

American Library Association

Abstract

As U.S. libraries transform to meet the needs of a changing nation, public programming is rising to the forefront of daily operations. Libraries have expanded from collection holders and lenders to centers for lifelong experiential learning, hubs for civic and cultural gatherings, and partners in community-wide innovation. Despite this change in mission, little national data is available to quantify its impact in libraries or in their communities. Ample anecdotal information exists about library programs, but we lack adequate evaluative data on impact and research to describe effective practices across the field.

New research is imperative to better understand this transformation and to prepare library professionals to embrace their changing role. We need to assess current program offerings in public, academic, and specialized libraries and identify the skills and training necessary to support library professionals to meet these new demands.

The American Library Association (ALA) Public Programs Office (PPO) requests two years of IMLS National Leadership support for a research project, *National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment: Phase I*. This project will implement the first research recommendation of a multi-phase strategy developed through an IMLS National Leadership planning grant and published in a [white paper](#) in December 2014. In this first-of-its-kind project, ALA PPO will bring together a network of researchers, practitioner-researchers, and advisors to implement a comprehensive research strategy to understand and document the characteristics, audiences, outcomes, and value of U.S. library public programming.

This project is designed to answer the following research questions:

1. *How can we characterize and categorize public programs offered by libraries today?*
2. *What competencies and training are required for professionals working with library programming today?*

Working with the network and researchers at New Knowledge Organization, the project team will disseminate a series of surveys to library practitioners; their responses will help map the existing landscape of library public programming (program types, topics, formats, audiences and partners) and the scope of current competencies — and also identify those skills required in the field that, perhaps, are not being adequately taught in formal education settings.

This research will develop a broad characterization of contemporary library public programming, its impacts, and the necessary competencies for libraries and their programming professionals to excel in this work. Additionally, a series of case studies will enable a deeper understanding of how impacts and outcomes can be measured.

As so many in the library profession are aware, library programming has the power to transform the lives of our patrons and the health of our communities. By taking a step back and assessing the landscape of library programming today, we will be able to better recognize the strengths of the field, map its accomplishments, and pinpoint those areas where additional work must be done. The trend toward libraries as do-ers, teachers, and experience providers will continue, and only by researching this transformation can the field be prepared for what comes next.

STATEMENT OF NEED

As U.S. libraries transform to meet the needs of a changing nation, public programming is rising to the forefront of daily operations. Libraries have expanded from collection holders and lenders to centers for lifelong experiential learning, hubs for civic and cultural gatherings, and partners in community-wide innovation. Despite this change in mission, little national data is available to quantify its impact in libraries or in their communities. A library literature review¹ determined that much anecdotal information about library programs exists, but we lack adequate evaluative data on impact and research to describe effective practices across the field.

New research is imperative to better understand this transformation and to prepare library professionals to embrace their changing role. We need to assess current program offerings in public, academic, and specialized libraries and identify the skills and training necessary to support library professionals to meet these new demands. This research will develop a broad characterization of contemporary library public programming, its impacts, and the necessary competencies for libraries and their programming professionals to excel in this work.

The American Library Association (ALA) Public Programs Office (PPO) requests two years of IMLS National Leadership support for a research project, *National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment: Phase I*². This project will implement the first research recommendation of a multi-phase strategy developed through an IMLS National Leadership planning grant and published in a widely distributed [white paper](#)³. In this first-of-its-kind project, ALA will bring together a network of researchers, practitioner-researchers, and advisors to implement a comprehensive research strategy to understand and document the characteristics, audiences, outcomes, and value of U.S. library public programming.

This project is designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How can we characterize and categorize public programs offered by libraries today?
2. What competencies and training are required for professionals working with library programming today?

This research effort will gather information from across the range of program types, topics, formats, audiences, and partners to build a matrix that aligns impacts, program types, audiences, and other variables. The project will lay groundwork to serve the emerging needs of library workers and provide a foundation for national metrics to assess how programming is impacting library services and users. This research is unique in its ability to link professional skills to program impact assessment, and to establish the training needs to support both.

