that contributes to library development and the quality of youth library services across the state.

Oregon has done more than most states to support libraries in Project Outcome. Of the Oregon public libraries participating in Project Outcome, nineteen have youth services staff participating in this project. Assuming some of these are using the Project Outcome Summer Reading Program survey, this could be used to publicize the value of the program. Similarly, one barrier to outcome evaluation is lack of participant contact information. A high percentage of participants sign up to be part of the full reading program and finish it. They could be asked to complete an outcome-based survey.

During the focus group sessions, many participants from all types of libraries were confused about the source of funding for the grants that help support Summer Reading Program activities other than the collaborative membership fee and manual. The funding is from the state (not LSTA) and is distributed as Ready to Read grants. The State Library might want to take steps to clarify the source of funds for that program to aid in efforts to maintain or increase funding.

COMPETITIVE GRANTS

Program Description

One of the major programs offered with LSTA funds is Competitive Grants. The State Library provides some guidance by emphasizing a theme, such as early literacy or extending service to the unserved, but libraries are not required to apply for

that theme. Projects vary by library need and perception of need of Oregon residents. Partnerships between and among libraries or libraries and community agencies are encouraged but not required.

Funds are made available to local libraries of all types for grants to conduct local projects. However, a single school or single school district project is not eligible unless it has statewide impact. School library projects sponsored by the Oregon Association of School Librarians are preferred over grants from individual school libraries or districts.

In the past, the grant application process was organized in two stages. Applicants had to first send a summary of their proposal for consideration. If the summary was approved, the applicant was asked to prepare a longer proposal. The final decision was based on the longer, full proposal. This was changed to a single step in the 2016-2017 grant cycle to require only the full proposal for consideration.

Grant projects do not need to be innovative, just new to the applicant. All grant applications are reviewed by the LSTA Advisory Council and State Library staff, and recommendations are made to the State Library Board for a final decision.

Libraries may request funding for multi-year projects; however, they must reapply for subsequent years, indicating what progress they made in the preceding years.

The grant guidelines strongly encourage outcome evaluation with this statement:

Grant projects should be planned to incorporate an outcome-based evaluation whenever possible. Outcome-based evaluation (OBE) measures the impact of a project on the skills, knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, condition, or life status of end-users. Your proposal should identify your specific audiences and say how the project will objectively and concretely measure outcomes. The State Library expects that your project would include in its request funds for surveys, focus groups, facilitators, or whatever methodology you design.

The guidelines also indicate where help is available to design outcome-based evaluations.

IMLS Focal Areas. Based on an analysis of the LSTA projects funded in the last three years, the following focal areas were addressed.

- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' formal education
- Lifelong Learning—Improve users' general knowledge and skills
- Information Access—Improve users' ability to discover information resources
- Information Access—Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library workforce
- Institutional Capacity—Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure
- Institutional Capacity—Improve library operations
- Economic & Employment Development—Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support

IMLS Process Questions: In the Competitive Grants program, data shared was primarily the report of achievement in a library's Final Grant Activity Report to determine if a multi-year project should be funded for additional years. The only change to the 2013-2017 LSTA Five-Year Plan was the change in process from a two-stage application process to a one-stage application process. There was no evidence that results of the competitive grants were shared widely from the State Library. However, local projects frequently shared their project outcomes with other agencies to demonstrate success and obtain funding after LSTA funding ended.

Relation to Oregon Goals and Objectives. The competitive grants funded over the last three years addressed the goals and objectives shown below:

Goal 1: Provide access to information resources and library services.

- Library services are extended to those who are currently unserved.
- Library services are enhanced for those who are currently underserved.
- Libraries expand access to multimedia material.
- Libraries partner with each other to create programming or information resources.
- Libraries partner with community organizations to create programming or information resources.

Goal 4: Develop information literacy skills.

- Create programs for development of information literacy skills at all agencies.
- Libraries offer services for children and young adults that prepare them for lifelong success

Goal 5: Foster the joy of reading.

- Libraries offer programs that encourage and enhance reading ability in children.
- Libraries provide access to material in different media formats that encourage or enhance literacy.

Budget Allocation.

Type of Library	FY 2013-2014	FY 2014-2015	FY 2015-2016	FY 2016-2017	Total
Academic	\$57,632	\$105,444	\$106,000	\$197,932	\$467,008
Public	\$589,112	\$434,287	\$168,187	\$165,214	\$1,356,800
School	0	0	0	\$20,350	\$20,350
Multitype	0	\$45,471	\$279,216	\$214,816	\$539,503
Other	0	0	\$80,646	0	\$80,646
Total	\$646,744	\$585,202	\$634,049	\$598,312	\$2,464,307

Usage, Participation, and Training. Competitive grants are varied—with different audiences, different activities, and different ways of counting. The competitive grants over this three-year period included both the general public and public library staff audiences. Some of the projects emphasized circulating items, some offered programs, some conducted training, and some cleaned up cataloging records. Thus, it is not possible to calculate the number of users as it is in statewide programs with one activity and one audience. However, competitive grants can be compared in other ways.

One way is by type of library. All libraries are considered equally eligible to apply for a grant. There are, however, restrictions on a single school or school district applying. That is reflected in the number of grants awarded by type of library. The figures for 2016-17 reflect the grants given that are just beginning.

Grants by Type of Library

Type of Library	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Total
Academic	2	2	3	3	10
Public	7	7	4	5	23
School	0	0	0	1	1
Multitype	0	1	1	3	5
Other	0	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	9	10	10	12	41

Note: Public libraries were the primary participants in two multi-type projects.

Findings

Survey. The survey of Oregon libraries showed a satisfaction rate of 4.11 on a five-point scale, which places it between “good” and “very good.” Not surprisingly, public and academic libraries were more likely to be aware of LSTA grants than school libraries; libraries with a larger staff (over 11) were more likely to be aware; and administrators more aware than other staff. Of survey respondents, 74 (37.4%) had applied for an LSTA grant, and 124 (62.6%) had not. Individual school libraries were the least likely to apply, again not surprising since they are discouraged from applying. When respondents were asked why they did not apply, the two biggest single issues were no time (30.6%) and no way of sustaining the project after it ended (13.5%). When asked what they would change, comments mainly revolved around earlier notification of the grant award and more time for the project.

Overall there was general satisfaction with the LSTA Competitive Grants program. One comment that sums up this positive attitude is: “The LSTA program is extremely valuable to Oregon libraries, and the State Library staff is very helpful to applicants and grantees. If only there were more funds to go around, as there is such a great need!” They indicated a high level of satisfaction on a five-point scale with help from OSL staff (4.20). Other responses showed that LSTA goals include some that meet the local library’s need (4.18); that the OSL resources on writing a grant were helpful (4.17); and that the one-step grant

process timetable is reasonable (4.14). However, when asked if they prefer the one-step process, the ranking fell to 3.84 on the five-point scale.

Focus Groups. All seven focus groups discussed the Competitive Grants program with many positive statements about the value of the program and its positive effects. Five of the groups also asked for changes. Participants praised many aspects of the program: ease of access to the grants; their diversity in dollar amounts from \$4000 to almost \$200,000; geographic reach; types of projects to meet local needs; encouragement of partnerships; and promotion of standards for metadata and digitization. They also found the OSL staff to be very helpful to applicants reviewing grants in advance and giving advice. They liked the new one-step application process as opposed to the former two-step process.

Concerns from small libraries included the challenge of cost sharing, lack of staff expertise to write grants, and reports and paperwork. Community college representatives felt there was too much competition with school and public libraries and that their needs were not considered.

Data on grants awarded in the last four years show that most grants and LSTA funding go to public libraries. No community college libraries have received a direct grant,⁸ and only one school consortium has received a grant. The CLG consulting team could not determine if community college or school libraries were included in some consortia grants.

The purpose of LSTA grants was also discussed, but no conclusion was reached. The discussion centered on how innovative a grant should be and how innovation for one library may be routine for another. They expressed appreciation that the LSTA guidelines do not require every grant to be innovative.

Interviews. Staff described the process used in awarding LSTA competitive grants. In 2016-2017, OSL changed from a two-step process that required submitting a project summary for review, and then, if approved, preparing a full grant application for a second round of reviews. This year only a single full proposal was required, allowing more information to be provided initially.

Output/Outcome Evaluation. The OSL website has an extensive webpage on outcome-based evaluation. This would be very helpful to libraries planning to evaluate the impact of the LSTA competitive grants they receive. The form that is used for the annual report is very clear in asking about both output and outcome/impact results of the project. Most of the annual reports showed a clear understanding by the project director of the difference between the two. Several of the projects reported doing interviews or surveys following the project to determine the outcome. For example, the Rural Outreach to Clatsop County (ROCC) project reported that 75% of the new card holders are now reading more books, 73% are better readers, 47% are doing better in school, and 49% feel better about themselves.

The ROCC project, which distributed free library cards, and the Ready to Learn program, which made donations to a college fund, received very positive comments from outcome/impact evaluations. Both programs had the advantage of having names and contact information for participants, making it easier to follow up with a longer-term evaluation. Another project focusing on Spanish-speaking library users conducted focus groups in Spanish with parents and determined how much the program was appreciated.

Cost Benefit Analysis/Return on Investment. Determining an overall return on investment for the totality of competitive grants is not possible because of the wide difference in the purposes of the grants and the different results in both output and outcome data from circulation to digitized objects to the number of children using their library cards. However, return on investment could be calculated on individual projects based on the data collected. Projects produced new and varied online information, from oral histories to mining and architectural resources, that offers the opportunity to calculate their financial benefits.

Observations

Evaluation. Competitive grant recipients that collected solid output and outcome/impact data should be commended. While not part of the Competitive Grants program, the number of libraries that have joined the PLA Project Outcome project may have created a positive climate for evaluation of overall library programs.

⁸ Linn-Benton Community College was a participant in a consortia grant.

Grant Process. Overall there was a positive reaction to the change from a two-step to a one-step grant application process. For small libraries, there was also a concern about the time required and the complexity of the grant application process, including the reports to be filed. A mini-grant process of small grants (under \$5000, for example) with a simplified process might be worth consideration.

Cooperative Grants. Many of the LSTA competitive grants were cooperative projects that brought together multiple libraries, sometimes of different types (e.g., Ready to Learn, digitization). Such grants can help smaller libraries develop experience and make progress toward statewide goals.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STATEWIDE PROGRAMS: ACTUAL AND PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

Federal Fiscal Year	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total LSTA Award	\$2,080,092	\$2,150,954	\$2,150,954	\$2,186,528
PROJECT	Actual Expenditures	Actual Expenditures	Actual Expenditures	Estimated Expenditures
COMPETITIVE GRANTS	\$419,669	\$483,300	\$675,342	\$598,312
Subtotal Competitive Grants	\$419,669	\$483,300	\$675,342	\$598,312
LSTA ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS				
LSTA Administrative Costs	\$83,204	\$86,038	\$86,204	\$87,461
LSTA Five-Year Plan Evaluation & Development				\$30,000
Subtotal Administration	\$83,204	\$86,038	\$86,204	\$117,461
STATEWIDE PROGRAMS & GRANTS				
Continuing Education				
Salary and Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$8,197	\$10,000
Library Science Collection	\$18,872	\$13,240	\$9,154	\$16,000
Online Learning Resources	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000
OLA MLS Scholarship	\$24,977	\$0	\$0	\$0
Focus on Children and Young Adults	\$9,387	\$0	\$10,474	\$0
Research Institute for Public Libraries	\$0	\$0	\$6,900	\$0
Subtotal Continuing Education	\$53,236	\$13,240	\$34,725	\$38,000
Statistics				
Bibliostat Collection Tool	\$4,950	\$4,950	\$9,900	\$0
QEM School Library Analysis and Report	\$16,847	\$13,058	\$9,905	\$12,000
Salary and Benefits	\$49,314	\$55,655	\$56,395	\$66,000
Subtotal Statistics	\$71,111	\$73,663	\$76,200	\$78,000
Youth Services				
Salary and Benefits	\$89,139	\$80,553	\$103,606	\$105,500
Statewide Summer Reading Program	\$5,423	\$2,450	\$2,450	\$2,450
Subtotal Youth Services	\$94,562	\$83,003	\$106,056	\$107,950
Oregon Center for the Book				
Salary and Benefits	\$15,297	\$16,417	\$4,999	\$6,000

Federal Fiscal Year Total LSTA Award	2013	2014	2015	2016
	\$2,080,092	\$2,150,954	\$2,150,954	\$2,186,528
<i>PROJECT</i>	<i>Actual Expenditures</i>	<i>Actual Expenditures</i>	<i>Actual Expenditures</i>	<i>Estimated Expenditures</i>
National Book Festival	\$5,473	\$1,972	\$6,703	\$4,000
Letters About Literature	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Oregon Center for the Book	\$30,770	\$18,389	\$11,702	\$10,000
School Library Services				
OASL Contract	\$30,000	\$27,791	\$89,930	\$30,000
OSLIS Consulting		\$28,439	\$53,370	\$58,000
School Library Consulting	\$64,181	\$71,067	\$37,496	\$38,000
Technical support and development	\$22,442	\$23,403	\$22,364	\$24,000
Subtotal School Library Services	\$116,623	\$150,700	\$203,160	\$150,000
PLINKIT				
National Collaborative	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$0	\$0
Salary and benefits	\$79,029	\$57,764	\$0	\$0
Subtotal PLINKIT	\$87,029	\$65,764	\$0	\$0
Technology Development Consulting				
Digital Collections Summit	\$1,817	\$4,000	\$0	\$0
EDGE	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
E-Rate	\$0	\$0	\$5,494	\$25,000
Subtotal Technology Development Consulting	\$11,008	\$65,363	\$133,297	\$157,000
E-Reference Service (Answerland)				
Subtotal E-Reference Service	\$294,500	\$256,449	\$119,476	\$150,000
Statewide Database Licensing				
Gale Database	\$432,667	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$400,000
Grant to Orbis Cascade	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$70,000
Learning Express	\$142,326	\$142,094	\$182,094	\$182,094
Oregon Encyclopedia	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Salary & Benefits	\$0	\$71,740	\$31,998	\$35,000
Subtotal Statewide Database Licensing	\$594,993	\$613,834	\$614,092	\$687,094
Sage Library System Courier Support	\$63,600	\$73,340	\$47,700	\$47,700

Federal Fiscal Year	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total LSTA Award	\$2,080,092	\$2,150,954	\$2,150,954	\$2,186,528
PROJECT	Actual Expenditures	Actual Expenditures	Actual Expenditures	Estimated Expenditures
Subtotal Sage Library System	\$63,600	\$73,340	\$47,700	\$47,700
Extend Services to the Unserved	\$149,787	\$157,871	\$0	\$0
Libraries of Oregon	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Subtotal Extend Services to the Unserved	\$149,787	\$157,871	\$0	\$1,000
Oregon Battle of the Books/OASL	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$43,000	\$10,000
Subtotal Expenditures	\$2,080,092	\$2,150,954	\$2,150,954	\$2,152,517
Balance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,011
GRANT TOTAL FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	\$2,080,092	\$2,150,954	\$2,150,954	\$2,186,528

APPENDIX B: ACRONYMS

AASL: American Association of School Librarians, a division of the American Library Association

CE: Continuing Education

CLG: The Consulting Librarians Group

CLSP: National Collaborative Summer Reading Program

ESSA: Every Student Succeeds Act

FFY: Federal Fiscal Year

FY: State Fiscal Year

ILL: Interlibrary Loan

ILS: Integrated Library System

IMLS: Institute of Museum and Library Services

LIS: Library and Information Science

LSTA: Library Services and Technology Act

MCL: Multnomah County Library

MLS: Masters in Library Science

OASL: Oregon Association of School Libraries

OBE: Outcome-Based Evaluation

OBOB: Oregon Battle of the Books

ODE: Oregon Department of Education

OLA: Oregon Library Association

OSL: Oregon State Library

OSLIS: Oregon School Library Information System

PLA: Public Library Association, a division of the American Library Association

RIPL: Research Institute for Public Libraries

ROCC: Rural Outreach to Clatsop County

SDLAC: Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee

SDLP: Statewide Database Licensing Program

SLAA: State Library Administrative Agency

SPR: State Program Report

SRP: Summer Reading Program

APPENDIX C: PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

MaryKay Dahlgreen, State Librarian

Susan Westin, Program Manager, Library Support & Development and Oregon Talking Book & Braille Library

Katie Anderson, Youth Services Consultant

Darci Hanning, Technology Development Consultant

Jennifer Maurer, School Library Consultant

Tamara Ottum, Virtual Reference Librarian

Ann Reed, Federal Programs Coordinator

Arlene Weible, Electronic Services Consultant

APPENDIX D: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

LSTA Documents

Oregon State Library's LSTA Five-Year Plan, 2013-2017

Evaluation of the Oregon State Library's 2008-2012 LSTA Five-Year Plan

Oregon Budget Information—2013-2016

IMLS Tips for Using Your State's Annual Reports for the Five-Year Evaluations with the New State Program Report (SPR)

LSTA Program-Specific Documents

Answerland.

Grant Activity Reports—2013, 2014

Project Summary for LSTA Advisory Council & State Library Board Packets—2016

Answerland Statistical Report—2016 (Summary & Full Report)

Recommendations to LSTA Council by the 2013 Task Force on Statewide Collaborative Reference Service

Recommendations for Answerland, Statewide Cooperative Reference Service (Document for State Library Board)

Answerland Information Sheet

Answerland Letter to librarians, teachers and school administrators (February 18, 2014)

Answerland Brochure—Services for Schools

Answerland Business Card

Answerland Card—Rubric for quality in virtual reference

Answerland Poster

Answerland Website

QuestionPoint Website

Competitive Grants Program.

Grant Activity Reports, 2013- 2015 for all funded LSTA competitive grants

Oregon Competitive Grants Funded, 2013-2016

Continuing Education Program.

State Program Reports—2013-2016

Oregon State Library Website—Continuing Education Resources; Library and Information Science Collection Blog

Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS).