Although our focus on the impact of library programming across public, academic, and special libraries is unique, we will leverage other current research efforts, such as the Public Library Association's (PLA) Project Outcome and the IMLS-COSLA Measures that Matter (MtM) initiative. A meta-analysis of Project Outcome data related to programming will help build our matrix of program types. The MtM initiative, designed to streamline public library data collection and storage practices, will inform our design, and we are fortunate to count MtM working group member Annie Norman, director and state librarian of the Delaware Division of Library Services, among our longtime NILPPA advisors.

¹ See attachment, Supportingdoc1.Literature Review and Bibliography

² For the purposes of this research, "public" and "public programs" refer to *the library's* public — the community the library serves or the audiences the library targets for its programs.

³ See Research Agenda table of NILPPA White Paper, pages 32-33, of attachment Supportingdoc2.NILPPA White Paper.pdf.

Table 1. Research Activities for NILPPA Phase 1⁴

Strategy	Activity	Population
Q1. Program Typology	Develop Taxonomy (analysis of PLA Project Outcome program types inventory)	N/A
	Library Programming Validity Survey	Min. N = 1,000 libraries
	Case Studies	Min 3 per type to represent full range
Q2. Library Programming Competencies	Analysis of MLIS curriculum and syllabi	N = 51 ALA-accredited MLIS programs
	Library Administrator, Academic Instructor, & Practitioner Surveys	Min N = 82 per survey module.
	Community Consensus Report & White Paper	Voluntary PPO list members
Research Committees	In-person all Questions meeting, 2 Monthly (1 per question), analysis & findings workshops	ALA, NKO & Question Leads
Advisor Committee	One in-person kick-off meeting + one virtual meeting	advisory committee + ALA, NKO & All Question Leads
	One virtual meeting + feedback on summative report	advisory committee + ALA, NKO & All Question Leads
Dissemination	See communications plan, attached (publications/ conferences)	ALA, NKO & All Question Leads with online feedback from advisory committee

This proposal covers the first two-year phase (of a six-year agenda⁵) by:

- Implementing a comprehensive mixed-methods strategy to understand the range of programming conditions relevant to the range of library types and situations
- Developing a framework for libraries to situate themselves within the field and align themselves by program service types, audiences served, and practices with demonstrable evidence of effectiveness
- Defining the core competencies and training needs required of a programming librarian

Response to reviewer feedback: This proposal responds to IMLS reviewer feedback with adjustments to budget and schedule and with a more detailed methods appendix. Training components for library workers have been moved to a future project phase, and additional information about our research partner has been added to the budget commentary. We have strengthened advisor relationships with Measures that Matter and Project Outcome, and have added practitioners to our research team.

STATEMENT OF IMPACT

Cultural programming in libraries has the power to transform the lives of individuals and communities through experiences that promote the use of library collections and create community-based connections. This project

⁴ See attachment, Supportingdoc9.Research Activities Overview

⁵ See Research Agenda table of NILPPA White Paper, pages 32-33, of attachment Supportingdoc2_NILPPA White Paper.pdf.

will help people, including librarians and library users, by supporting core library practices, building programming competencies, and offering opportunities for new research partnerships. Ultimately, people — young and old, rich and poor, of all ethnicities and abilities — will be best served through programs that address the changing needs of a 21st-century society. ALA asserts that library public programs have three key areas of impact:

- **Libraries benefit:** Public programs build awareness of the library’s value and draw attention to the important services the library provides. Program audiences use library collections and resources; they also communicate the library’s value to community members, media, and decision makers.
- **Communities benefit:** Programming helps develop a community voice and establish civil dialogues. It develops community networks, introduces residents to one another, and introduces ideas in a “safe” environment. Local businesses and organizations may also connect to new audiences and partners.
- **Individual people benefit:** Library programs serve all community members, providing practical skills as well as entertainment, enrichment, and opportunities to explore new ideas.