US locations of OSLIS searches

OSLIS, Gale, & LearningExpress, Background

Counselors: Ideas to Use these Quality OSLIS Resources handout

Ideas to Maximize Use of these Quality OSLIS Resources (4 handouts)

Information Literacy eBooks Available in OSLIS handout

OSLIS: Please Share this Relevant Information with Your Teaching Team! handout

Learn to Research Posters

Memo on School Library Consulting from Jennifer Maurer, October 19, 2016

Memo from Jennifer Maurer dated July 24, 2016: Summary of 6/22 Meeting about ESSA & School Librarians
Sample appreciation letters for OSLIS, email sent by Jennifer Maurer on September 13, 2016
Information Literacy eBooks Alpha List for Secondary Schools handout
Learn to Research Videos for Secondary Schools handout
Follow-up Survey to OSLIS Mailing and Digital Repository
OSLIS usage data for 2013-2015
OSLIS Audience Overview, July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2016
Various emails on Work Group to Address School Librarians & Teacher Evaluations (SB 290), and Standards for School Librarians, October 19, 2016
Letter of appreciation from Oregon Association of School Libraries to Jennifer Maurer

Statewide Database Licensing Program.
SDLAC Annual Reports—2012-2016

Youth Services.
Oregon Public Libraries participating in the Public Library Association’s Project Outcome
Summer Reading Brief, 2014
Summer Reading, 2013 – 2016 (provided by Katie Anderson via e-mail on October 19, 2016)
State Library Outreach, Consultant’s Report (template and example of completed form)
Summer Reading Program (template for local reports)
Sample questions for outcome measurement for children’s programs
Results of 2016 Focus Institute evaluation (overall and individual sessions)
Number of libraries in Summer Food Service Program or other community outreach sites, 2013- 2015

Other Program Information.
Battle of the Books Grant Activity Report—2013-2015
EDGE Project handout
Report on State of Oregon E-Rate Assessment
Plinkit Sustainability Status Report—September 9, 2013
Compilation of Responses from Plinkit Steering Committee on the Future of the Plinkit Collaborative

APPENDIX E: LIBRARY COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. Getting Started
 - Introductions: participants and facilitator
 - Agenda review
 - Background information on purpose of focus groups
 - Objectives
 - Gather impact data on key statewide programs funded with LSTA funds.
 - Collect input on the perceived needs of Oregon libraries in the next five years to better serve their users.
 - Obtain input on priorities for the use of LSTA funds in the next five years.
 - Ground Rules
2. Evaluation of key LSTA programs
 - 2.1. Programs we will be discussing are:
 - Competitive grants
 - Answerland (a cooperative e-reference project)
 - Youth Services Programs (Summer Reading Program, Institute for Children & Youth, Consulting Services)
 - Statewide Database Licensing
 - Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS, a project to support student learning)
 - 2.2. For each of the LSTA programs above, we will be asking:
 - What do you like about this program that should remain the same?
 - What is the perceived value of continuing the program?
 - What improvements would help this program have more impact?
 - Should the program be continued? If not, why?
 - Optional question: Please share a story about the impact of this program on Oregon residents and libraries, including both training of librarians and delivery of the service.
3. Questions about the future
 - 3.1. What are the key issues facing Oregon residents in the next 3-5 years? Which of these issues might libraries respond to? How might Oregon State Library assist libraries in addressing these issues?
 - 3.2. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants
 - This year, 39% of the LSTA funds are being spent on statewide programs and 34% on competitive grants with 27% spent on administration and salaries. Do you agree with that balance? Why?
 - If you do not agree, what would you change?
 - Are there other areas that should be funded as statewide programs? If yes, which current statewide programs or competitive grants should receive less funding?
 - 3.3. The Oregon Library Association has adopted public library standards.
 - If you represent a public library, is your library using the standards? If yes, how? If not, why?
 - How can the State Library support libraries using the public library standards?
 - Can the State Library support other types of libraries using standards? How?
4. What else would you like to share with us today that you haven't already had an opportunity to say?

APPENDIX F: LSTA ADVISORY COUNCIL FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. Getting Started
 - Introductions: participants and facilitator
 - Agenda review
 - Background information on purpose of focus groups
 - Objectives
 - Understand your views of the LSTA Advisory Council roles and responsibility
 - Gather information on your opinion of current LSTA programs
 - Hear your views on future priorities for LSTA Funds.
 - Ground Rules
2. LSTA Advisory Council
 - 2.1. Describe your understanding of the role of the Advisory Council.
 - 2.2. Why is the LSTA Advisory Council important to a successful federal library program in Oregon?
 - 2.3. Would you recommend changes in the role and procedures of the LSTA Advisory Council?
3. Of the following LSTA programs, which are the most useful and why?
 - 3.1. Answerland (a cooperative e-reference project)
 - 3.2. Youth Services Programs (Summer Reading Program, Institute for Children & Youth, Consulting Services)
 - 3.3. Statewide Database Licensing
 - 3.4. Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS, a project to support student learning)
 - 3.5. Competitive grants
4. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants
 - 4.1. This year, 39% of the LSTA funds are being spent on statewide programs and 34% on competitive grants with 27% on administration and salaries. Do you agree with that balance? Why?
 - 4.2. If you do not agree, what would you change?
 - 4.3. Are there other areas that should be funded as statewide programs? If yes, which current statewide programs or competitive grants should receive less funding?
5. Questions about the future
 - 5.1. What are the key issues facing Oregon residents in the next 3-5 years? Which of these issues might libraries respond to? How might Oregon State Library assist libraries in addressing these issues?
6. What else would you like to share with us today that you haven't already had an opportunity to say?

APPENDIX G: FOCUS GROUP REPORT

See separate attachment – pages 1-20

APPENDIX H: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

See separate attachment – pages 1- 34

APPENDIX I: SURVEY REPORT

See separate attachment – pages 1- 61

**APPENDIX G: FOCUS GROUP REPORT
OREGON FIVE-YEAR LSTA EVALUATION
December 2016**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Focus Group Process.....	1
Focus Group Results Analysis.....	2
Findings.....	3
<i>Organization.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>General Observations.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Major Programs.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Trends & Issues with Potential Library Responses.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Balance of Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Library Standards.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Other.....</i>	<i>16</i>
Appendices.....	17

Introduction

This document reports on seven focus groups conducted between November 7 and November 16, 2016.

The report presents the focus group results with no interpretations or recommendations. The focus group findings—along with the results of the survey, interviews, and document review—will form the basis for the final evaluation report, which will include interpretations and recommendations.

Focus Group Process

The Consulting Librarians Group facilitated seven focus groups. Sandra Cooper and Nancy Bolt conducted the first session virtually using GoToMeeting software on Monday, November 7, with members of the LSTA Advisory Council. Sandra Cooper led the remaining six groups onsite in Oregon between November 9 and November 16. Table 1 shows a list of the sites and the attendance.

Table 1: Focus groups, locations and attendance

Location	Participants
LSTA Advisory Council Virtual Meeting	4
LaGrande LaGrande Public Library	6
Bend Central Oregon Community College	5
Portland	7

Location	Participants
Southeast Campus, Portland Community College	
Forest Grove Forest Grove Public Library	9
Albany Albany Public Library	7
Grants Pass Josephine Community Library	10

Following discussions with staff, the CLG team drafted the focus group agenda, and the Oregon State Library (OSL) Library Support and Development Division staff provided feedback. The final agendas for both the LSTA Advisory Council group and the other six groups are included as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. The LSTA Advisory Council covered these topics:

- The LSTA Advisory Council roles, responsibilities, and procedures
- A review of competitive grants and statewide programs
- The balance of funding for competitive grants, statewide programs, and administration
- Trends and issues facing Oregon’s residents and potential library responses

The agenda for the general focus groups omitted specific questions about the Advisory Council and added a discussion of library standards and the Oregon State Library’s role in supporting the implementation of the standards, with an emphasis on the Oregon Library Association’s *Standards for Oregon Public Libraries*.

At the end of the session, each group was given the opportunity to raise any additional issues or concerns that had not been discussed.

Focus Group Results Analysis

For the LSTA Advisory Council virtual meeting, the discussion was transcribed on-screen so that the participants could view the recording in real time. During the onsite focus groups, the facilitator recorded the discussion on flip charts. In each session, the facilitator asked participants to make certain that the notes were an accurate reflection of their discussion.

To analyze the results, the consultants transcribed the notes and flip charts and organized them on Excel spreadsheets, with one worksheet per question and one comment per line. They then reviewed the results for each question, establishing a coding system based on common categories or themes for each. Each response was labeled to reflect the focus group location and the code to reflect the response category.

Once the coding was complete, each spreadsheet was sorted to group responses by category. The report of findings includes the key themes that were discussed in more than half of the groups, with sample comments included from the transcripts in most cases.

Findings

Organization

After general observations, the report begins with information on each of the major programs. The individual programs discussed included:

- Competitive grants
- Answerland
- Youth Services (including the Summer Reading Program, the Institute on Children and Youth, and consulting services)
- Statewide Database Licensing
- Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)

The narrative then moves on to analysis of three remaining discussion topics:

- A discussion of trends and issues facing Oregon in the next three to five years with potential library responses
- Participants' views on the balance of funding between statewide programs, competitive grants, and administration
- Library standards

The description of the findings ends with the responses to the opportunity to discuss anything else participants believed was relevant.

General Observations

Support for the State Library

Participants throughout the focus group process were universally supportive of the Oregon State Library as well as the staff and the services they provide. They expressed their appreciation—and two groups said they hoped that the State Librarian would not retire.

Here are some sample comments:

- We have a strong state library with strong staff.
- Staff has been terrific.
- Appreciate that OSL has LSTA dollars to administer— “they get it.”
- OSL seems to understand our roles.
- Appreciate that they listen.
- OSL staff easy to work with on grants.

Impact of the Election Results

Except for the LSTA Advisory Council Focus Group, the focus groups were held in the week after the 2016 election. The results of that election created an undercurrent of uncertainty and concern about the future funding of libraries at national, state, and local levels. Specific election results that contributed to this atmosphere included:

- Douglas (Oregon) County's rejection of a proposed library district, which will mean the county's public library will close.
- The failure of Oregon's Proposition 97, changes to the state's corporate tax, which would have increased state revenue and helped cover state budget shortfalls. The

result created concern among participants about funding for the Oregon State Library, which had already reduced services in recent years.

- The national election resulting in Republican control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency created uncertainty about the future of federal library funding through the Library Services and Technology Act.

Major Programs

Competitive Grants

All seven focus groups discussed the competitive grant program with many positive statements about the value of the program and its positive aspects. Six of the groups had positive things to say about the grant process itself. On the other hand, five of the groups would like to see some changes in the grant process to help it run more smoothly and make it accessible for smaller libraries and community college libraries.

Table 2. Competitive Grants

Issue	Groups Discussing
Value of the competitive grant programs	7
Positive comments about the grant process	5
Concerns about the grant process	5

Value of the competitive grant program

Participants praised many aspects of the program: ease of access to the grants; their diversity in dollar amounts, geographic reach, and type of project; support for innovation; encouragement of partnerships; and promotion of standards for metadata and digitization. Here are examples of the comments:

- Any size library can qualify
- Doesn't require expertise
- Both accessible and competitive
- Doable
- Diversity is wide
- Price points vary to fit project
- Funding balance is right; way to broaden services to the entire state
- Opportunities for partnership with small libraries
- Spread money around
- Nice mix of projects for libraries
- Diversity of projects—nice spectrum
- Encourage risk taking (things we might not get local dollars for)
- Keep requirements for partnerships—had unanticipated “impactful relationships”
- Encouraging collaboration
- Really appreciate
- Keep
- Serving unrepresented voice
- Increasing emphasis on standards and metadata

- Evaluation and discipline plus promoting standards (e.g., digitization)
- Competitive grants are important for all types of libraries—helps them advocate for more services from funding bodies.

Positive comments about the grant process

Participants had positive comments about the ease of applying for the grants, and there was good support for the one-step grant application process. Here are a few of the comments:

- Easy to write
- Like vetting/like process
- Easy to fill out—get OSL feedback
- State Library staff helpful
- Staff approachable and helpful because they want people to succeed
- Like 1-step process
- Easier as 1-step process
- 2-step process was rough; like the 1-step process

Concerns about the grant process

There were concerns that there are barriers that keep small libraries from applying for grants; that the competitive grant program is not accessible to community colleges; that there is not enough time between the announcement of grant awards and the project start date; that some aspects of collaboration are a challenge; and that the wording of the grant agreement reads like a generic boilerplate contract for services rather than a grant agreement.

- For smaller libraries, cost sharing is a challenge for some
- Resentful re: large grants; why do they need the dollars
- Disparity between libraries/capability
- Reports/paperwork [are a negative]¹
- Time/resources [problematic]
- Create a simple application with simple reporting—make it easier
- Perception that college students [and libraries] are not sexy
- From an academic perspective, too much competition from school/public libraries
- Community colleges have diverse student population; they are like the “struggling middle class”
- Community colleges do not seem to get grants; gone to larger institutions; not sure why
- Look at community college grants in Washington state (e.g., assessment techniques; Open Educational Resources (OER); helping students go to university with skills)
- There are bureaucratic hoops for some partners [that slows the start-up process]
- Could use more guidance for collaboration

¹ Brackets are used throughout the report to indicate clarifying language added by the consultants; parenthesis are part of the actual comments made during the focus group discussions.

- Found the process a little confusing; a little frustrating; contract language a little strange
- Compressed timeline between notification and startup needs to be changed
- Time between notification and project start needs to be at least 6 weeks.
- For a 1-year grant, if you are hiring staff, you have less than 12 months.

Other topics—Innovation, need and replication

The LSTA Advisory Committee characterized the competitive grants this way:

Competitive grants are special projects being funded—aiming to support creative services and thinking. They must be replicable by other libraries to have impact—must include partnerships. How to fund replication is a challenge.

The comments seem to indicate confusion about innovation vs. need and replication. These are statements advocating for changes:

- Can they emphasize innovation/creativity—set aside funds for innovation
- Overemphasis on need?
- Replication: don't need blueprint, need money

These are statements about positive aspects of this issue:

- Does not have to be new/cool/sexy
- Willing to support newer ideas, too (e.g., data presentation)
- Try new things—opportunity for rural libraries
- Replicate previous programs; can be improved

Impact of grants

- Grant to Oregon State University has helped create a more trusting relationship between the University and the Native American tribes. The project has enabled the tribes to curate their own resources while making them discoverable.
- Another grant created a sustainable project by leveraging local funds and support. Libraries worked together, creating a cultural shift—creating collaboration.
- Grant preserving oral histories has made a hidden history accessible.
- Our library received bridge funding for a position—giving the library a full-time person for Latino outreach. Attendance at events went from less than 25 people to over 400 people. Funding for the position was assumed locally.
- When a mother got a call that her two-year-old had received a \$1,000 Ready to Learn scholarship, she said, “I am going to tell my daughter she is going to college.”
- A grant to support volunteer retention changed the culture of the library when the staff learned to view the volunteer program as a service, and the Library takes pride in it.
- Grants to the Historical Society have allowed it to make its resources available to people living outside of Portland.

Answerland (a cooperative e-reference project)

Answerland is an information service available to Oregon residents 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Librarians from participating libraries help find answers to questions and provide research guidance. Questions are accepted through email, chat and text.

All seven focus groups discussed Answerland. There were positive comments about the value of the service; however, there were also questions and concerns voiced about the service. Table 3 summarizes the times major topics were discussed.

Table 3. Answerland

Issue	Groups Discussing
Quality of service issue	6
Value of Answerland	5
Importance of 24x7 reference service	5
Skepticism about level of use	4

Quality of Service Issue

There were a variety of concerns expressed about the quality of the services being offered through Answerland.

- Doing more damage than good. Without consistently high quality and resources; damaging our brand
- Will training and yearly conference continue?
- Uneven service—no follow through
- Bizarre and uneven reference service quality
- Out of state services not helpful
- Are we providing best service?
- If it were revamped and quality improved—anecdotal question about quality of services
- Lot of concerns about the quality of response out of state
- Service quality issues; training on quality service; coaching capacity.

Value of Answerland

- Would be expensive to offer on our own
- Can refer questions to subject experts/libraries with other specialization
- Students give positive feedback
- Branding effective
- Great marketing tool
- I love Answerland!
- Community college faculty love it
- Having virtual reference is very important to spread out rural state
- Being without helped prove importance of it
- Absolutely of value to Art Library because our collection is so specialized, helps for topics outside art.

Importance of 24x7 reference service

Academic library representatives believe that the 24x7 service is important, and they would not be able to offer it on their own.

- Enables us to offer 24x7 reference
- Allows us to offer 24x7 service
- 24x7 reference is important to our community college/good amount of traffic/could not do it locally
- I like 24x7
- A library needs a reference service—so we have 24x7

Skepticism about level of usage

- Students at community college don't like it; does not meet their needs
- Difficult to get people to use; did not seem relevant
- What is return on investment?
- Overall usage is not that high

At one focus group, a participant said: "Don't think it should continue." In discussion of subsequent topics, people indicated that Answerland was a statewide program that could be abandoned if LSTA funds were reduced.

Youth services (including the Summer Reading Program, Institute for Children & Youth, and Consulting Services)

The Youth Services programs were given high marks during discussions in six of the seven focus groups. The seventh group's participants had limited knowledge of the youth services programs.

The state-funded "Ready to Read" grants were assumed to be LSTA grants by some participants and were discussed in that context. References to that topic are not reported here. At the Albany Focus Group, which only had three public library representatives, the entire discussion of youth services focused on their use of the "Ready to Read" grants, and none of the participants were familiar with the Institute.

Table 4 shows the number of groups discussing each of three topics.

Table 4. Youth Services

Issue	Groups Discussing
Value of the Summer Reading Program	6
Value of the Institute for Children & Youth	5
Value of Consulting Services on Youth Services	6

Value of the Summer Reading Program

The groups were positive about the Summer Reading Program (SRP), which funds OSL’s participation in the national Summer Reading Collaborative and the development and printing of the SRP manual. Here is a sample of the comments:

- SRP critical for small libraries
- SRP manual is a collaboration with the Oregon Library Association’s Children’s Services Division
- Materials bilingual
- Quality of materials is a positive.
- SRP is probably the most visible program to the public.
- Cannot imagine doing SRP without help

Value of the Institute for Children & Youth

The Institute for Children and Youth was described in very positive terms—here are some examples:

- Institute: level of training high for cost—good value
- Staff comes back energized.
- Institute takes advantage of Oregon library staff.
- Institute is awesome—energizes participants
- Sets staff on fire/empowers thinking about the “why” of what they do

Value of Consulting Services on Youth Services

The consulting services provided by Katie Anderson were described in glowing terms, as demonstrated by these examples:

- Sing Katie’s praises—she always answers with multiple answers
- Katie goes above and beyond
- Katie shares information with school libraries; work is well done and accessible to libraries
- Katie helps fill out evaluation for outcome-based evaluation
- Katie works seamlessly with OLA’s Children’s Services Division

Potential changes in youth services programs

The only changes were suggestions for new programs modeled after successful youth services activities:

- Add a teen SRP with more dollars
- Do institutes for other areas
- Use the Kansas program as a model for other areas for continuing education for paraprofessionals.
- K-12 non-certified/paraprofessional library staffs need professional development.

Statewide Database Licensing

All seven of the focus groups discussed the statewide database-licensing program. Table 5 summarizes the key themes that emerged in the discussions.

Table 5. Statewide Database Licensing

Issue	Groups Discussing
Value of statewide database licensing	5
Value LearningExpress	5
Switch from EBSCO to Gale	4

Value of Statewide Database Licensing

There was strong support for the program. One group agreed that it is “the best thing ever.” Other comments included:

- Helps extend reach of resources
- Procurement burden is not on my library
- Critical
- Small business resources are good
- As an academic at a small school, we would be bereft without the database licensing.
- As a small public library staff person, I don’t know what we would do.

Value of LearningExpress

Five groups discussed how much they like the resource LearningExpress , which is focused on career education and development and test preparation. One group agreed that LearningExpress “is fabulous.” Examples of other comments:

- Love LearningExpress (comment from 2 groups)
- Nice databases like LearningExpress; wide variety

Switch from EBSCO to Gale

Four groups discussed the decision that was made prior to this evaluation period to change from EBSCO to Gale as the primary aggregator. Academic library representatives believe that EBSCO is better suited to the needs of their students; and there was at least one comment from a public library representative on the topic.

- Impact of change from EBSCO to Gale on academic library; Gale better for freshmen
- Switch from EBSCO to Gale was unfortunate
- Loss of EBSCO is a negative; Gale not used—does not meet academic needs—puts community college in a bad position
- From an academic perspective, loss of EBSCO is a negative; not serving four-year academics
- Public libraries also pay for EBSCO for NoveList and other resources

Impact of statewide database licensing

A public library director reported that she made a presentation featuring the small business resources available through the statewide database licenses to the local Rotary Club. When she returned to the library, six Rotarians were in line to sign up for a library card so that they could use the resources.

Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)

Only three school library media specialists (referred to as teacher-librarians in Oregon) could attend the focus groups, which were held while school was in session. As a result, few focus group participants had an in-depth knowledge of OSLIS. At the focus group in Forest Grove, one of the principal volunteers working on OSLIS (a retired teacher-librarian) attended and described OSLIS to the group. OSLIS was not discussed at the LaGrande focus group.

Table 6. OSLIS

Issue	Groups Discussing
Value of OSLIS	5

Value of OSLIS

- There were three positive comments about citation maker.
- Use may increase with more teacher-librarians
- Schools love it
- State Library has been very supportive of the staff member responsible for OSLIS
- Great to have
- Thumbs up for the new web design
- With LSTA funds, every single student has access to Gale resources and citation maker.

Trends & Issues with Potential Library Responses

What are the key issues facing Oregon residents in the next 3-5 year?

This was the first part of a question designed to help identify potential priorities for the next five-year LSTA plan. All seven groups discussed the topic, and the predominant themes were funding (local, state and federal), technology challenges, demographic shifts, and social issues. Table 7 shows the number of groups discussing each topic.

Table 7. Trends and Issues Facing Oregon

Issue	Groups Discussing
Funding	7
Technological challenges	5
Demographic shifts	5
Social issues	4

Funding

Participants in all the groups identified funding issues and challenges that will face Oregonians in the next 3-5 years. The unfunded liability for the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) was mentioned in three groups. Others cited the state funding challenges, and yet others mention the uncertainty of federal funding. Some examples of the comments:

- State funding challenges—impact on libraries; especially municipal libraries

- Funding uncertainty; federal funding; afraid IMLS funding will get cut
- State funding shortfall
- Rural areas not supporting library funding
- Funding for PERS and health care
- \$1.3 billion shortfall in state funding; I am concerned about OSL
- “Haves” versus “have not’s”
- Funding for education
- Strengthening financing for poorer counties

Technology challenges

A variety of issues resulting from the demands of technology were identified by five groups:

- Future of technology; increasing use of smartphones
- Greater aggregation/technology standards
- Changes in technology; we need staff who can use it; need to buy it
- Sustainable digital content/preservation, especially for smaller institutions; cost of digital content
- Keeping up with the pace of change and the assumption that people have access to technology
- Internet access—assessment; we don’t know who has what/study of internet access

Demographic shifts

Participants in five groups cited changes in the population facing the state:

- Latino population—libraries have to adapt to
- Increasing diversity
- Multicultural population in Greater Portland; beyond Latino; need to learn more about serving 60 languages (e.g., Russian, Ukrainian, Somalian)
- Lots more children
- Lots of mobility within the county
- More non-traditional students entering college
- ESL; non-native residents; other immigrant needs.

Social issues

Participants identified a range of social issues that Oregonians must grapple with in the coming years. The list was lengthy: poverty, hunger, housing, financial insecurity, living wage, homelessness, transportation—all topped off by the loss of social services.

Library Response to Trends & Issues

All seven groups suggested potential library responses to the challenges facing Oregon, and three areas were mentioned by four or more groups.

Table 8. Library Response to Trends and Issues Facing Oregon

Issue	Groups Discussing
Advocacy	7
Outreach	4
Civic Engagement and Inclusion	4

Advocacy

Telling the library’s story and educating stakeholders about the value of libraries in today’s environment was very much “top of mind” for focus group participants. Here are some examples of the comments:

- How do we demonstrate our value to the community?
- Tools to tell the library story
- Direct communication from State Library to local governments is helpful
- Do studies of funding models for public libraries
- Debunk that libraries are going away
- Advocacy education at all levels
- Challenge for paraprofessionals to advocate for the library
- Promote what we have

Outreach

Primarily in response to the issue of changing demographics, four focus groups emphasized the importance of taking the library where people are.

- Need outreach—get the kids first
- Need to do outreach story time
- We need to be where the people are
- Washington County doing ethnographic study
- Hood River went out to the migrant population

Civic Engagement and Inclusion

The concept of the library being an active partner in the community, offering a non-judgmental place for everyone, and serving as a venue for the discussion of civic issues also rose to the top of the list in four groups.

- Role as a social equalizer
- Libraries emphasize the role of providing equity
- Source of information to work toward solving issues
- As a venue for discussing issues
- Downtown Bend Branch has a social service person on staff
- Partnership with police/fire departments
- LSTA leverages partnerships-especially in smaller communities

Balance of Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants

All seven groups discussed the question about the balance of funding between statewide programs, competitive grants, and LSTA administration. Six of the seven groups commented on the balance, with only one indicating that they preferred statewide

programs. Five groups suggested changes to statewide programs—although there was not necessarily a clear link between new ideas and the elimination of programs. Comments on competitive grants are reflected in the discussion of the statewide programs.

Table 9. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants

Issue	Groups Discussing
Balance of current programs	6
Changes to statewide programs	5

Balance of current programs

Five of the groups support the current balance if funding remains stable. There were some comments on the advantages of statewide programs, and one group indicated a preference for statewide programs. Finally, one group commented that the percentages are not as important as asking “Are we funding the right thing?”

- Comfortable with the balance
- Okay with current balance
- Balance is okay
- Ideally it would be balanced
- Think we have a pretty good balance
- Important to meet the needs of all types of libraries with statewide programs
- Some of the statewide programs have huge impact for the dollar
- Challenge of grant writing and reporting for k-12 libraries makes them feel inaccessible; leads to a preference for statewide programs
- Innovation is not meat and potatoes; see statewide programs as more important

Changes to statewide programs

Some groups commented on priorities among the current programs, and there were suggestions for new priorities.

- Digitization benefits the entire state; repository needed
- Should digitization become a statewide project with a repository and consolidation?
- Statewide databases are a high priority.
- Take Answerland funds
- If there are funding cuts, Answerland could go; most expendable; valuable but not well used.
- Database licensing—reduce resources
- How pie in the sky are we being? Statewide digital repository; enhanced courier; shared systems

Library Standards

All six of the regular focus groups discussed library standards, which was not on the LSTA Advisory Council agenda. In four of the groups, participants indicated they were using the standards. Five of the groups suggested ways that the State Library could assist with the standards implementation other than accreditation/certification, and four groups

discussed varying points of view on accreditation or certification. Four groups discussed other types of standards.

Table 10. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants

Issue	Groups Discussing
Role of OSL in implementing public library standards	5
Pro's and con's of accreditation/certification based on standards	4
Using the public library standards	4
Reason for not using public library standards	4
Other types of standards	4

Role of OSL in implementing public library standards

The discussion in five of the six groups suggested a variety of ways for the State Library to help with standards implementation. Here are the ideas that were suggested:

- If we turned in scores, then OSL could identify gaps to identify needs.
- Incorporate into the statistics.
- OSL could give libraries tools to analyze statistics to compare themselves to the standards.
- Review standards at Directors meeting.
- Share success stories for meeting standards
- OSL role is training and networking.
- EDGE as a model for how OSL could help
- Support and promote
- Use LSTA to help close the gap
- Emphasize a standard each year, then do a statewide initiative that brings together training, information, and grants to intensify the impact.
- Provide samples and best practices so that libraries do not have to reinvent the wheel

Pro's and con's of accreditation/certification based on standards

Participants in four groups expressed views about having the State Library lead a program to accredit or certify libraries that meet the standards with strong opposition to the concept in one group.

- Might do certification or accreditation
- The State Library's role is.....NOT monitoring and certifying; waste of time; [high] cost; would make the rural-urban divide greater
- Offer accreditation with presentation of an annual plaque to libraries that qualify.
- Accreditation would help; use peer evaluators to assess public libraries and how they are doing—like the college accreditation process.

Using the public library standards

Libraries reported using the standards, primarily as a tool for educating boards and setting priorities. Here are some examples:

- Great for educating the board
- Useful for setting priorities and identifying needs
- Use it to educate governing boards
- Board goals
- Used it in the campaign in Douglas County [to gain support for the proposed library district]
- Hired a consultant to analyze how well we met the standards

Reason for not using public library standards

Several participants explained their rationale for not using the standards.

- Lacks quantitative measures that help with funding requests
- Current standards not useful for smaller libraries; prescriptive vs. self-study
- No teeth in standards
- With old prescriptive standards, there were benchmarks

Other types of standards

Academic librarians in the focus groups did not suggest a role for OSL in standards implementation. Standards for school libraries are being developed now—and there were only two school library representatives at the regular focus groups. As one of the school librarians said: “Anything OSL can do to support k-12 is important.” One participant also expressed appreciation for the influence that LSTA has had on metadata standards in Oregon.

Other

The majority of the topics discussed in this section re-enforced topics and themes reported elsewhere. There were two comments about the value of the LSTA programs in Oregon:

- LSTA is a big success—has shown its benefits.
- Without LSTA, we would not have all the things we have.

Appendix 1
Focus Group Discussion Guide
LSTA Advisory Council
Oregon LSTA Five-Year Plan Evaluation

1. Getting Started
 - Introductions: participants and facilitator
 - Agenda review
 - Background information on purpose of focus groups
 - Objectives
 - Understand your views of the LSTA Advisory Council roles and responsibility
 - Gather information on your opinion of current LSTA programs
 - Hear your views on future priorities for LSTA Funds.
 - Ground Rules

 2. LSTA Advisory Council
 - 2.1. Describe your understanding of the role of the Advisory Council.

 - 2.2. Why is the LSTA Advisory Council important to a successful federal library program in Oregon?

 - 2.3. Would you recommend changes in the role and procedures of the LSTA Advisory Council?

 3. Of the following LSTA programs, which are the most useful and why?
 - AnswerLand (a cooperative e-reference project)
 - Youth Services Programs (Summer Reading Program, Institute for Children & Youth, Consulting Services)
 - Statewide Database Licensing
 - Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS, a project to support student learning)
 - Competitive grants

 4. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants
 - This year, 39% of the LSTA funds are being spent on statewide programs and 34% on competitive grants with 27% on administration and salaries. Do you agree with that balance? Why?
 - If you do not agree, what would you change?
 - Are there other areas that should be funded as statewide programs? If yes, which current statewide programs or competitive grants should receive less funding?

 5. Questions about the future
 - 5.1. What are the key issues facing Oregon residents in the next 3-5 years? Which of these issues might libraries respond to? How might Oregon State Library assist libraries in addressing these issues?

 6. What else would you like to share with us today that you haven't already had an opportunity to say?
-
-

Appendix 2
Focus Group Discussion Guide
Oregon LSTA Five-Year Plan Evaluation

1. Getting Started
 - Introductions: participants and facilitator
 - Agenda review
 - Background information on purpose of focus groups
 - Objectives
 - Gather impact data on key statewide programs funded with LSTA funds.
 - Collect input on the perceived needs of Oregon libraries in the next five years to better serve their users.
 - Obtain input on priorities for the use of LSTA funds in the next five years.
 - Ground Rules

2. Evaluation of key LSTA programs
 - 2.1. Programs we will be discussing are:
 - Competitive grants
 - AnswerLand (a cooperative e-reference project)
 - Youth Services Programs (Summer Reading Program, Institute for Children & Youth, Consulting Services)
 - Statewide Database Licensing
 - Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS, a project to support student learning)

 - 2.2. For each of the LSTA programs above, we will be asking:
 - What do you like about this program that should remain the same?
 - What is the perceived value of continuing the program?
 - What improvements would help this program have more impact?
 - Should the program be continued? If not, why?
 - Optional question: Please share a story about the impact of this program on Oregon residents and libraries, including both training of librarians and delivery of the service.

3. Questions about the future
 - 3.1. What are the key issues facing Oregon residents in the next 3-5 years? Which of these issues might libraries respond to? How might Oregon State Library assist libraries in addressing these issues?

 - 3.2. Statewide Programs & Competitive Grants
 - This year, 39% of the LSTA funds are being spent on statewide programs and 34% on competitive grants with 27% spent on administration and salaries. Do you agree with that balance? Why?
 - If you do not agree, what would you change?
 - Are there other areas that should be funded as statewide programs? If yes, which current statewide programs or competitive grants should receive less funding?

 - 3.3. The Oregon Library Association has adopted public library standards.

- If you represent a public library, is your library using the standards? If yes, how? If not, why?
 - How can the State Library support libraries using the public library standards?
 - Can the State Library support other types of libraries using standards? How?
4. What else would you like to share with us today that you haven't already had an opportunity to say?

APPENDIX H: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Oregon LSTA Survey

1. Welcome to the Oregon LSTA Satisfaction and Impact Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your responses will help the State Library evaluate the use of Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Funds in Oregon as specified in its LSTA Five Year Plan, 2013-2017.

You will also provide information for the LSTA Advisory Council and the State Library Board to use when writing the new LSTA Plan, which will guide the use of these funds in 2018 to 2022.

IMPORTANT! All opinions and information that you provide will remain completely confidential. We will combine your responses with all others to analyze the results and will not link any response with an individual. This survey will ask you for information about yourself and your opinions about the following:

- Answerland (statewide virtual reference)
- Online databases provided by State Library
- Youth Services programs
- OSLIS website (Oregon School Library Information System)
- LSTA competitive grant program
- Continuing Education program
- Priorities for Oregon's LSTA program

This survey will take about 10 to 20 minutes to complete depending on how many questions that you answer.

If you have any questions about the State Library's LSTA program, please contact Ann Reed at 503- 378-5027 or at ann.reed@state.or.us. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Sandy Cooper at 707-408-2247 or at scooper105@earthlink.net.

* 1. Are you a public library trustee or retiree?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

3. Information about Survey Respondents

* 1. In which part of Oregon do you work?

Central

Coastal

Eastern

Metro Portland

Southern

Willamette Valley

* 2. In which type of library do you work?

College or University

K-12 School

Not employed

Public

Special

Tribal

Volunteer

Other (please specify)

* 3. Which of the following areas best describes the area in which you work? We know you might perform more than one job; please choose the area in which you work most of your time.

- Administration
- Children or Young Adult Services
- Circulation Services
- Collection Development
- Information Literacy and/or Instruction
- Reference Services
- Technical Services
- Technology Services
- Other (please specify)

* 4. What is the number of full-time equivalent staff that work in your library?

- Less than 1 to 10
- 11 to 30
- 31 to 50
- 51 to 100
- 101 to 200
- Over 200

* 5. Do you have a MLS, MLIS degree, or Library Media Endorsement?

- Yes
- No

4. Answerland

Answerland provides a centralized online reference service for all Oregon residents, and training and support for staff at Oregon libraries to provide that service

Answerland also provides software tools so that local libraries can provide the same service to their communities. Any library in Oregon may use Answerland Local to provide online chat reference service to their local community or in partnership with other Oregon libraries.

* 1. Do you participate in the Answerland program in any of these three ways?

1. Answer reference questions using Answerland
2. Offer Answerland local to your community
3. I'm an Answerland partner

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

5. Answerland Awareness

* 1. How did you first hear about Answerland?

- Search engine, like Google
- Email message or listserv
- Conference or meeting
- Brochure or newsletter
- Colleague
- Contact from the State Library
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

6. Answerland Reference

Any library or person in Oregon may use Answerland for reference services.

* 1. Do you use Answerland for reference services?

- Yes
- No

Oregon LSTA Survey

7. Answerland Reference

* 1. Why does your library not use Answerland Reference? (Select all that apply)

- I don't know enough about Answerland
- My library can answer all our users' reference questions
- We used Answerland, but stopped because we were not happy with the service.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

8. Answerland Reference Satisfaction

* 1. What is your overall satisfaction rating with Answerland reference services?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

2. If you have contacted a State Library staff member to answer a question about Answerland, what is your satisfaction rating with the response?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

3. Please answer the following about the impact of using Answerland to answer reference questions. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My library increased its visibility in our community because we use Answerland.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library's users are better served because we use Answerland.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Answerland is an essential part of my library's services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library's users depend on Answerland to find the information resources that they need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Oregon LSTA Survey

9. Answerland Local

Any library in Oregon may use Answerland Local to provide online chat reference service to their local community or in partnership with other Oregon libraries.

* 1. Do you or your library use Answerland Local?

- Yes
 No

Oregon LSTA Survey

10. Answerland Local

* 1. Why do you or your library not use Answerland Local? (Select all that apply)

- I don't know enough about Answerland Local.
 We use our own chat service.
 We used Answerland Local, but stopped because we were not happy with the service.
 We do not need a chat service.
 Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

11. Answerland Local

* 1. What is your overall satisfaction rating with Answerland Local?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

2. Please answer the following questions about Answerland Local. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Overall, what is your rating of the Answerland Local technical support?	<input type="radio"/>				
Overall, what is your rating of the Answerland Local training?	<input type="radio"/>				
If you have contacted a State Library staff member to ask questions about Answerland Local, rate your overall satisfaction with the response.	<input type="radio"/>				

3. Please answer the following questions about the impact that Answerland Local has made to your library. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My library increased its visibility in our community because of Answerland Local.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library's users are better served because of Answerland Local.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Answerland Local is an essential part of my library's services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library's users depend on Answerland Local to find the information resources that they need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Please share any comments that you have about Answerland Local.

Oregon LSTA Survey

12. Answerland Partners

* 1. Answerland Partners are those libraries that contribute staff time to answer reference questions or promote Answerland in their communities.

Are you or your library an Answerland Partner?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

13. Answerland Partners

* 1. Why are you or your library not an Answerland Partner? (Check all that apply)

My library does not have staff time to contribute.

My reference staff members do not have enough experience in reference work.

My library does not employ reference librarians.

I don't know enough about Answerland.

Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

14. Answerland Partners

* 1. What is your overall satisfaction rating with Answerland Partners?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

2. Overall, what is your rating of Answerland Partner training?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

3. Why are you (or your library) an Answerland Partner?

- I like networking with other reference librarians.
- It makes my job more interesting.
- I want to contribute to library service statewide.
- My library benefits from Answerland and I want to give back.
- My supervisor gave me this duty.
- Other (please specify)

4. Please share any comments that you have about being an Answerland Partner.

Oregon LSTA Survey

15. Youth Services

The State Library provides support program for public libraries that offer services for youth. The programs funded by LSTA include the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute, and resources to support the Statewide Summer Reading Program.

* 1. Have you or your library participated in the Focus Institute OR the Statewide Summer Reading Program?

- Yes
- No

Oregon LSTA Survey

16. Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute

* 1. Have you or one of your library's staff attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute?