PROJECT DESIGN⁶

Background: 2014 Planning Grant and White Paper: “Now that programming has become central to what we do, we need more training and assessment,” said a NILPPA planning grant stakeholder, as quoted in ALA’s 2014 [NILPPA white paper](#)⁷. Although library programming has become an established part of library service, the NILPPA planning grant revealed that guidelines and tools for (1) defining audience and community needs; (2) developing and initiating a range of program types; and (3) determining objective outcomes, are rare. Library professionals identified a growing need for program data, including guidelines and tools for measuring impact. Libraries also seek guidance on competencies and training for public programming professionals. These needs were identified throughout the planning grant process across types and sizes of libraries — and were echoed by more than 160 library professionals who responded to our call for feedback to the white paper.

Recognizing the many variables in library programming, the planning project called for a research framework that would incorporate a suite of studies. The stated goal for this comprehensive research framework is “to ensure all library stakeholders have access to information they need to make strategic policy and investment decisions that will further leverage the infrastructure and expertise that flow from libraries’ public programming.”

Since 1992, ALA PPO has supported libraries as places of cultural and civic engagement where people of all backgrounds gather for reflection, discovery, participation, and growth. Tens of thousands of libraries of all types have carried out ALA PPO programs as grantees. In 1998–99, a major survey⁸ conducted by PPO and the University of Illinois Library Research Center, provided a wealth of benchmark information on the state of adult cultural programming. In the 17 years since that study, the efficacy and applicability of that benchmarking program led to calls for a new research strategy as significant as the IMLS/Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2010 “Opportunity for All,” a study of internet use in public libraries that led to profound positive changes in library-based digital access.

⁶ See attachment, Scheduleofcompletion.pdf

⁷ See attachment, Supportingdoc2.NILPPA White Paper.pdf.

⁸ See attachment, Supportingdoc3.ALA Wallace Survey Report

Literature Review: A library literature review⁹ determined that much anecdotal information about library programs exists, but there is a lack of adequate evaluative data on impact or research to describe best practices across the field. The review revealed that the majority of publications on cultural programs in libraries are descriptive and anecdotal (Benway, 2010; Catterall, Chapleau & Iwananga, 1999; Harris 2011; Hill, 2008; King 2006; Sigala, 1990; Tidy, 2008; Villaseñor, 2004; Weiner & Heinz, 2011) or aspirational (AASL & AECT, 1998; ALA 1989; 2000; ACRL, 2000; IMLS, 2001; n.d.; Mandel, 2007; NCSS, 2001; Parsons & Lisman, 1996; Ronnberg, 2000; Scott, 2011a; 2011b; Shuler, 2007; Sigala, 1990; Smith, 2012). A thorough meta-analysis of the ALA archives of program evaluation validated these findings (Fraser, Sheppard & Norlander, 2014). While these well-described studies about information literacy interventions, digital literacy, or other library skills demonstrate that programs achieve goals for target audiences, the results do not align to larger questions that can help shape the future of library programs as a whole.

The review identified one exception: Kranich’s (2001; 2005; 2006; Kranich, Reid & Willingham, 2004) study of the literature surrounding the role of libraries in civic engagement. Those studies offered a tentative taxonomy for assessing program public impacts. However, this project builds on Kranich and colleagues’ work by proposing common metrics or measures that might aid librarians in contributing to a body of knowledge that serves their publics and the entire field.

Relevance of the Proposed Research to Current Practice: Librarianship has been characterized as a “three-legged stool,” consisting of information technology, reader’s advisory, and programming. Although programming has grown rapidly in all sizes of communities, little has been documented about this “third leg.” This project will provide insight, direction, training, and tools to enhance the effectiveness of library programming and to use ongoing evaluation strategies to strengthen the community services.