- Yes, I attended.
- Yes, one of my library's staff attended.
- No

Oregon LSTA Survey

17. Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute

1. Please answer the following about the impact of the Institute on you. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I returned to my library and changed the way I served children and teens.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I developed a network of colleagues in which we continue to provide each other with professional support and advice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned valuable information and received good resources that I <u>plan</u> to use in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned valuable information and received good resources, but <u>will not</u> use it in the future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Please share any comments that you have about the Focus Institute.

Oregon LSTA Survey

18. Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute

1. Please select the impacts of Institute attendance on your library's staff. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The staff returned to my library and changed the way they served children and teens.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The staff developed a network of colleagues in which they continue to provide each other with professional support and advice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The staff learned new information and received resources that they <u>plan</u> to use in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The staff learned information and received resources, but <u>will not</u> use it in the future	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Please share any comments that you have about the Focus Institute.

Oregon LSTA Survey

19. Statewide Summer Reading

* 1. Does your library participate in the Statewide Summer Reading Program?

- Yes
 No

Oregon LSTA Survey

20. Statewide Summer Reading Program

* 1. Overall, what is your opinion of the Summer Reading Program?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

* 2. Overall, what is your opinion about the Statewide Summer Reading Program materials provided by the State Library and its summer reading partners.

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

3. The State Library pays the membership fees to the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP), and purchases CSLP summer reading manuals for all public, volunteer, and tribal libraries in Oregon. What is your opinion of how the State Library and the Oregon Library Association represent you in CSLP?

- I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP as a result of their efforts.
- I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts because my library could not have a summer reading program without the CSLP summer reading manual and CD of clip-art.
- I appreciate the efforts of my CSLP representatives, but I don't think they or anyone else can effectively represent me because CSLP is too big.
- CSLP representatives need to makes changes in how they gather feedback and communicate important information to represent me more effectively.
- Other (please specify)

4. If the State Library did not pay for your library's participation in the CSLP and you did not receive summer reading materials, what would your library do?

- The library would not have a Summer Reading Program.
- The library would develop its own Summer Reading Program, but would significantly reduce the scope and activities.
- The library would develop its own program and could continue it at the current level.
- Other (please specify)

5. Please answer the following about the impact of the Summer Reading Program. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	---------------------------------	-------	-------------------

The SRP participants had a lot of fun and read many books.	<input type="radio"/>				
The SRP participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	<input type="radio"/>				
More children used the library over the summer because of the SRP.	<input type="radio"/>				
The parents in the community appreciated the SRP.	<input type="radio"/>				
The teachers in the community appreciated the SRP.	<input type="radio"/>				

6. Please share any comments that you may have about the Statewide Summer Reading Program.

Oregon LSTA Survey

21. Statewide Database Licensing Program

The State Library uses LSTA funds to pay for statewide subscriptions to the Gale and LearningExpress database products.

* 1. I use at least one of the databases.

- Daily
- 2-3 times a week
- 2-3 times a month
- A few times a year
- I do not use.

* 1. Why do you not use Gale and LearningExpress database products? (Select all that apply)

- I don't know enough these databases.
- My library can answer all our users' reference questions without using these databases.
- We used these databases, but stopped because we were not happy with these products.
- These databases not do meet the needs of our library's users.
- I have no need to use these databases in my job.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

23. Database Training

* 1. Have you attended either an in-person OR an online training (webinar) on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?

- Yes
- No

Oregon LSTA Survey

24. Database In-person Training

* 1. Have you attended an in-person training on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?

- Yes
- No

* 1. Please rate this in-person training.

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

* 2. In-person database training improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 3. In-person database training improved my ability to teach library staff and users how to use the databases.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Oregon LSTA Survey

26. Databases In-person Training

* 1. Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not attended an in-person training? (Select all that apply.)

- I don't have the time.
- In-person trainings are too far from my library.
- I didn't know about their availability.
- I don't need this training; I already know how to use databases.
- I don't use databases.
- I don't know enough about what is in the databases.
- My library doesn't have enough employees to cover in my absence.
- I prefer not to attend training provided by vendors.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

27. Database Online Training

* 1. Have you participated in online training sessions (webinars) on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

28. Database Online Training

* 1. Please rate this online training.

Poor

Fair

Average

Good

Excellent

* 2. Online database training improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features.

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Neither disagree or agree

Agree

Strongly Agree

* 3. Online database training improved my ability to teach library staff and users how to use the databases.

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Neither disagree or agree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Oregon LSTA Survey

29. Database On-line Training

* 1. Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not participated in online training? (Select all that apply.)

- I don't have the time.
- My library's technology does not support webinars.
- I didn't know about their availability.
- I don't need this training; I already know how to use databases.
- I don't like to participate in webinars.
- I don't use databases.
- I don't know enough about what is in the databases.
- My library doesn't have enough employees to cover my work during a webinar.
- I prefer not to attend training provided by vendors.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

30. Database Impacts

1. Please answer the following questions about the impact of the databases. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My library has saved money on <u>print</u> journal and magazine subscriptions because of the Statewide Database Licensing Program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library has saved money on <u>online</u> journals and magazines subscriptions because of the Statewide Database Licensing Program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library receives more use, such as increased website traffic or in-person visits, because of the Statewide Database Licensing Program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If my library did not have the Statewide Database Licensing Program, my library could not offer the equivalent information resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The State Library's databases are an essential part of my library's services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library's users depend on the Statewide Database Licensing Program to find the information resources that they need.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The promotional materials, such as bookmarks, provided by State Library and the database vendors are effective.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Please share any comments that you may have about the Statewide Database Licensing Program.

Oregon LSTA Survey

31. OSLIS Participants

The Oregon School Library Information Service (OSLIS) is a website providing access to statewide licensed databases, information literacy resources, and a citation creation tool designed for K-12 students and teachers.

* 1. Do you or your library use the OSLIS website?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

32. OSLIS

* 1. Which of the following reasons best describes why you or your library does not use OSLIS? (Select all that apply.)

- OSLIS' resources are not relevant to me or my library's users.
- I don't know about enough about OSLIS.
- My library's internet connection is not fast enough.
- I would use OSLIS if I had the training.
- The Gale and LearningExpress databases are difficult to use.
- Citation Maker is difficult to use.
- The information literacy resources are difficult to use.
- The OSLIS website is difficult to use.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

33. OSLIS Satisfaction

* 1. Do you use OSLIS to access (Check all that apply)

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy resources
- Professional resources

* 2. Does your school or library webpage have a link to OSLIS?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

* 3. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your school?

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy resources
- I don't know
- Other (please specify)

* 4. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?

- Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)
- Citation Maker
- Information literacy resources
- I don't know.
- Other (please specify)

* 5. How easy is it to find the information that you need on the OSLIS web site?

Very Easy	Easy	Neutral	Difficult	Very Difficult
<input type="radio"/>				

* 6. Have you participated in training given by State Library staff about OSLIS?

- Yes
- No

7. If you have attended OSLIS training, please rate the quality of this training.

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

8. Please share any comments that you may have about the OSLIS program.

Oregon LSTA Survey

34. State Library Continuing Education (CE) Program

The State Library offers a variety of CE programs, both online and in-person to Oregon's libraries, funded by LSTA funds. It also offers a collection of Library Science materials for continuing education purposes.

* 1. Would you like the State Library to provide the following? (Select all that apply.)

- More workshops in person
- More workshops online
- More information about CE opportunities
- I have enough information and opportunities for CE
- Other (please specify)

* 2. Please select the answer that best describes your use of the State Library's CE information.

- I received the information and I have taken at least one CE course.
- I received the information but I have not yet taken a CE course.
- I did not know that State Library provided CE information.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

35. Library Information Services (LIS) Collection

The State Library offers a comprehensive collection of library related materials and promotes this collection through a blog.

* 1. Do you use the Library Information Sciences (LIS) Collection?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

36. LIS Collection Use

* 1. Why do you not use the LIS Collection? (Select all that apply)

- I don't have the time.
- I did not know about this collection.
- I receive continuing education from other sources.
- I am not required to engage in continuing education.
- I am not interested in this collection.
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

37. Library Information Sciences (LIS) Collection

* 1. How did you first hear about Oregon's LIS Collection?

- Search engine, like Google
- Email message or listserv
- Conference or meeting
- Brochure or newsletter
- Colleague
- Contact from the State Library
- Other (please specify)

* 2. What is your overall satisfaction rating with the LIS Collection?

Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
<input type="radio"/>				

3. Please answer the following about the impact of using the LIS collection. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The LIS Collection is a valuable part of my continuing education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned ideas from the LIS Collection to improve my library's services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The LIS Collection helps me stay current with library science trends and professional development resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My library and/or I saves money on continuing education because of the LIS Collection.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Oregon LSTA Survey

38. The LSTA Competitive Grants Program

Each year, the State Library makes approximately \$600,000 to \$800,000 of LTSA funded competitive grants available to legally established libraries or non-profit entities serving libraries. One of the main criteria in awarding a grant is if it supports the state's LSTA Five-Year Plan.

* 1. Do you know about the State Library's LSTA competitive grants program?

Yes

No

Oregon LSTA Survey

39. Competitive Grants Program

* 1. How did you first hear about Oregon's LSTA competitive grants program?

Search engine, like Google

Email message or listserv

Conference or meeting

Brochure or newsletter

Colleague

Contact from the State Library

Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

40. LSTA Grant Program

* 1. On behalf of your library, have you applied for a LSTA grant?

Yes

No

* 1. Why has your library not applied for a LSTA grant? (Check all that apply)

- No need
- The process is too complicated
- I didn't know that my library was eligible
- No time to write the proposal
- The program is only for public libraries
- My library could not provide ongoing funding for a potential project
- I don't know
- Other (please specify)

Oregon LSTA Survey

42. LSTA Grant Program

1. Please answer the following about the LSTA competitive grants program. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The one-step grant cycle timetable is reasonable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understood what I needed to include in the grant application.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I prefer the current one-step application process more than the past two-step process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State Library staff members helped me when I asked for help with our grant application.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The written resources from the State Library were helpful to me when I wrote and submitted a grant application.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understood the process used to review and evaluate my	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The goals of the State Library's LSTA program include some that match my community's needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

application.

2. What, if anything, would you change about the LSTA grants process?

3. What resources would you find useful as you prepare and submit a LSTA grant application?

4. Please share any comments that you may have about the LSTA competitive grants program.

Oregon LSTA Survey

43. Priorities for the Future

The State Library will adopt a new plan covering Federal Fiscal Years 2018 to 2022 to guide the use of LSTA funds. This Plan must be based on priorities set by Congress. The following questions ask you to identify your priorities for the use of LSTA funds during this time.

1. Please rate the following areas for LSTA funds priority. You can skip any item for which you have no opinion or information.

	Not a priority	Low priority	Average priority	Above average priority	High priority
Answerland	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Digitization projects for materials important to Oregon's history and culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The competitive grants program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Early literacy programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Continuing opportunities for library staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EDGE Initiative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Extending library services to special populations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Libraries of Oregon	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
OSLIS – Oregon School Library Information System	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Providing Statewide Databases, like Gale and LearningExpress	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Summer Reading Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support for the E-Rate Program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. What other priorities can you identify for the use of LSTA funds?

3. In FY 2015, the State Library allocated LSTA funds as follows: 44% to statewide programs; 31% to the competitive grant program; and 25% to administration and salaries. Which of the following statements best describes your opinion about this allocation of funds?

- The State Library should place more money in statewide programs that benefit all libraries, making fewer funds available for competitive grants.
- The current allocation is just about right.
- The State Library should place more money in competitive grants, making fewer funds available for statewide projects.

APPENDIX I: RESULTS OF CONSTITUENT SURVEY
OREGON FIVE-YEAR LSTA EVALUATION
December 2016

This report summarizes the responses to the survey conducted for the Consulting Librarians Group (CLG) evaluation of the Oregon State Library’s Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) program. The survey was administered online using Survey Monkey for two weeks between October 18 and November 1, 2016.

The survey is based on the one used by the Nancy Bolt and Associates consulting team for the earlier LSTA evaluation in 2012. The Consulting Librarians Group prepared an initial draft, and the State Library’s Library Support and Development Services staff provided comments and feedback that were incorporated into the final survey questions.

This report does not interpret survey results. The CLG Consulting Team will combine those results with the information from focus groups, interviews, and our document review in the final evaluation report. This survey report will be attached to that final report.

Contents

Section 1: Survey Analysis Information	1
Section 2: Observations.....	3
Section 3: Respondent Demographics	5
Section 4: Answerland.....	7
Section 5: Youth Services	11
Section 6: The Statewide Database Program	15
Section 7: Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS).....	21
Section 8: Continuing Education	24
Section 9: LSTA Competitive Grants	27
Section 10: Future Priorities.....	30
Appendix A: Oregon State Library Survey Comments	33

Section 1: Survey Analysis Information

Within each report’s sections, there is a table that summarizes all responses to each question. These tables are followed by information if those results **differed** by groups. These differences are shown in two ways. First, if there were a small number of differences, these are expressed in a sentence. Second, if there were many differences within a group that information is presented in a table.

Groups tested for differences that were statistically significant include the following (for convenience, these groups are abbreviated in this report by the word in bold):

- By library type (**Type**): Public, Academic and School, omitting “Other” and “Special” libraries because of the small number of responses. This report uses “Academics” to designate respondents, or in some instances a libraries from colleges and universities. Likewise, this report uses “Schools” for those respondents from K-12 schools, or in some cases, a libraries in K-12 Schools. The difference in usage is clear in context. These three types are capitalized to indicate their special usage as an abbreviation for a group of responders.
- By role (**Role**): Administration, reference, and children/youth
- By location (**Location**): Metro Portland , Willamette Valley, Coastal, Central, and Eastern Oregon
- By education (**MLS**): If the respondent holds a MLS degree (Master of Library Science), or a Master of Library and Information Science degree (MLIS) degree or a Library Media Endorsement (LME) or does not hold one of these degrees. The LME prepares licensed educators to become school-based education media specialists.
- By the number of employees in the library (**Size**)

Statistical significance does not refer to the magnitude of a difference between groups of respondents but to the certainty that the difference is not from sampling error or random. The test used to find statistical significance results in a confidence (95% certainty) that an observed difference is real. These results also have an error margin of under 5%.

Statistical significance does not reveal the reasons behind or the meaning of the observed difference. To find the meaning behind these differences and draw conclusions, survey results must be interpreted with all the other evaluation information gathered in this project.

This analysis for statistical significance follows a guideline that recommends disregarding an answer with only ten or fewer respondents when testing for significance. With such small number of responders in one area, the final calculation may overstate the level of probability. Therefore, this report only contains results for those answers with ten or more respondents.

In addition, the results of this survey can only be used to draw conclusions about those who answered survey questions. Because this survey did not use a stratified, random survey of those who work in libraries (and their trustees), we cannot say that the survey’s findings are true for all those who work in Oregon’s libraries.

Some survey questions asked respondents to choose one response from a five-point Likert Scale. “Very dissatisfied” or “Strongly disagree” are assigned a value of “1”. On the other side of the scale, “Strongly agree” or “Very satisfied” have a value of “5”. The average score is calculated for each of the Likert Scale responses.

4.20 to 5.00	Excellent
3.51 to 4.19	Good
2.71 to 3.50	Fair
1.90 -2.70	Poor
1.00 -1.80	Very Poor

Appendix A contains the comments received to specific survey questions. Some of these responses were non-responsive, defined as a response that is not related to the question, and, therefore, not included in this Appendix. The Appendix clusters comments under the same categories used in the focus group analysis, when possible. This report contains a few comments for explanatory purposes.

Section 2: Observations

1. The Consulting Librarians Group has implemented statewide library staff surveys in other states. Based on this experience, the response rate to the Oregon survey is very high. A high response rate indicates interest in the organization's programs and services. This is clearly true for the Oregon State Library. Library staff from across the state are interested in the State Library and its programs.
2. Oregon is home to unique geographical economic, social and political areas. State agencies of such a diverse state are sometimes challenged to adopt policies and program that meet the needs of these different areas. This survey, however, found less difference in the views of respondents from areas of Oregon than anticipated. Typically, respondents from across Oregon agree with each other about State Library services and programs.

There are a few differences to note: responders from Eastern Oregon are less likely to participate in the Answerland program than respondents from other locations. Those from the Willamette Valley are less likely to want more workshops in person than those from Metro Portland, Eastern, and Coastal areas. Other differences were found, but they showed more trivial variations among respondents in different areas; for example, some rated an item "good" rather than "excellent."

3. As expected, the survey found differences in the use of programs by type of library because some programs are primarily designed for the constituents of different types of libraries. For example, public libraries are the primary users of the Summer Reading Program. However, in an important question, which asked respondents to identify priorities for the next five years, there was a surprising uniformity in responses from Schools, Publics, and Academics. In their top five priorities, Academics included two programs designed for children, Summer Reading and Early Literacy Program. Academics may not have a role in implementation of these programs but clearly see a role for the State Library in supporting them.
4. Overall, respondents are satisfied with the State Library's programs. The table below contains some of the results from the questions about program satisfaction. Any rating above a 4.20 is considered an "excellent" rating; those under a 4.20 average in the table below are either very close to the "excellent" rating or on the high end of the "good" rating.

Table 2.1 Programs	Rating Average
Summer Reading Program	4.37
OSLIS Training	4.25
Answerland	4.18
LIS Collection	4.18
Database in-person training	4.13
LSTA Competitive Grants	4.11
Answerland Reference	4.02
Answerland Local	3.96
Overall Database online training	3.89
Answerland Partners	3.75

5. Responders strongly agreed that State Library programs had a positive impact not only on their library but also on their communities. The table below summarizes the overall results of these responses.

Table 2.2 Program Impact Statements	Rating
Summer Reading Program (SRP) participants had lots of fun and read many books.	4.48
Parents appreciated the SRP.	4.45
More children used the library over the summer because of SRP.	4.42
Focus Institute (Institute) I learned valuable information and received good resources that I plan to use in the future.	4.39
Institute participants, from my library, learned new information and received resources that they plan to use in the future.	4.35
SRP participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	4.31
My library could not offer the equivalent information resources as Databases.	4.11
The Institute changed the way I served children and teens.	4.11
Institute participants from my library changed the way they served children and teens.	4.07
Databases are an essential part of my library's services.	4.01

Section 3: Respondent Demographics

The survey received 424 non-Trustee and 21 Trustee respondents. Not all completed the survey, and the last survey question received 386 responses. By region, respondents were roughly equally divided among Metro Portland, the Willamette Valley, and the other locations.

Table 3.1 In which part of Oregon do you work?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Metro Portland	36.8%	149
Willamette Valley	29.4%	119
Coastal	9.4%	38
Eastern	9.4%	38
Central	7.7%	31
Southern	7.4%	30
<i>answered question</i>		405

Type: By the type of library, respondents were almost one-half Public, 15% from Academic, almost a third from School libraries, and a small amount of “Others”. Only responses from Academic, Schools, and Public libraries are analyzed for statistical significance because responders from other libraries, including “other,” were too few.

Table 3.2 In which type of library do you work?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Public	49.1%	199
K-12 School	29.4%	119
College or University	15.1%	61
Other (please specify)	4.2%	17
Special	0.7%	3
Tribal	0.7%	3
Volunteer	0.5%	2
Not employed	0.2%	1
<i>answered question</i>		405

Size: Most respondents worked in small libraries with between less than one and 10 full-time equivalent employees (FTE).

Table 3.3 What is the number of full-time equivalent staff that work in your library?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 1 to 10	61.7%	250
11 to 30	17.3%	70
31 to 50	6.9%	28
51 to 100	6.4%	26
Over 200	4.9%	20
101 to 200	2.7%	11
<i>answered question</i>		405

MLS: Over half of the respondents have an MLS degree. This report uses MLS as an abbreviation for that degree, a MLIS degree, and a Library Media Endorsement.

Table 3.4 Do you have a MLS, MLIS degree, or Library Media Endorsement?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.2%	252
No	37.8%	153
<i>answered question</i>		405

Role: Administrators were the most frequent respondents. Respondents in “technology and technical services” and “collection development” were too few to include in the tests for statistical significance. All the “role” categories respondents are included in the overall results. The report uses the abbreviation “Children” for all respondents from the area of “children and young adult services.”

Table 3.5 Which of the following areas best describes the area in which you work? We know you might perform more than one job; please choose the area in which you work most of your time.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Administration	26.7%	108
Children or Young Adult Services	25.2%	102
Other (please specify)	13.8%	56
Reference Services	12.3%	50
Circulation Services	8.1%	33
Information Literacy and/or Instruction	7.7%	31
Technology Services	2.5%	10
Technical Services	2.0%	8
Collection Development	1.7%	7
<i>answered question</i>		405

Individual Programs

The survey contained a number of questions about individual statewide programs and the competitive grants program. These questions asked respondents about their use, satisfaction, and impacts of these programs. In some cases, responders answered questions about how they learned about a program.

Section 4: Answerland

Participation:

Table 4.1 Do you participate in the Answerland program in any of three ways (listed in survey)?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	47.6%	200
No	52.4%	220
<i>answered question</i>		420

Location: Responders from Eastern Oregon are less likely to participate than respondents from any other location.

Type: Academic and Public respondents were more likely to participate in the Answerland program than those respondents from Schools.

MLS: Those respondents with a MLS are more likely to participate in Answerland than those respondents without a MLS.

Role: Administrators were more likely to participate than those working in Circulation and Children Services.

Promotion:

Table 4.2 How did you first hear about Answerland?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Colleague	30.7%	61
Contact from the State Library	21.1%	42
Conference or meeting	18.6%	37
Email message or listserv	17.1%	34
Other (please specify)	9.5%	19
Brochure or newsletter	2.5%	5
Search engine, like Google	0.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		199

Location: Respondents from the Metro Portland area were less likely to hear about Answerland from contact with the State Library than those from the Willamette Valley.

Type: Schools were more likely to have heard about Answerland from contacts from the State Library than Public respondents.

Size: Libraries with less than 10 staff are less likely to have heard about Answerland from colleagues than those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees.

Answerland Reference

Use:

Table 4.3 Do you use Answerland for reference services?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	73.4%	146
No	26.6%	53
<i>answered question</i>		199

Type: Participation is higher in Academic than School.

Size: Libraries with less than 10 staff are less likely to participate in Answerland Reference than those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees.

Reasons for not using:

Table 4.4 Why does your library not use Answerland Reference? (Select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Other (please specify)	52.1%	25
My library can answer all our users' reference questions	33.3%	16
I don't know enough about Answerland	22.9%	11
We used Answerland, but stopped because we were not happy with the service.	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		48

Satisfaction:

Table 4.5 Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
	1	3	21	76	33	4.02

Answerland Local

Participation:

Table 4.6 Do you or your library use Answerland Local?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.9%	80
No	55.1%	98
<i>answered question</i>		178

Type: Academics are more likely to participate in Answerland Local.

Size: Libraries with less than 10 staff are less likely to participate than those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees.

Reasons for not using:

Table 4.7 Why do you or your library not use Answerland Local? (Select all that apply).	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't know enough about Answerland Local.	59.2%	58
We do not need a chat service.	21.4%	21
Other (please specify)	17.3%	17
We use our own chat service.	8.2%	8
We used Answerland Local, but stopped because we were not happy with the service.	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		98

Satisfaction:

Table 4.8 Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
Contact with OSL staff	0	0	9	17	16	4.17
Overall satisfaction	0	1	17	39	16	3.96
Answerland Local technical support	0	1	16	21	9	3.81
Answerland Local training	1	3	14	26	6	3.66

Participation:

Table 4.9 Answerland Partners are those libraries that contribute staff time to answer reference questions or promote Answerland in their communities. Are you or your library an Answerland Partner?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	45.8%	77
No	54.2%	91
<i>answered question</i>		168

Type: Academics are more likely to participate in Answerland Partners than School or Public respondents.

MLS: Those respondents with an MLS are more likely to participate than those respondents without.

Role: Administrators are more likely to participate than Children.

Reasons for not using:

Table 4.10 Why are you or your library not an Answerland Partner? (Check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
My library does not have staff time to contribute.	74.4%	67
My library does not employ reference librarians.	31.1%	28
I don't know enough about Answerland.	11.1%	10
Other (please specify)	12.2%	11
My reference staff members do not have enough experience in reference work.	4.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		90

Type: Schools were significantly more likely to answer "My library does not employ reference librarians."

MLS: Those respondents with an MLS are more likely to choose "My library does not have staff to contribute" than those without a MLS.

Satisfaction:

Table 4.11 Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
Overall satisfaction	1	6	18	36	14	3.75
Answerland Partner training		6	15	32	10	3.65

Reasons for Participating:

Table 4.12 Why are you (or your library) an Answerland Partner?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I want to contribute to library service statewide.	62.9%	44
My library benefits from Answerland and I want to give back.	60.0%	42
I like networking with other reference librarians.	28.6%	20
It makes my job more interesting.	27.1%	19
Other (please specify)	14.3%	10
My supervisor gave me this duty.	11.4%	8
<i>answered question</i>		70

Section 5: Youth Services

Focus Institute (Institute)

Participation:

Table 5.1 Have you or one of your library's staff attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, I attended.	15.1%	29
Yes, one of my library's staff attended.	30.2%	58
No	54.7%	105
<i>answered question</i>		192

Type: 87 respondents said they or a member of the library staff had attended the Institute (almost all of these were from Public and School libraries).

MLS: Those who do not have a MLS are more likely to attend than those who do.

Impact: All respondents to the questions about impact rated the statements high, except for the last response, which asked if the attendee would **not** use the Institute's materials and information in the future.

Many responders praised the Institute; this comment summarizes these compliments: "Terrific information, inspiration, and lots of great resources. Thank you for such an excellent program."

Impact on Individual Attendee:

Table 5.2 Please answer the following about the impact of the Institute on you. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.						
Answer Options	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average
Learned valuable information and received good resources that I plan to use in the future.	0	0	2	13	13	4.39
Changed the way I served children and teens.	0	0	1	22	4	4.11
Developed a network of colleagues	0	2	8	13	4	3.70
Learned valuable information and received good resources, but will not use it in the future	9	10	4	2	0	1.96
<i>answered question</i>						28

Impact on Staff Members:

Table 5.3 Please select the impacts of Institute attendance on your library's staff. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.						
Answer Options	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average
Learned new information and received resources that they plan to use in the future.	0	0	1	26	16	4.35
Changed the way they served children and teens.	0	0	9	22	12	4.07
Developed a network of colleagues	0	1	11	21	8	3.88
Learned information and received	12	18	7	4	0	2.07

Table 5.3 Please select the impacts of Institute attendance on your library's staff. You can skip any question about which you have no opinion or no information.						
resources, but will not use it in the future						

Summer Reading Program (SRP)

Participation:

Table 5.4 Does your library participate in the Statewide Summer Reading Program?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	90.9%	170
No	9.1%	17
<i>answered question</i>		187

Satisfaction:

The survey asked two questions about satisfaction: the first about overall satisfaction; the second about the SRP materials. The average rating for both questions is quite high, 4.37 and 4.17 respectively.

A number of responders provided comments praising the efforts of the CSLP, even though many did not understand its role. This comment is an example:

“I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts. I love that all participating libraries present a cohesive program. If we didn't have access to the materials, I'm sure we would still do SRP, but the branding and theme would be more difficult to create within our staff time and budget.”

In addition, many responders provided laudatory comments about the SRP program, such as the following:

“The Statewide Summer Reading Program allows families who move into the community during the summer to feel they fit in, as there is a strong likelihood, the theme and artwork is already familiar to them. Our library benefits from national and statewide marketing efforts, as we share the theme and artwork. We still have the flexibility to make sure that the program works for our community. The Summer Reading Program is critical to supporting literacy maintenance and development between school terms.”

Table 5.5 Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
Overall opinion	0	3	7	81	73	4.37
SRP Materials	0	3	15	97	49	4.17

Location: Those from the Willamette Valley were more likely to rate the materials as “excellent” than those from Metro Portland area, who more often rated them as “good.”

Role: Administrators are more likely to rate the materials as “excellent” than children’s librarians who more often rated the materials as “good.”

Opinions about Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP):

Table 5.6 The State Library pays the membership fees to the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP), and purchases CSLP summer reading manuals for all public, volunteer, and tribal libraries in Oregon. What is your opinion of how the State Library and the Oregon Library Association represent you in CSLP?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don’t fully understand how they represent me; my library could not have a summer reading program without CSLP materials.	39.9%	61
I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP.	37.9%	58
Other (please specify)	11.8%	18
I appreciate the efforts of my CSLP representatives, but don’t think they or anyone else can effectively represent me because CSLP is too big.	7.8%	12
CSLP representatives need to makes changes in how they gather feedback and communicate important information to represent me more effectively.	2.6%	4
<i>answered question</i>		153

Location: Those from the Willamette Valley are most likely to agree with the first statement, “I appreciate how they represent me;” more than those from the Metro Portland area.

Role: MLS are more likely than non-MLS to understand the role of the Oregon representatives in CSLP.

Table 5.7 If the State Library did not pay for your library’s participation in the CSLP and you did not receive summer reading materials, what would your library do?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
The library would develop its own Summer Reading Program, but would significantly reduce the scope and activities.	56.1%	87
The library would develop its own program and could continue it at the current level.	26.5%	41

Table 5.7 If the State Library did not pay for your library’s participation in the CSLP and you did not receive summer reading materials, what would your library do?		
The library would not have a Summer Reading Program.	9.7%	15
Other (please specify)	7.7%	12
<i>answered question</i>		155

MLS: Respondents without a MLS are less likely than MLS holders to say that their library would not have a SRP.

SRP Impacts:

Table 5.8 Please answer the following about the impact of the Summer Reading Program.						
Answer Options	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average
Participants had lots of fun and read many books.	0	0	9	60	82	4.48
Parents appreciated the SRP.	0	0	12	59	81	4.45
More children used the library over the summer.	0	1	14	55	78	4.42
Participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	0	0	20	61	66	4.31
Teachers appreciated the SRP.	0	0	26	56	63	4.26

MLS: Respondents with a MLS were more likely to “strongly agree” with all four statements in bold text in the chart than those without a MLS. The latter group chose “agree” more often as their response for the same four statements.

Section 6: The Statewide Database Program

Use:

Table 6.1 I use at least one of the databases.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
2-3 times a month	30.9%	112
A few times a year	21.2%	77
2-3 times a week	19.8%	72
I do not use.	14.3%	52
Daily	13.8%	50
<i>answered question</i>		363

Table 6.2 Database Use - Significant Differences by Type			
Answer Options	School	Public	Academic
Daily	More likely	Less likely	Less likely
2-3 times a week	More likely	Less likely	More likely
2-3 times a month	Less likely	More likely	
A few times a year	Less Likely	More likely	

MLS: Those without a MLS are more likely to choose “a few times a year” and “I do not use.” Those with a MLS are more likely to choose “2-3 times a month.”

Reasons for not using databases:

Table 6.3 Why do you not use Gale and LearningExpress database products? (Select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't know enough about these databases.	51.0%	26
I have no need to use these databases in my job.	33.3%	17
Other (please specify)	19.6%	10
These databases not do meet the needs of our library's users.	3.9%	2
We used these databases, but stopped because we were not happy with these products.	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		51

Although responses to this question did not vary significantly by groups, many responses provided comments on the Gale product. Many of these respondents were from the Academic group, and most were happier with the products from EBSCO.

Training:

Table 6.4 Have you attended either an in-person OR an online training (webinar) on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	55.0%	171
No	45.0%	140
<i>answered question</i>		311

Type: Schools and Publics are more likely to attend training, either in-person or online, than those from Academics.

In-person Training:

Table 6.5 Have you attended an in-person training on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.1%	113
No	33.9%	58
<i>answered question</i>		171

MLS: MLS respondents are more likely to have attended in-person training than respondents without a MLS.

In-person training satisfaction:

Table 6.6 Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
Improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features.	1	0	6	71	34	4.22
Overall training	0	2	14	63	33	4.13
Improved my ability to teach library staff and users how to use the databases.	1	1	9	72	29	4.13

Reasons for not attending in-person training:

Table 6.7 Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not attended an in-person training? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't have the time.	33.9%	20
In-person trainings are too far from my library.	32.2%	19

Table 6.7 Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not attended an in-person training? (Select all that apply.)		
I don't need this training; I already know how to use databases.	28.8%	17
My library doesn't have enough employees to cover in my absence.	25.4%	15
I didn't know about their availability.	18.6%	11
Other (please specify)	16.9%	10
I don't know enough about what is in the databases.	1.7%	1
I don't use databases.	0.0%	0
I prefer not to attend training provided by vendors.	0.0%	0
answered question		59

Online training participation:

Table 6.8 Have you participated in online training sessions (webinars) on how to use the Gale or LearningExpress databases?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	56.5%	96
No	43.5%	74
answered question		170

Type: Public and Schools are more likely to attend an online training than Academics.

MLS: Respondents with an MLS are more likely to have attended an online training than those without an MLS.

Role: Administrators are more likely to have attended online training than those working in Children's Services.

Online training satisfaction

Table 6.9 Answer options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
Overall online training.	1	0	24	55	16	3.89
Improved my understanding of how to use the databases and their features.	0	2	6	75	13	4.03
Improved my ability to teach library staff	0	1	12	68	15	4.01

Table 6.9 Answer options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
and users how to use the databases.						

Reasons for not participating in online training:

Table 6.10 Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not participated in online training? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't have the time.	40.3%	29
I don't need this training; I already know how to use databases.	19.4%	14
I didn't know about their availability.	16.7%	12
My library doesn't have enough employees to cover my work during a webinar.	15.3%	11
Other (please specify)	13.9%	10
I don't like to participate in webinars.	12.5%	9
I prefer not to attend training provided by vendors.	4.2%	3
My library's technology does not support webinars.	1.4%	1
I don't use databases.	1.4%	1
I don't know enough about what is in the databases.	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		72

Database impacts: There were significant differences among groups in their answers to this question. These differences by answer and group are summarized below the following chart, which show the overall responses to this question.

Many responders provided comments praising the databases. The following pithy comment is an example of the many received: "Love it, appreciate it, keep them coming."

Table 6.11 Please answer the following questions about the impact of the databases. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.						
Answer Options	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average Rating
Could not offer the equivalent information resources	9	14	40	78	123	4.11
Databases are an essential part of my library's services.	5	16	52	94	102	4.01

Table 6.11 Please answer the following questions about the impact of the databases. You can skip any item about which you have no opinion or no information.

Saved money on online journal and magazine subscriptions	3	14	62	87	90	3.96
Saved money on print journal and magazine subscriptions	6	24	72	76	74	3.75
My library's users depend on the databases	6	22	74	89	67	3.73
My library received more use because of the databases	6	14	109	74	47	3.57
The promotional materials are effective.	3	27	116	71	40	3.46

Differences by Type:

Table 6.12 Database Impact Differences by Type			
Type	Schools	Public	Academic
Saved money on print subscriptions	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Saved money on online subscriptions		Less likely to agree	More likely to agree
Could not offer equivalent resources	More likely to strongly agree	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Are an essential part of my library's services	Less likely to strongly agree	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Users depend on databases		More likely to strongly agree	

Differences by MLS:

Table 6.13 Database Impact Differences by MLS		
Answer Options	MLS	No MLS
Saved money on print subscriptions	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Saved money on online subscriptions	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Library receives more use	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree

Table 6.13 Database Impact Differences by MLS		
Are an essential part of my library's services	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree
Could not offer equivalent resources.	More likely to strongly agree	Less likely to strongly agree

Differences by Size:

Table 6.14 Database Impact Differences by Size		
Answer Options	Less than 10	From 11 - 30
Saved money on print subscriptions	Less likely to disagree	More likely to strongly agree
Are an essential part of my library's services	Less likely to disagree	More likely to disagree

Differences by Location: Willamette Valley responders are more likely to “strongly agree” that “My library has saved money on online journals” than those from Metro Portland.

Section 7: Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS)

Participation:

Table 7.1 Do you or your library use the OSLIS website?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	48.3%	168
No	51.7%	180
<i>answered question</i>		348

Location: Respondents from the Willamette Valley are more likely to use OSLIS than those from Coastal and Eastern areas. Respondents from Metro Portland are more likely to use the service than respondents from the Coastal area.

Type: Schools are the more likely users of OSLIS; however, seven Academics and 45 Public respondents say that they use OSLIS.

Size: Libraries with 1 to 10 employees are more likely to use OSLIS than those with 11 to 30 employees.

Role: Administrators are less likely to use the OSLIS than children.

Reasons for not participating:

Table 7.2 Which of the following reasons best describes why you or your library does not use OSLIS? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't know about enough about OSLIS.	38.5%	69
OSLIS' resources are not relevant to me or my library's users.	36.9%	66
Other (please specify)	24.0%	43
I would use OSLIS if I had the training.	10.1%	18
The OSLIS website is difficult to use.	1.7%	3
My library's internet connection is not fast enough.	0.6%	1
The Gale and LearningExpress databases are difficult to use.	0.6%	1
Citation Maker is difficult to use.	0.0%	0
The information literacy resources are difficult to use.	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		179

Type: Public are more likely to choose “I don’t know enough” than Academics, who are more likely than Public respondents to choose “Not relevant”.

Role: Administrators are more likely to choose “not relevant” than Children’s.

MLS: Those with a MLS are most likely to select “not relevant” than those without a MLS, who are more likely to select “I don’t know enough.”

OSLIS use:

Table 7.3 Does your School or library webpage have a link to OSLIS?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	71.4%	115
No	13.7%	22
I don't know	14.9%	24
<i>answered question</i>		161

MLS: Those with a MLS are more likely to answer “Yes” than non-MLS, who are more likely to select “I don’t know.”

Table 7.4 Do you use OSLIS to access (Check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	85.7%	138
Citation Maker	63.4%	102
Information literacy resources	62.7%	101

Table 7.4 Do you use OSLIS to access (Check all that apply)		
Professional resources	38.5%	62
<i>answered question</i>		161

Type: Public are less likely to use all types of resources than Schools.

MLS: Those with a MLS are more likely to use Citation Maker than those without a MLS.