Research results will be designed to guide management, elicit community support and institutional engagement, and encourage whole community development. By identifying the competencies for library programmers and encouraging new training opportunities, it will assure that this growing area of community service is well served. In addition to the skills to present programs and collaborate across the community, programming librarians will also gain the skills to evaluate their work and continually refine community offerings. The research will further transform library operations by examining best practices and creating teaching models.

Research Methods. ALA and its research team have designed a unique partnership approach to the series of planned studies. Two distinct research committees, each addressing one of the core questions, will comprise academic researchers and a leading practitioner/innovator to guide the work. These research committees will then collaborate with advisory teams through quarterly conference calls to ensure that the parallel research questions are synergistic and that the research addresses the needs and standards of both practitioners and academic researchers. In addition to the scheduled in-person convenings of the research and advisory groups, ALA will lead committee/team coordination and communications, using the WebEx platform for regular conference calls, and Evernote to manage documents sharing and editing. New Knowledge Organization will coordinate the data collection using the Qualtrics platform.

ALA will further work with New Knowledge, a central research “think tank” familiar with association-level data feedback and administrative burden management, to solicit feedback on surveys and data collections from library professionals. Feedback will be collected based on a maximum variation representative sampling, rather than full feedback from all libraries on all questions, to avoid survey fatigue. Each data collection effort will require no more than a 10-minute response time for any participant in any given week and will occur no more than twice per month. Thus, the quantitative data noted below will be deployed in waves and spread over a six-

⁹ See attachment, Supportingdoc1.Literature Review and Bibliography

week period to ensure high response rates, representative data, and reasonable process management for all practitioners contributing to the work.

As noted above, each research team will be responsible for pursuing a distinct area of study, as follows.

Question 1: Program Typologies. This descriptive study will characterize the range of library public programming by type, developing a metadata coding strategy that can characterize content type, delivery technique, library patron profile, and possible program sponsor relationships. It will further use data to define the role of the programming professional in design, development, and facilitation of each program type, and align information with existing ALA research data and emerging trends identified in programs and programming presentations over the past decade. The study will employ a sequential quantitative/qualitative, two-phase, mixed-methods data collection strategy. That is, the first quantitative study will identify programs by type, audience, technique, and degree of design, production, or facilitation by the library. The second wave of studies will explore in detail the nuance of these programs with representative professionals to characterize these data in detail. This effort will ensure minimum burden while maximizing professional input and user voices to the research question.

- **Data Analysis:** Using PLA Project Outcome's inventory of program types as a base, the research team will develop a tentative taxonomy by service populations, delivery strategies, techniques, library profiles, and community descriptors using an emergent coding scheme. These results will be distributed for peer-review to the advisory panel for verification and use in the first-wave national quantitative survey.
- **Grounding Findings in Practice:** The quantitative survey will be distributed to 4,600 individuals from ALA's Programming Librarian database to test the validity of the taxonomy by inviting practitioners from academic, school, public, and special libraries to review the findings, and to confirm with simple check boxes, if they deliver programs as described. Practitioners will be invited to: supplement the taxonomy with descriptions of the depth and range of their own programs where there is variation from the initial taxonomy; clarify categories and codes for consistency across sites; offer brief descriptions of program support strategies; and define common terms for the field.

This survey technique will be staged in waves over time to ensure limited daily burden on respondents. Using triangulating data, these surveys will ensure no more than 10-minute response time per two-week cycle until complete. The overall aim is to represent at least 1,200 responding institutions to support data analysis. These program categories will be re-examined for consistency and clarified for validity in each wave. Once again, the results will be reviewed by the advisory panel prior to full release of a recommended coding scheme for internal tracking of the range of program types. As noted, the results of this work will be shared with the entire advisory network for primary review, then released widely for practitioner review.