Table 7.5 Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your School?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	41.0%	66
I don't know	29.8%	48
Citation Maker	18.0%	29
Other (please specify)	7.5%	12
Information literacy resources	3.7%	6
<i>answered question</i>		161

Table 7.6 Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Databases (Gale and Learning Express)	29.2%	47
Citation Maker	6.2%	10
Information literacy resources	6.8%	11
I don't know.	49.7%	80
Other (please specify)	8.1%	13
<i>answered question</i>		161

MLS: Those without a MLS are more likely to select "I don't know".

Table 7.7 How easy is it to find the information that you need on the OSLIS web site?						
Answer Options	Very Difficult	Difficult	Neutral	Easy	Very Easy	Rating Average
	0	4	60	74	23	2.28
<i>answered question</i>						161

OLIS Training:

Table 7.8 Have you participated in training given by State Library staff about OSLIS?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	38.5%	62
No	61.5%	99
<i>answered question</i>		<i>161</i>

Type: School respondents are more likely than Public to have participated in training.

MLS: Those with a MLS are more likely to participate in training compared to those without a MLS.

Training Satisfaction:

Table 7.9 If you have attended OSLIS training, please rate the quality of this training.						
Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
	1	1	8	27	30	4.25

Section 8: Continuing Education

This section included questions about the general Continuing Education (CE) program and a special collection called the Library Information Sciences Collection (LIS).

General CE:

Table 8.1 Would you like the State Library to provide the following? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
More workshops online	40.4%	134
More workshops in person	37.7%	125
More information about CE opportunities	31.6%	105
I have enough information and opportunities for CE	22.6%	75
Other (please specify)	9.0%	30
<i>answered question</i>		<i>332</i>

Type: Both Schools and Publics are more likely to select, “More workshops in person” than Academics. Academics are more likely to select “I have enough information and opportunities for CE” than Schools and Publics.

Location: Those from the Willamette Valley are less likely to request more workshops in person than those from Metro Portland, Eastern, and Coastal areas.

MLS: MLS are more likely to select “I have enough information and opportunities for CE” than those without a MLS.

Size: Those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees are more likely to select “I have enough information and opportunities for CE” than those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees.

CE information use:

Table 8.2 Please select the answer that best describes your use of the State Library’s CE information.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I did not know that State Library provided CE information.	45.2%	150
I received the information but I have not yet taken a CE course.	30.7%	102
I received the information and I have taken at least one CE course.	18.7%	62
Other (please specify)	5.4%	18
<i>answered question</i>		332

Size: Those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees are more likely to select “I received the information and I have taken at least one CE course” than those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees.

Those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees are more likely to select “I did not know that State Library provided CE information” than those from library with 11 to 30 employees.

MLS: MLS more likely to select “I received the information” than non-MLS, who are more likely to not know that the State Library provided CE information.

Role: Administrators were more likely to have taken at least one CE course than Children, who more likely than Administrators to select “I did not know that State Library provided CE information.”

LIS Collection

Participation:

Table 8.3 Do you use the Library Information Sciences (LIS) Collection?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	28.4%	94
No	71.6%	237
<i>answered question</i>		331

Type: Public are more likely to use the LIS collection than those from Schools.

MLS: Those with an MLS are more likely to use the LIS collection than non-MLS.

Table 8.4 Why do you not use the LIS Collection? (Select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I did not know about this collection.	51.9%	123
I don't have the time.	25.7%	61
Other (please specify)	12.7%	30
I receive continuing education from other sources.	10.1%	24
I am not required to engage in continuing education.	8.9%	21
I am not interested in this collection.	4.6%	11
<i>answered question</i>		237

Size: Those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees are more likely to use the collection than those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees.

Reasons for not using:

MLS: Non-MLS were more likely to choose “I did not know about this collection” and less likely to choose “I receive continuing education from other sources” than MLS.

Promotion:

Table 8.5 How did you first hear about Oregon's LIS Collection?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Email message or listserv	72.0%	67
Contact from the State Library	14.0%	13
Colleague	7.5%	7
Conference or meeting	3.2%	3
Other (please specify)	3.2%	3
Search engine, like Google	0.0%	0
Brochure or newsletter	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		93

Satisfaction:

Table 8.6 What is your overall satisfaction rating with the LIS Collection?						
Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Rating Average
	1	0	10	52	30	4.18
<i>answered question</i>						93

Section 9: LSTA Competitive Grants

Table 9.1 Do you know about the State Library's LSTA competitive grants program?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	60.5%	199
No	39.5%	130
<i>answered question</i>		329

Type: Schools are less likely to have heard of this program than Academics and Public.

Size: Respondents from libraries with 11 to 30 employees are more likely to have heard of the program than those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees.

MLS: Those with a MLS are more likely to have heard of the program than those without a MLS.

Role: Administrators were more likely to have heard about the program than and to have applied for a grant.

Promotion:

Table 9.2 How did you hear about LTSA grants?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Email message or listserv	35.0%	70
Colleague	30.5%	61
Contact from the State Library	15.5%	31
Conference or meeting	12.0%	24
Other (please specify)	6.5%	13
Search engine, like Google	0.5%	1
Brochure or newsletter	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		200

Type: Schools are more likely to hear about the competitive grants programs from email messages or listservs than Public.

Participation:

Table 9.3 On behalf of your library, have you applied for a LSTA grant?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	37.4%	74
No	62.6%	124
<i>answered question</i>		198

Type: Schools are less likely to have applied for a competitive grant than Publics and Academics.

Size: Respondents from libraries with 11 to 30 employees are more likely to have heard of the program than those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees.

Note: Many commenters reported that they were confused by this question, wondering if the question asked about their library’s participation or their personal participation.

Reasons for not applying:

Table 9.4 Why has your library not applied for a LSTA grant? (Check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Other (please specify)	35.5%	44
No time to write the proposal	30.6%	38
My library could not provide ongoing funding for a potential project	18.5%	23
I don’t know	17.7%	22
I didn’t know that my library was eligible	12.1%	15
The process is too complicated	10.5%	13
The program is only for Public libraries	9.7%	12
No need	8.9%	11

Satisfaction:

A number of responders provided comments about the LSTA grant program, many of these complimentary. The following comment is an example of these:

“The LSTA program is extremely valuable to Oregon libraries, and the State Library staff is very helpful to applicants and grantees. If only there were more funds to go around, as there is such a great need!”

Table 9.5 Please answer the following about the LSTA competitive grants program.						
Answer Options	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average
I understood what I needed to include in the grant application.	0	1	3	36	20	4.25
OSL staff helped me when I asked for help with our grant application.	1	0	9	26	24	4.20
The program's goals include some that match my community's needs.	0	1	7	33	20	4.18
OSL written resources were helpful to me when I wrote and submitted a grant application.	0	1	7	32	19	4.17
The one-step grant cycle timetable is reasonable.	0	0	6	37	14	4.14
I understood the process used to review and evaluate my application.	0	3	9	34	14	3.98
I prefer the current one-step application process more than the past two-step process.	0	1	19	23	12	3.84
<i>answered question</i>						63

The following questions asked for an open-ended response. This type of question differs from those that offer “other” as one of many responses. The responses are summarized below and included verbatim in Appendix A.

Question 2. (Under LSTA Competitive Grants) What, if anything, would you change about the LSTA grants process?

Responders provided specific suggestions for changes. One remarked, “It would also help to have earlier notification so that there's time for the grant administration training before the grant starts,” and, from another respondent, “More time in between the approval and the start period of the grants would be very appreciated.”

Others responses included requests for more funding and for help coping with local financial requirements. One responder commented that paperwork takes “too much time,” and another urged the State Library to “Continue to streamline ease of use.” One responder understood the requirement that a project be replicable but mentioned that libraries with more resources can more easily create such projects than smaller libraries.

Question 3. (Under LSTA Competitive Grants) What resources would you find useful as you prepare and submit a LSTA grant application?

Responders appreciated help and feedback from State Library staff members; one suggested nearby help from “a local or regional mentor.” A few appreciated the availability of past grant applications and one suggested posting “model” applications and outcome reports, with examples from different applicant types. Another suggested a revamp of the State Library’s LSTA web pages.

Section 10: Future Priorities

Overall, the highest priorities for respondents are for databases, summer reading, and early literacy. Respondents were less likely to choose the EDGE Initiative and E-Rate Program support.

Table 10.1 Please rate the following areas for LSTA funds priority. You can skip any item for which you have no opinion or information.						
Answer Options	Not a priority	Low priority	Average priority	Above average priority	High priority	Rating Average
Databases	2	3	39	79	144	4.35
Summer Reading	2	5	42	81	133	4.29
Early literacy programs	2	5	34	108	113	4.24
OSLIS	5	11	49	72	90	4.02
The competitive grants program	3	9	70	86	73	3.90
Extending library services to special populations	2	12	72	98	40	3.72

Table 10.1 Please rate the following areas for LSTA funds priority. You can skip any item for which you have no opinion or information.						
Continuing education	2	14	89	107	43	3.69
Libraries of Oregon	6	17	69	66	48	3.65
Digitization projects for materials important to Oregon's history and culture (Digitization)	7	21	74	105	46	3.64
Answerland	14	26	77	70	44	3.45
Support for E-Rate	12	23	66	51	32	3.37
EDGE Initiative	13	22	62	41	11	3.10

Priorities by Group differences:

Location: Responders from the Willamette Valley were more likely to rate CE “above average” than those from Metro Portland, who more often gave this program an “Average” priority. Valley respondents were also more likely to give Libraries of Oregon an “above average” priority than those from Metro Portland, who most often gave this program an “average” rating.

Type: Each type chose Summer Reading, Early Literacy and the Statewide Database Programs as one of their top five priorities. Public and Academic respondents agreed that Competitive Grants were among their top five. Only Academics included Answerland as one of their top five. Only Schools chose CE and OLIS, and only Publics chose Digitization.

Table 10.2 Priorities by library type (top five highlighted)	Public	Academic	School
Summer Reading Program	4.48	3.83	4.26
Early literacy programs	4.43	3.92	4.18
Statewide databases	4.20	4.36	4.65
Competitive Grants	4.00	3.97	3.78
Digitization	3.75	3.80	3.43
CE for library staff	3.64	3.32	3.88
OLIS	3.53	3.73	4.70
Answerland	3.37	3.98	3.33

Role: More often Children gave a rating of “average” to Digitization Projects than Administrators, who were more likely to choose “above average.”

Children were more likely to choose “above average” or “high” priority for OLIS than Administrators.

Size: Libraries with 11 to 30 employees were more likely to give the following programs “higher priority” than libraries with less than 1 to 10 employees:

- Answerland
- Digitization
- Support for E-rate

Those from libraries with 1 to 10 employees are more likely to give OSLIS a “high priority” than those from libraries with 11 to 30 employees.

Role: More often Children gave an “average” to Digitization Projects than Administrators, who were more likely to choose “above average.”

MLS: Differences are summarized below.

Table 10.3 Priority differences by MLS		
Priority	MLS	No MLS
Answerland	High priority	Average priority
CE	Low priority	Above average priority
E-rate	High priority	Average priority
EDGE	Above average priority	Average priority

Allocation of LSTA funds

Table 10.4 In FY 2015, the State Library allocated LSTA funds as follows: 44% to statewide programs; 31% to the competitive grant program; and 25% to administration and salaries. Which of the following statements best describes your opinion about this allocation of funds?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
The current allocation is just about right.	66.0%	190
More money in statewide programs, making fewer funds available for competitive grants.	32.3%	93
More money in competitive grants, making fewer funds available for statewide projects.	1.7%	5
<i>answered question</i>		288

MLS: Those with an MLS are more likely to select “The current allocation is just about right” than those without an MLS.

This statistical information provided through the survey analysis gives the State Library a picture of statewide views about resources and programs funded by LSTA funds. Overall, library staff view these resources and programs favorably and believe that they have a

positive impact on library services and on their communities. Responders tend to be uniform in their opinions regardless of their locations and share similar opinions about the priorities for LSTA use for the next five years.

Appendix A: Oregon State Library Survey Comments

This appendix lists responses to open-ended questions and responses to “other” options in the November survey. Responses are categorized under broad subject headings and, if possible, categorized using the same headings as the Focus Group Report. Replies that are non-responsive, i.e. “I don’t know,” or “N/A”, are not categorized or otherwise reported. Replies are modified by substituting a line (____) to remove personally identifiable information.

3. In which type of library do you work?

Type	Number
Public-School	8
Consortia	3
Consultant	1
Non-profit	1
Board member	1

4. Which of the following areas best describes the area in which you work? We know you might perform more than one job; please choose the area in which you work most of your time.

Role	Number
All of these jobs	31
Teacher-Librarian	8
K-6 Media Technician	7
Special Collections	5
Outreach	4
Board member	2
Distribution	1

8. How did you first hear about Answerland?

At work

I was told I was assigned to it, and was scheduled for training.

Through my job

It was a service being promoted by my library when I first came to Oregon.

From our Library Director

Volunteer

I volunteered with the service when it was managed via Multnomah County library as part of my schooling at PCC.

I am a former volunteer .

I have volunteered with Answerland, back before it was called Answerland.

Website

Multnomah County Library Website

Library website

School district library resource page

Library school

Library school

I think it was during my Master's Program or K-12 teacher cert. program, sometime between 2006-2008.

Through my reference class for MLIS coursework at the University of Washington online program.

"There at the start"

I was involved in virtual reference efforts from the start when the state decided to support the service.

Founding partner

From the very, very beginning or its creation

I can't remember! I feel like I've known about Answerland (and L-Net before it) forever.

On the first committee looking at alternatives to the 5 area reference centers. Answerland developed out of our work to get something that would work better and was online instead of tied to physical location.

10. Why does your library not use Answerland Reference?

Intend to use

Just going to start this year, see where it goes grade 4th & 5th.

We are still setting it up again after it switched from Spark Ref.

I haven't had time yet to tell our students about it. I only work part time.

I'm at a K-8 school and tell the students about the service, it's been linked to our library webpage in the past, but it does not get used during the school day (sounds like I need to talk it up again with my students/teachers!). I also work at ___ and we DO use Answerland, but at my .8 FTE position at a school, we do not.

Try to promote use

We try to get the students to use it.

Some of our school libraries promote the service, others do not.

Answerland is available on our computers for patrons to use from their homes or here in the library if they wish. SO, I guess we do 'use' it to some degree.

Answerland is important to have for those patrons who are reluctant to ask their local library staff.

No time

Not enough time to promote

No need

We don't customarily have the level of reference question that warrants contacting Answerland. Most of questions are 'ready reference' or reader's advisory.

I haven't had a question where it was necessary, but I would use it and refer others if needed.

I haven't had / or needed to do so, but will take this in consideration for the future.

I have had no reason to use it recently.

It is faster to Google the answer.

Some in my library do use it but personally I am able to assist my patrons, ages 0-18, without the use of Answerland so far. I know it exists if I ever need it.

We don't usually answer any reference questions due to lack of staff.

I have had no reason to use it recently.

We are among the few librarians who handle our specialty (legal reference) in Answerland and use other means to address questions we cannot answer.

We used Answerland but switched to another service during the service interruption this summer.

Doesn't come to mind

We simply don't think of it on the relatively rare occasions when we're stumped by a reference question.

I forget about it.

15. Why do you or your library not use Answerland Local? (Select all that apply)

Intend to use

We have not set up a chat mechanism for our patrons.

We have a link on our website to Answerland but haven't used it yet to answer patron inquiries. We should!

We use our own chat service but Answerland for afterhours coverage of chat.

Value of Answerland

We use Google to answer most of our patron's questions because it is faster.

Level of question does not warrant contacting Answerland.

Doesn't make sense for us at this time.

Not used frequently enough to bother

No interest

No time or staff

Our county cooperative has chosen to not have a local queue due to lack of staff time at individual libraries; they will consider options in 2017 after new service gets settled in after transition to QP.

We used Answerland Local but stopped due to shortage of staff time to contribute.

We are not able to fully staff a service of this sort.

Unable to provide service with current staffing

19. Please share any comments that you have about Answerland Local.

General

Answerland is not the only way our users get reference help, but it is one that appeals to many students.

As with other libraries, navigating other libraries has been time consuming. Hopefully, Question point design makes it easier.

My rating of Answerland Local technical support is of OCLC documentation; State Library support is excellent.

Compliments

Core service!

It makes it easy for our library to offer online reference services. Without it we would probably not be able to offer the level of help to our students that we currently do.

Training

I rated local training lower because there has been no local training since we changed providers. I'm not very happy with OCLC, but Answerland coordinator and aides are very helpful.

Software

The recent transition between vendors, including the prolonged outage, was very frustrating, causing us to scramble to identify potential alternate options, and to cease offering chat service for two months before we could implement OCLC's Question Point. We also find OCLC Question Point to be inferior to SparkRef in many ways: we miss the pop-up notifications that would appear when a new chat arrived in SparkRef, and navigating the Question Point interface is clunky and non-intuitive. It has also been difficult to get answers to questions about technical issues or options for configuring the service during this transition time.

21. Why are you or your library not an Answerland Partner?

No time or staff

As the Director, I am the only MLIS and with being the least-staffed library in ___ Oregon, I do not have the time to give.

We work with public libraries and have Answerland on our website but we don't directly work with the public and provide reference services. I am a fan on Answerland but don't have staff that can work on Answerland. If we had that kind of staff, then we would.

I have a staff of 1. Me. And we don't need chat. :)

I believe we used to several years ago, before I started in 2014, but staffing changes and time commitments made it difficult to keep going. I'm open to being a partner in the future.

24. Why are you (or your library) an Answerland Partner?

Always have been

We have been historically, so are continuing now, but may not do it forever.

Founding partner

Other

We provide specialty reference service (legal reference) that other librarians may not be comfortable handling.

Answerland recruited us.

It's been a great way to make sure I keep my reference librarian skills current.

Co-operation I think but not sure exact reason why but I think in general it keeps libraries up to date about each other's answers.

It helps me learn more about chat and text service with patrons.

My library benefits from Answerland, and as a result, we need to contribute to the service.

I was a volunteer a few years ago. I have just been asked by the library in which I work to take a shift once every 2 months when everyone else is in a staff meeting. So I am just relearning to use it.

25. Please share any comments that you have about being an Answerland Partner.

Looking forward to rebuilding our community within the QP interface, which will take some time to work out. The Spark/Answerland website combination was quite facile at allowing lots of librarians to contribute and share information without a lot of training. QP's interface is proving to have less flexibility and accessible features to share as we did in the past.

I have always gotten very good help from Answerland coordinators, from Caleb and Emily to Tamara. I am thankful for the assistance they have given and continue to give.

We do want to support a statewide effort, but I do not think that this is a vital service. The numbers just don't seem to support the level of effort.

The questions are interesting and it's important for libraries to have an online option for answering questions.

Training has been very limited, with limited dates and locations. This has affected our ability to participate.

More than half of the questions we get on Answerland are patrons from other libraries with Circulation questions we can't answer. It's frustrating because we can't give them an answer right away and/or must refer them back to their library (which is where they started in the first place when they clicked on the Answerland widget to ask their question originally).

Youth Services – Focus Institute

29. Please share any comments that you have about the Focus Institute. (For attendees)

Value of the Institute

Lots of great information at the focus institute, already making some changes and plan for more in the future. Thanks!

Fantastic! Lots of information.

I would love to implement a lot of what I learned at the Focus Institute, but on a scale that would be best for our small community. However, I also want to be realistic with my time and so I purposefully decided to only do 2 major changes in my library in the coming year.

I attended many years ago, but the experience was valuable and had lasting positive impact on me and my job.

Every single seminar was valuable to me in more than one way, and the general atmosphere of collegial professionalism was very welcome also. I especially appreciated the extremely concrete ideas, which required little preparation or money, and have already incorporated some of them into our programs. Knowing the science behind early literacy is very helpful to explaining it to parents and supporters of the library.

The timing was great for me and I'm excited to develop programming for children and teens.

A very valuable training opportunity - especially for Eastern Oregon where many, if not most, that do the children's programs are not MLS librarians and most likely have no early childhood training at all.

Terrific information, inspiration, and lots of great resources. Thank you for such an excellent program.

Wonderful experience.

Working in a small group, having well prepared speakers and information or handouts made for a great learning experience. The setting and schedule gave time to take in large amounts of information with breaks to rest, but absorb the information and prepare for the next session. I always enjoy meeting and connecting with other librarians and the family style meals and evening talks were a nice way to connect in a relaxed setting. I would highly recommend the Focus Institute to other librarians.

31. Please share any comments that you have about the Focus Institute. (For employers)

Value of the Institute

The Focus Institute is perhaps THE most important training that paraprofessionals receive in this state due to the lack of MLIS librarians to staff libraries properly.

I've heard from many attendees that they found it valuable and informative, and the chance to connect with peers was invaluable.

One of our staff members attended the most recent Institute and came back very inspired and full of new ideas. Also felt empowered to go forward with programs in new way. I attended the Institute years ago and had the same experience. It is a very valuable service you provide to small libraries that do not have the staff numbers or salary structure to support MLS librarians.

The only information that will not be used is the special collections recommendations. They are too complex for our library system.

The Focus Institute has been SO valuable. Over the years probably 4-5 staff have been able to attend. It transforms their notions about youth services and greatly enhances the ability and performance in delivering excellent services to youth and their families.

When we hire library assistants in Youth Services, this is a great way to give them some consistent training and allow them to connect with others in Oregon libraries.

It was very encouraging and inspiring with great ideas; some of which we have already implemented

Focus Institute is amazing and invaluable training for staff who have not attended library school. It is also crucial training even if they are mid-career librarians.

Two of staff here have attended. They loved it! They learned much and use what they learned in programs and other activities.

Two staff members have attended. They both rave about it! They learned much and are using it in current practices.

It was great.

We have used the Focus Institute 2 or 3 times with new Youth Library Assistants in my library. They always return informed about youth services in libraries and excited to put their knowledge to work. Because we are a small, rural library with limited staffing, they are not able to put everything to work that they learn.

One of the best trainings provided by the State Library for Youth Services

Summer Reading Program (SRP)

35. The State Library pays the membership fees to the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP), and purchases CSLP summer reading manuals for all public, volunteer, and tribal libraries in Oregon. What is your opinion of how the State Library and the Oregon Library Association represent you in CSLP?

Not sure about representation

I am not sure how they represent me or my library.

Our library has not worked very hard to use all the CSLP materials; however, we plan to be more proactive in taking advantage of resources available to us.

This aspect of the project is not relevant for my library because we are able to provide our own materials if necessary.

I don't know how it works at Multnomah County Library, where I currently work, but I'm guessing MCL does things differently.

We work with our local public library to secure and distribute materials for summer reading. It would be very helpful if they could sign up and return the form through the school instead of having to turn it in at the public library. Also, for those who have trouble getting to the public library it would be nice if it could be returned to the school library the first week of school and the school turn in the completed forms for the students.

I don't fully understand how they represent me and provide clip-art and a manual. Our library would have a summer reading program regardless.

I wonder about the effort and expense that goes in to summer themes, and wonder whether it is worth it. The program has become so complicated. I wonder if having the same generic theme every year (or no theme) would simplify it.

Value of the Summer Reading Program

I appreciate the work done by our CSLP representatives and believe they have a challenging position to balance all the voices/participants/interests that are part of the consortium. While I haven't adored all the themes, artwork, etc. equally - I appreciate the economy of scale it brings and it's good for me to stretch out of my comfort zone now and then. Thanks reps past, present and future!

I do appreciate how OLA has represented our library, but I do not see changes due to their efforts.

I appreciate the consistency that having the same art countywide gives us. I feel represented, I guess.

I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate the CSLP materials which make it easier to have the program especially the discounts from Demco on the incentives such as book-bags and t-shirts.

Because every library serves a different community with differing needs, I think it is too difficult to be properly represented. I do appreciate being given the theme and clip art to use but we don't use most of the information in the handbook because it doesn't work for our patrons and how we set up our program.

I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts. I love that all participating libraries present a cohesive program. If we didn't have access to the materials, I'm sure we would still do SRP, but the branding and theme would be more difficult to create within our staff time and budget.

I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts

36. If the State Library did not pay for your library's participation in the CSLP and you did not receive summer reading materials, what would your library do?

Create a program

The Library would develop its own Summer Reading Program, but would not enjoy: A) the ability to be connected to most libraries nationwide through a shared theme and B) access to professional artwork on banners, posters, bookmarks, etc. on the theme.

The library would develop its own SRP but would have to change its scope and activities

The library may still have a summer reading program but the quality and scope would not be nearly as good as what we have with the CSLP. We need the CSLP!

We'd develop our own program with our own themes, but there might be a decrease in offerings simply due to the staff time required to develop the program from scratch instead of taking the existing ideas, art, etc. and building on them.

The library would develop our own Summer Reading Program, likely at the current level, but all libraries would lose out on the branding and consistency provided by CSLP. I believe this would be a significant loss.

Join others to create a program

My library would collaborate with others in our county - and ideally with others in the Metro area. It might be similar in scope, but we'd sure miss the quality of the print

materials. I'd hate to see us go back to a statewide CSD SR structure, having served many years on it and knowing how exhausting it can be!

I would think that we would have to work as a cooperative to create the program. It would be a pain.

Benefits

The greatest benefit of CSLP is that libraries across the nation run the same theme and use the same artwork. Although I am not always crazy about the artwork, I appreciate the continuity and professional look. We would continue to provide a Summer Reading Program, regardless.

I don't really know. We modify the CLSP materials so much that it might not make too much difference.

Creating art would be very time consuming-- we appreciate the service.

38. Please share any comments that you may have about the Statewide Summer Reading Program.

Suggestions - Audience

I would love to see continued outreach and creative ways support increased participation from children in poverty or who can't easily travel to a public library.

Expand the program to include the new communities and their languages/cultures.

My only complaint/concern is the lack of funding for teen readers.

Suggestions - Materials

The prizes are rather disappointing. Often we are hampered by not being able to purchase early and the 'good stuff' is taken.

My staff seems to never like the artwork from CSLP so create their own.

We actually had fewer kids finish our program this year. We consistently heard that the prizes/incentives were not enticing to the kiddos this year. That is a twofold bummer. The first of course is because we even have to incentive [sic] but the other is that the kids were "meh" about what we were able to offer.

I have concerns about the way effectiveness is being measured. I do not agree with the emphasis on numbers to tell the story of what happens during the program. I am not a fan of outcome-based evaluation that does not EQUALLY rely on anecdotal evidence.

We have not been overly excited about the graphics in the past several years with the exception of the graphics for Fizz, Boom, Read. We wish we could get the PSAs earlier.

Value of the Summer Reading Program

This program not only serves the participating children extremely well, but it also gives our library a much-needed boost in PR and enthusiasm within the community.

Membership in the CLSP is so very important. It saves libraries from having to invent a new theme and materials each year.

We all know the benefits of encouraging reading over the summer. We really appreciate being able to participate in the Statewide SRP. Also, having access to the CSLP themes and materials offers a consistent experience no matter where a child goes to the library, at least in our cooperative.

Although we do not use a lot of the activities in the CSLP manuals, we use the marketing materials which cuts on costs, and we have a unified summer reading program with our district, which helps focus our programming.

Many children struggle with reading and even sharing and just connecting with other children. I see the summer reading program helps them to overcome those problems.

A unified statewide and national summer reading program is essential to the success of summer learning.

Summer Reading is a great way to keep kids reading, and prevent loss in reading skill, over the summer.

Communication around SR is one of our strongest links with our local schools. Having a statewide theme increases our credibility. Educators talk to each other across school district and town lines. If they see our summer program as a unified program, it carries more weight than if it appears to be a locally produced program.

It gives many of our children and opportunity to be involved fun activities and makes them aware of our library and all our resources. Otherwise many of the children never come into the library. We are fortunate to have the SRP.

The SRP materials make it easier to create handouts which the adults enjoy working on during their program. These are quite helpful to me. The program ideas are also of assistance.

The Statewide Summer Reading Program allows families who move into the community during the summer to feel they fit in, as there is a strong likelihood, the theme and artwork is already familiar to them. Our library benefits from national and statewide marketing efforts, as we share the theme and artwork. We still have the flexibility to make sure that the program works for our community. The Summer Reading Program is critical to supporting literacy maintenance and development between school terms.

The statewide SRP is flexible, which allows each library to fit their program according to their resources and their community needs. Youth Services staff feel supported in their efforts and the State Library does an excellent job encouraging public libraries and schools to partner in their summer literacy efforts. Summer Reading Program is something communities can come together to support and each community benefits from the statewide theme.

We would carry on with a full Summer Reading program without CSLP but it is nice to have a somewhat coordinated program and we really do like how easy it is to order good materials for the library to use. We would not have as professional looking graphics without this program.

A terrific program. It's nice to see all the young readers come in all excited about the-Books. It's nice to see the young people who aren't particularly big readers all excited about the program and the prizes, such a great way to encourage reading.

I appreciate the open-minded approach to what is allowed for the programs. That is very important for the small rural libraries. I am talking towns of 150 people.

Having access to high quality publicity materials makes promoting the program easy and effective. While we could continue with our programs, our visibility to the public as a professional and worthwhile endeavor would diminish.

Summer Reading has had such a positive impact on our community - creating yearlong users who value their library and the services it provides.

Because we are so small, the Statewide program enables us to provide a much more extensive program than we would otherwise be able to do.

A stranger came in the library yesterday, Oct 17, and asked about our program. She said they are talking it up downtown and the kids and parents love it. Made my day.

As an Adult Services Librarian, I think the CSLP seems to focus a lot on youth services, so I am less familiar with it. I do think the artwork is a helpful part, although I used it more at my last library than in my current position.

I feel the information gathered is extremely helpful on many levels. For families, schools, the state, and for me to best provide services and help to the youth in our area. Also, to bring new experiences, activities, community awareness to our area that may otherwise not be possible.

The Statewide Summer Reading Program is a bridge in our community to other entities working with kids throughout the summer, including the local elementary school, home school families, vacationers, the summer literacy program, and the summer lunch program.

At the school level we really appreciate the program to keep kids reading over the summer so their reading skills do not decrease while off for an extended period of time.

We are a small community with many families that farm and are busy on ranches during the summer. This effects attendance and participation.

Statewide Database Licensing Program

40. Why do you not use Gale and LearningExpress database products?

No time or staff

My time is filled with other activities

We are limited with time in our libraries and don't have the time for learning new programs that may help or not. This is sad for us because we are a S.T.E.A.M. school and could utilize Gale and Learning Express database.

I guess I have not used them as I have very little time and haven't really gotten into learning what they are about. Sorry

Compliments

The database products are WONDERFUL and I used them when I was a middle school librarian. I am now retired and volunteer in the public library in a limited capacity.

Intend to Use

I am bookroom clerk, and only do circulation. SHOULD learn gale, and point students in that direction if it would help.

To my knowledge, these databases are not available to our library.

We are trying to get them going, but they aren't up yet.

We just have not set up to do it yet.

46. Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not attended in-person (database) training?

No need

Elementary school librarian --I use mostly with teachers. My knowledge and previous training come from my time as a youth librarian in a public library

I can find information about the databases online or ask colleagues

Just an IA at a school library

I generally get what I need from online training.

I have found that the web-based trainings are sufficient.

Not aware

I'm not aware of the schedule, hard to find subs, lack of funding to send me and cover cost of the course and hotel

Other

Our library serves a community on the poor side of the digital divide. We plan to work harder this year at getting patrons to use the valuable information, but many do not own devices on which to regularly access the databases are slow to adopt their use.

51. Which of the following reasons best describes why you have not participated in online training?

No time or staff

Haven't taken the time, priorities. I was fortunate enough to attend live training through OASL. I wish you had a training targeted to classroom teachers. I am an assistant and have no way to connect this great resource with Licensed staff training.

Timing has not worked out. Other things get prioritized.

No need

Other staff members can take the training then report to the entire staff.

My schedule at the times available did not allow. I definitely will take a webinar. When is the issue? I recommend them to staff. Several have taken some of the webinars.

My staff does the majority of direct public service interactions.

We had the training at an In-service.

I have attended in-person trainings in the past and knew I was going to have another in-person opportunity coming up soon, so didn't do a webinar. Taught myself enough to get by until the in-person training.

I learn more effectively with in-person training.

53. Please share any comments that you may have about the Statewide Database Licensing Program.

Lack of use

I have not found any databases that have a reasonable return on investment due to lack of use by our patrons. I would not purchase the Gale databases but I might purchase Learning Express just to avoid having all the paper copies continually stolen. I appreciate the State Library purchasing Gale/Learning Express for all libraries.

Switch from EBSCO to Gale

Learning Express is much more valuable than the Gale Resources. EBSCO's products were much more valuable and useful than the Gale products.

We would get more use and benefit from a database that is better suited to academic libraries (EBSCO or ProQuest). Or from the NYT or Oregonian.

Gale databases aren't the best for linking, metadata, or content. Especially for our academic medical library. We much preferred when discounts for EBSCO databases were offered

It would be great to offer Britannica or Worldbook in addition to Kids Infobits as the databases for younger kids is lacking.

We appreciate the statewide databases. The only suggestion would be that if the budget were larger, we could afford additional databases and in some cases a database package that is easier to use.

I *know* much of this is outside your control, but I would love to see a better "mix" of resources offered to patrons statewide. I worry that "traditional" databases will continue to be less frequently used, while we could (in an ideal world) be offering patrons access to resources that are more relevant to their needs/desires.

The Gale databases get very little use at our college library. Most of the students prefer EBSCO's Academic Search Premier, due to the depth and quality of articles. Not Gale. :(

We are not fond of the Gale interface. My library continues to purchase our own subscriptions to EBSCO databases rather than use the lower quality interface and content that Gale provides.

As an academic library we rarely use the Gale article databases. Instead we subscribe to EBSCO. I wish the SDL program went back to funding the EBSCO subscriptions.

We added the Gale databases to our resource lists but we guide our students to the EBSCO databases we had to purchase when the state went with Gale. It cost us money on database subscriptions, no savings here.

The most useful part of the SDLP is the help with payment for our EBSCOhost databases. We do not often use nor do we encourage use of Gale databases.

I have noticed that many results from Gale tend to be Canadian or Australian resources. There needs to be more US content.

I tend to use the databases my library subscribes to over the Gale databases when helping patrons. They tend to be more reliable. When the Statewide Database Licensing Program subscribed to EBSCO resources, I used these far more heavily than I use the Gale resources.

Intend to use

I'm learning more about the database and online journals, going to be sharing the information with staff.

My staff and I need to take advantage of the training so we can more effectively show our users the value of these tools.

Other

I think my library uses their own subscriptions.

Many patrons are not capable of using these services themselves - thus staff are asked on their behalf.

The problem I see is that the library staff members are part time clerks and in spite of training, do not always remember to show the patrons the databases or use the databases themselves to provide information.

Not used much - our clientele have a lower average education, and don't often research journals or subscriptions. They search websites for info., but not usually from print articles. Public school and college students already have access from classes, and just sign in.

Also, I would like the database to offer an encyclopedia with this, some of the freshmen classes use this type for research in Global Studies. We no longer can afford BOL.

Promotion

Our library needs to improve our promotion and education of our users to better utilize the databases.

We don't give out promotional bookmarks

What bookmarks? Promo materials?

Would distribute bookmarks if I had some.

I don't think we have ever had any promotional materials at our library beyond what we have developed in house---I didn't know any were available.

I feel my library could do more to promote online databases. I know for myself that I do need to invest some additional time in training myself on what we offer.

Meme-style promotional materials would be welcome for marketing in social media, newsprint, newsletters, etc.

I think the resources are great, but we haven't marketed them as effectively as I think we could. It would be nice to have some classes or pointers on databases marketing.

Value of statewide database licensing

The Gale databases and LearningExpress Library are wonderful resources for our students! Our students rely on the Gale dbs for current, vetted information. We couldn't afford to provide our students with such extensive, up-to-date reference materials on our own as a school or even as a district.

Students and teachers use Gale multiple times a day for many classes.

Well run, truly tries to take into account the needs of all types of libraries, needs to continue to branch out and fund online resources like learning express that are not necessarily "databases" per se.

College/university libraries aren't the target of this program, which I understand. Glad to have any benefit that falls our way, particularly in the area of popular/general publications and K-12 education.

The databases provided by the State Library are an essential part of my high school research program. Thank you!

It is a totally essential tool for ALL schools

Students and teachers use Gale multiple times a day for many classes.

Doh, I didn't even think about it in terms of it as an expansion of offerings from print journals and magazines.

Well run, truly tries to take into account the needs of all types of libraries, needs to continue to branch out and fund online resources like learning express that are not necessarily "databases" per se.

It is an invaluable service to school libraries with limited budgets.

This is such an important resource for all the libraries - but especially so for the smaller, rural libraries that would never be able to offer this depth of information without the state licensing program. thank you!

This is a hugely valuable program, and greatly expands my library's collection of electronic full text.

The statewide databases are a goldmine.

College/university libraries aren't the target of this program, which I understand. Glad to have any benefit that falls our way, particularly in the area of popular/general publications and K-12 education.

Our students heavily use the statewide databases and we definitely would not be able to replace all of the resources provided through this service via our budget.

With declining budgets, this service is vital. We could not afford to provide the equivalent ourselves. I don't need promotional materials; the best promotion is staff who knows how to use the databases.

The program allows us to expand our offerings to students; by providing content it lets us spend resources on other electronic databases that are more specialized.

The database is very valuable to our school since we are a small school and resources are so expensive.

Students and teachers use Gale multiple times a day for many classes.

If not for the Statewide Database Licensing program, the library patrons would not have access to the journal and magazines available in the databases. The library does not have the funding to provide the number and quality of items available in the databases.

This program really is one we very much need in our small libraries with limited budgets. It helps us be able to provide the library services our users expect. I just wish more would use the materials but those that do use them find them extremely helpful. I don't use the databases much myself because I am in an office and not directly working with the public. I would use them much time throughout the day if I was working with the public.

I think it's a fabulous resource that works toward equity within library programs statewide. I am excited to promote it to the teachers and students at my school.

This program is extremely effective at helping to prepare high school students for college.

I work at both a school library and moonlight one day a week on the reference desk of a public library. The Gale databases are essential to both locations.

K-12 schools rely heavily on having access to these resources across the state. Without this program, many schools would not have online subscription resources.

I appreciate the statewide database-licensing program, and know that the staff and students do too.

Classes use Gale Resources for research in all subject areas. My orientation introduces Gale to all classes.

I'm sorry I do not have the information to answer the questions above, but I believe the State Library databases are an essential part of library services.

We don't see much of an increase in library traffic, as the database is available to our patrons on any internet-accessible device, and we give students passwords to use at home.

This LSTA-funded set of resources creates a fair and even playing field for all Oregon schools. However, without much stronger staffing levels for school libraries, these resources tend to gather dust and go neglected.

This is a must-have resource for my school library. We haven't historically had a budget and this allows my students to have equal access to proprietary, credible sources of information that prepares them for college.

In the K-12 community, we would be "up the creek, without a paddle" without the statewide database licensing program. Our budgets in library are so depleted we are unable to purchase even the award books in many buildings. We stopped purchasing print copies of reference 15 years ago. Without the databases we would have NOTHING to offer our students for research and reference. Should this ever cease it would be catastrophic, at the very least, to our schools and services for students and staff.

Love it, appreciate it, keep them coming.

OSLIS

55. Which of the following reasons best describes why you or your library does not use OSLIS?

Not relevant

I'm sure our library does, but I don't work in youth services, so it doesn't come up for me.

OSLIS is a site for students and teachers. We have our own portals to the Gale and Learning Express resources.

it's simply non-applicable. We have linked resources on our county website so our default is to use those resources first.

We are a public library and do not know the access code

We are familiar with OSLIS as something that our students may have used in their secondary schools. We also direct users towards it when helping elementary or secondary school students in Answerland.

We're a public library, not a school library.

I gave OSLIS website info to some of the local high schools. Other than that, we don't use it.

I don't work with the public. The school media staff and some of the public library staff have talked about OSLIS very positively.

We have no need for it during Library time.

Most children use OSLIS directly through computers at their schools and not at the library.

I think of it as an exclusively school accessed service. wow-I might be wrong about that....will investigate it tomorrow!

We are a public library, and OSLIS is available only to school students and staff. We do encourage the use of OSLIS and assist students who use our computers to access OSLIS with their school login.

My library website offers nearly all of the same resources as OSLIS.

We access Gale and LearningExpress through our own website portal.

We used to link to citation makers but found others freely available that are more suitable for a university user group.

We are a public library - not eligible. Our schools have access and feedback from local school media staff indicate they love it and want to spread the word. We recommend that students contact their school for a login so they can use OSLIS on public library computers.

Hadn't really thought about it since we do already use the databases provided by the State Library.

The customers I work with are adults.

Not relevant to my work

We are a public library.

We access these databases through our current online resources offerings. I do promote its usage during school visits.

Not relevant to my job.

As a public library we use the general databases and don't go through OSLIS

We are a public library, and it was my understanding that OSLIS was mainly for schools.

Generally speaking, the titles are available within our county's public libraries' holdings. Sometimes, there is only one copy and it is a reference or professional collection copy that does not circulate. In that case, we literally are not allowed to use the state library's collection to access that title, because theoretically, there is a copy of the title "available" to us in the county's holdings, even if the owning library of the reference or professional copy will not loan it. I've only tried to borrow from the State Library's collection twice, but both times, the above situation prevented me from being able to access the titles.

No time

We don't have the time for research and learning new programs. I haven't tried because it's difficult to just complete my job in the minimal time we have.

The Youth Services Librarian does not have time to use this.

Not aware

I...didn't know this existed. Gale is not nearly as good as EBSCO was, (which we did use). I need to start from scratch with Learning Express. I find that, if websites, use info. and logins are not easily available, my time is so limited, that other demands take priority. Our local college offers some similar services, but I would like to use Learning Express more.

I could very well investigate this on my own. I don't know how useful this would be so really doing have an answer. My fault for not investigating.

Don't you need to have a password to access the OSLIS holdings? I know schools have access to a password, but I'm not aware of a password that our public library has access to.

Suggestions

The resources on the OSLIS webpage are not visually appealing to use with students.

Not clearly linked on our cooperative's website. There may be hidden links that are labeled otherwise but there is not OSLIS link in the list of resources.

OSLIS has been removed from our webpage because we were unable to access it.

Again, part time staff members, in spite of training, do not refer patrons to OSLIS or use it themselves.

58. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your school?

Databases first and Citation Maker is a very close second.

I have used OSLIS in the past, when I worked in a school library and when I answered questions for Answerland, but I haven't used it recently. I am not currently in a school.

Citation Maker is a close second.

Gale Resources and Citation Maker

BOTH Databases and Citation maker

Our students do not use OSLIS; librarians use it to answer Answerland questions from high school students

59. Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?

I'm not sure my teachers use this service...if they did it would be for the databases.

Both Databases and Citation makers

I would guess Citation Maker, but I don't have any evidence to support that.

Our instructors do not use OSLIS.

63. Please share any comments that you may have about the OSLIS program.

Value of OSLIS

It is critical component for success for K-12 libraries, as we no longer have print resources to support students in the areas of reference or research. If LSTA could add an online encyclopedia such as World Book, we would have all our basic reference needs met. Schools could then use what little funds available to purchase additional resources such as CultureGram, etc

We use the citation maker daily as well as gale.

OK I will JOIN OSLIS and become a smarter and more knowledgeable bookroom maven.

I love the OSLIS program and I wish I had more time to share details with staff and students.

Without this database I don't think our school would have any databases available to students. I find that students find the website a little cumbersome; they have to change screens a lot and have a hard time understanding how to use databases, which is combined with lots of database options on OSLIS

It's great!

The OSLIS plays a large part in our students research needs. If we didn't have Gale and many of the other resources, students would be wasting their time googling everything. I tell our students that Gale is a one stop shop.

When I was a volunteer for Answerland in the past, I found this a very helpful resource.

Love the training videos.

Essential K12 resource!

Essential tools for k12. Citation Maker is great

Training

I've only had on line training - and it was average. Lots to learn about all the resources.

It is difficult to SHARE everything with teacher because of trying to remember the exact context on how everything was presented. More OSLIS training with teachers would be great.

OSLIS needs to be trained with gusto at OSBA and COSA conferences. And to legislative aides.

Continuing Education

Suggestions

More outreach and programming to school libraries without certified professionals

Training for teachers in schools where they don't have a licensed librarian to teach

When EBSCO had the state contract their reps came around to all the libraries on a constant rotation to check on how well their products worked for us and do individual and small group tips, training and tweaking. Gale's online training sessions are very poor by comparison.

I am not interested in a library degree but other areas might be of interest.

Short Videos or graphics that we can use to promote the databases in classrooms

Communication and Promotion

Please provide info on CE

More workshops online or in person and more information on CE programs.

Content Suggestions

I appreciate hearing about on line training from other states that are available. It broadens the options.

I would like more specialized, Oregon-centric training from the State Library. Either focusing on Oregon resources, Oregon questions, or Oregon patrons (as opposed to, for example, general tutorials about databases).

We need training in Answerland.

No time

I don't have time for workshops

There are so many programs and databases that I don't have time to study all of them and we are only open a few hours a week so it is hard to use everything.

The State Library is doing a good job getting the word out about their CE programs. However, if we have to travel to the 'Valley' for classes, we cannot afford them.

More workshops as resources get added/updated. Good to learn, to be able to share with students and staff.

Compliments

Our State Library consultants do a great job through kids-lib, OYAN, and other means to let library staff members and other subscribers know about CE opportunities in person, online, in Oregon and nation-wide. This is very helpful.

The State Library does an excellent job of CE information and provision of in-person and online opportunities at this time. I would hate to see it reduced.

Not only for librarians but for computer lab staff and teachers as well.

I really appreciate all of Darcy's emails about opportunities

The State Library has been very ambitious in outreach with training.

65. Please select the answer that best describes your use of the State Library's CE information.**Share with others**

I share the information with colleagues in my library district.

I have forwarded the CE information to my library staff.

Compliments

I have only recently learned about CE opportunities through the State Library and am grateful for this service.

I have borrowed several of the-Books purchased by the State Library--thank you for providing those!

Not aware

I did know about the physical collection, but not the online CE opportunities (or did receive information, but did not understand it was a State Library offering).

Suggestions

Would like to see more webinars that are available anytime - to fit into our schedule.

67. Why do you not use the LIS Collection? (Select all that apply)**No need**

I purchase what interests me.

I haven't had a need. I do know about the collection and appreciate that it's available - just haven't needed to use it yet.

I just haven't as yet, and I can usually get what I need through MCL.

My library is able to acquire these resources

I purchase many of the same items for our local library staff to use.

I know about the collection but choose to buy any materials that would be useful to myself or staff.

I use my own library's collection.

I have not made the time yet, but do plan on using it in the future. This collection is essentially replicated at my own library.

I have other ways to access library literature.

Not aware – don't know how to use

Unsure what it is. Can certified teachers use it?

Do not know about it

I don't know how to request the materials

I do not know about it.

Still learning

I might be interested in this collection if I knew more about it. It just hasn't crossed my radar in the right way I think. Perhaps an email dedicated to this one piece of info with a link to the blog or a collection list would help.

I'm not sure how to access this collection.

Other comments

Items have been checked out by others.

My library charges for access to these materials.

I read the blog and am glad that the resources are there, but have not had time to use them yet

I have tried to use the collection but some items listed in the catalog were not available for check out.

68. How did you first hear about Oregon's LIS Collection?

I have not used the collection for some time. I must have missed the changeover from emails sent by the state library to the blog format.

I was browsing Gale Power Search and saw it listed.

I do need the link to order more. Don't remember where that is...

72. How did you first hear about Oregon's LSTA competitive grants program?

Don't remember

It's been so long that I no longer remember how I first learned about LSTA grants.

I don't remember.

I was a member of the LSTA Advisory board something like 20 years ago and can't remember how I got there! :)

It was a long time ago so I don't exactly remember how. What I do remember is that it was stressed that the process is long and cumbersome and if you use it, it should be for something large thus making it worthwhile.

Another source

I was familiar with LSTA grants from another state, so I researched Oregon's program.

My community partner

OASL

I have heard about it from multiple sources - conference/meeting, colleague, contact from the State Library (I just couldn't select more than one in your form).

Osmosis

Through professional organization (OASL)

From a publishing company who supplies library books

Because I have been working in libraries for a very long time and know about the LSTA programs in various states.

Internal email from administrator

74. Why has your library not applied for a LSTA grant?

No time or other resources

Due to the required Federal paperwork, I would only use LSTA funds for \$75,000 or more. It isn't worth my time otherwise.

Difficult to come up with matching funds; staff time not available to write grants or support grant programs. Criteria seems to favor innovative projects only, with the expectation that the program project would be supported by my library at the end of the grant.

The current staffing level within my library system is insufficient to maintain the level of project for a LSTA grant.

Staff time

Have not had time to consider whether I have a need that would fit the grant requirements.

Not applicable in my position

Doesn't apply in my current positions

There does not seem to be opportunities for K-12 school libraries. When I have inquired I was told the OSLIS and OBOB were the ways LSTA supports K12. I am not sure if this is accurate or not.

In a new position

I just started in a management role at my library.

I am a new director and plan to apply if the grant is offered in the future

I just began at my library in August

My library has

The library may have but I am not involved in that process.

My colleagues have applied. The question asked if I had applied.

You did not ask if we applied, you asked if I applied. Our consortium has applied and received a grant.

Others at my library have applied, but I have not.

My library has, I have not personally

I have received in the past at another library I worked at a multiyear LSTA grant. We have not applied for one here at my current library.

I have not applied for a grant but others from my library have done so.

My library has applied (children's division) but I haven't for adult services.

Other programs in my organization have applied for a LSTA grant, but I personally have not

I have at other Libraries, but not yet at this one. I'm not sure if this Library ever applied for one.

My library did apply for a grant and got it (thanks!). My position does not include grant writing.

Applications were made through groups of which I was a part

Question #23 asked if "I" had applied on behalf of my library which I have not. However, my library has applied, so this question is confusing.

OASL is the best avenue for schools to apply for LSTA grants.

Not enough time, and the LSTA seems geared towards public libraries.

The library has applied and received LSTA grants, but I have not been part of the process.

I am part of at least two groups that has applied and been granted LSTA funds

My library has applied for a grant but I was not part of the process.

I do not apply for these grants. Our Library Director does.

My library has applied, though I didn't apply

We have partnered with other libraries in a LSTA grant.

I'm not sure my private school library is eligible

I personally have not applied, but other staff in my library may have already applied.

My consortium applies for LSTA funds, and I feel guilty about double dipping.

This is not the question I answered -- my library applies for LSTA funds annually, but I personally have not done so.

The Youth Services Librarian has applied for grants. I don't have any need to apply for grants with cataloging, reference, and interlibrary loans as my jobs.

The previous question was if I applied on behalf of my library. I haven't, but others in my library have.

One of my colleagues may have applied for one, but I haven't.

Other

Administrator was not interested.

I have not yet had a project for which I needed to apply for an LSTA grant.

I will apply if some program comes up for which it would be helpful to have grant funding.

We got discouraged when we knew that we would get no help getting a new our upgraded ILS. That may not be true now but it was for some time. In addition, I prefer to find money

that I know will be a constant and ongoing than to rely on grants and hope that we aren't starting programs that we will end up dropping when the grant runs out

78. Please share any comments that you may have about the LSTA competitive grants program.

Concerns about the grant process

Stop giving such big grants to certain large libraries in the state that get multiple big grants every year, often for 2-3 year projects. LSTA has changed over the years and now seems to concentrate on big projects that cannot be replicated at small libraries, and small libraries with small but very worthy projects lose out.

From the reviewers' comments, I had the impression that they would not have approved any grant to my library. If this is the case, possibly a clearer statement about eligibility would have saved us the trouble.

I have not requested an LSTA grant, others before me have. The only comment I have heard is that they are very cumbersome to write and the paperwork required when one is received is very difficult. I to plan to request one in the next year or two.

I have been happy to see the grants emphasize common standards, measurable outcomes, and other parameters for designing grants. I think that these help the products of our grant projects be more useful and accountable to the public. I'd say keep up with good work on these initiatives!

I've only applied once and was rejected so that may influence how I feel. However, I wonder how unbiased is the evaluation of grant requests. My application was completely vetted by state library staff yet it was rejected without much discussion of the proposal (at least with me). Happily for me, my project was funded by several nonprofit foundations.

Grant reporting is still confusing as we move into outcome-based evaluation. Some projects are such as system migration are harder to put into that model.

Positive comments about the grant process

I'm glad the timeline was changed so that the awarding of the grant and the accomplishment of the work are closer together!

I am very thankful for LSTA grant program. Thanks to LSTA grants my library have been able to bring important programs and resources to the immigrant community.

This is a great program and the State Library staff who coordinate it are exemplary.

Hugely grateful that it is there. OASL has used LSTA grants to undertake statewide projects that could not be done without LSTA funding.

I appreciate its availability and the focus on developing digital collections resources that make its grants more sustainable.

The LSTA program is extremely valuable to Oregon libraries, and the State Library staff is very helpful to applicants and grantees. If only there were more funds to go around, as there is such a great need!

I have been happy to see the grants emphasize common standards, measurable outcomes, and other parameters for designing grants. I think that these help the products of our grant projects be more useful and accountable to the public. I'd say keep up with good work on these initiatives!

I received LSTA funding at a previous library and it was extremely useful and provided a long needed service to not only the immediate library/community, but also added to the research materials available worldwide. Without the LSTA money the Library would never have been able to do the project.

While there are many pressures on the LSTA budget which affect the competitive grants program, it offers a very valuable source of library-specific funding for all types of libraries. For that reason alone, it is important.

The Sage consortium does apply for these grants on our behalf, and we have benefitted from the extra resources.

80. What other priorities can you identify for the use of LSTA funds?

Database or other online resources

World Book could be another resource or purchase other Gale products not currently provided

Adding to digital content available for children and teens (e.g. e-Books, audiobooks, magazines).

Dedicated eBook collection for K-12 students in addition to GALE databases (such as 3M or Overdrive)

Oregon Battle of the-Books (OBOB)

Since I am not familiar with the exact funding I can't really give an accurate response.

OBOB??

Oregon Battle of the-Books should be a high priority.

Oregon Battle of the-Books

Help with OBOB has been very appreciated. I miss Novelist for reading reviews and researching potential purchases.

School media specialists

Oregon needs more trained school media specialists. Here in Lincoln County, we have one professional for the entire county. That's not enough to help all the students and the school media center clerks have too much responsibility, not enough training, and low pay for their responsibilities. Is there any way for the State Library to help?

I would love to see certified teacher-librarians be reinstated in schools. So--adequate staffing for high-quality school libraries.

I am concerned how districts in the state are able to get away with only having one LMS. Schools without LMS are not being served adequately, yet there is no incentive for non-LMS to obtain licensure or take media classes. However, I am not that familiar with the LSTA fund parameters to know if advocacy would be an appropriate use.

Funding for Library Teachers in all school libraries. 1 person working in school libraries when it takes 2 people for the quality to be at the level our student need in this technology world. You can have all the programs, systems, grants you want but if the children aren't able to use them what the point.

Having Teacher librarians with a library Manager gives you a better chance that our children will get the reading bug at a young age. The LSTA funds should go to the schools 1st. The administration salaries can go up when our graduation numbers go up. Right now our reading is down for the state of Oregon.

Increase time given to School Library IA's

Diversity

Expanding STEM early literacy programs targeting communities of color. Also, make libraries more friendly to families with children and families from communities of color.

Diversity help, especially in rural libraries, especially kids

Other

Keep the percentage of funds available to competitive grants the same, but stop favoring a few large and expensive projects from a few large systems over the many smaller libraries and systems with smaller projects.

Statewide library-marketing program (promoting the use of libraries in our state).

Encouraging sharing and partnerships across the state.

Taking over the Oregon Digital Library Consortium

Promote Information Literacy, including IL at the college level.

Support for small and rural libraries in grant writing
Special transformation and maker space technology updates
With the changes in E-rate, I could use help with the practical application of the second part of funding.

Adult literacy programs

Establishing a DPLA Service Hub for Oregon and providing training support statewide
Internet access for K-12 students without access at home.

Maintaining the Oregon level of the Letters About Literature program.

Support for scholarship programs offered by the Oregon Library Association that assist Oregon students engaged in earning their Master's in Library and Information Science from ALA-accredited programs. Support for innovative internship or mentoring programs for librarians who have recently completed their MLIS.

Pay fees for libraries to place holds and check out your materials.

Promoting library standards (possibly with OLA) and certifying libraries.

Special "trial" programs. I have found that what worked in the ___ area bombs on the coast or in the mountains. What I would like to do is have funding to try programs to see what would work in individual locals. For example ___ students are in school (Grade) all summer long for fun activities, learning and field trips. Parents pay a small fee and their child is in school from 8:00 - 3:00 Mon - Fri. and taken to swimming lessons, science trips, all kinds of things so our summer reading program is attended by the home school children and children visiting from out of the area. I would like to test a couple of programs such as during the holidays, Saturdays, and maybe some with a mixture of adults and children.

Construction/capital projects. I prefer large projects over small as the small frequently can be funded out of existing budget monies or cannot be supported in the years following the grant. LSTA monies should focus first on statewide projects.