- **Case Studies:** In Year 2, following completion of the taxonomy of programming types, the research team will develop a case study strategy for deeper understanding of how impacts and outcomes can be measured. This phase will collaborate with practitioners delivering exemplary programs that represent core types emerging from the taxonomy. The strategy will employ practitioner-developed ethnographies that illustrate a broad range of public, academic, and special libraries. These will include images, program observations, program strategies, pre- and post-experience think-alouds, and a program-specialist facilitated reflection session with library staff and administrators. Data collection will employ familiar PPO program reporting tools in the final report to incorporate a broad range of practitioner voices and user perspectives.

Question 2: User-focused Programming Competencies. This mixed-methods research effort will develop community-wide definitions for core competencies necessary to be a library programming professional (e.g., degrees, training, certifications, aptitudes, expectations, and mid-career professional development). Working with academic programs, program practitioners, and administrators, the NILPPA team will describe current practices, desired competencies, and challenges facing the field. Using strategies similar to those in Question 1, this effort will employ parallel data collection strategies to create a large set of data types for analysis by the team.

- **Studying the Field.** In Y1 and Y2, research team members will collect and analyze curriculum offerings and syllabi from MLIS programs and solicit feedback from professionals on non-MLIS learning that helped prepare them for their field as programming professionals. Simultaneously, we will deploy three parallel online surveys to library administrators, academic instructors, and practitioners on current needs. These data will be synthesized for presentation in support of a discussion forum at ALA’s 2018 Midwinter Meeting and 2018 Annual Conference. The results of these two sequential activities will be used to prepare a draft white paper to solicit practitioner feedback (Y2/Q3).
- **Community Consensus:** During the first half of Y2, the team will host a series of online, field-wide practitioner and academic discussion forums to assess the white paper recommendations. Based on these data, a refined document will be shared in Y2/Q2 for feedback from academic program administrators and library administrators. The final competencies report will outline components of effective library programming, strategies for benchmarking in the national context, and professional training and tools to meet the needs of future program users.

Outcomes: This research will develop a broad characterization of contemporary library public programming, its impacts, and the necessary competencies for libraries and their programming professionals to excel in this work. At the conclusion of this project, researchers will possess: (1) primary data to inform national assessment of how programming is changing and responding to community needs; (2) a codified understanding of how public programming is situated as part of library services in communities; (3) data to demonstrate how all types of libraries can deliver relevant, effective, and comprehensive services through their public programming; and (4) knowledge that can help these programming professionals be more targeted in their career advancement.

Data Management and Public Availability of the Project Data and Metadata: As outlined in the supplementary materials,¹⁰ the project is committed to a transparent public process in the development of these outputs. The ALA NILPPA website will contain ongoing updates and an RSS update feed for registered users. The project will conform with the principles of the National Science Digital Library legislation and the goals of ALA PPO to provide public access to all supporting data for future scholarship and in a publicly accessible online area for future use and management. New metadata created for coding programming types and competencies will also be made available for continued use and refinement by the field. As material of public interest, qualitative data will be stored in a publicly accessible qualitative data repository such as the Syracuse University QDR or another qualified library host site.

IMLS Strategic Plan Alignment: This project aligns with IMLS Goal 2 by developing a comprehensive research agenda to document the impact of public programs as “core components of the broader community learning and service infrastructure.” NILPPA will be the first national study to describe the specific impact of library programs, including those funded by other federal agencies. It expands understanding of how public

¹⁰ See attachment, Digitalproduct.pdf

perception of libraries is changing based on public engagement strategies. It will produce actionable, accessible results so public and private sector leaders have information to make strategic policy and investment decisions, and offer guidance on professional training, mid-career support, and academic planning.

DIVERSITY PLAN

As ALA's diversity policy states, libraries play a crucial role in empowering diverse populations for full participation in a democratic society. The association prioritizes efforts to include diversity in all components of services and activities, including continuing education. ALA's commitment to diversity is reflected in every aspect of this project design, from the recruitment of advisors to the inclusion of all types of libraries and the varied populaces they serve. The two research questions will be pursued with an explicit goal of characterizing representation and under-representation, including socio-economic services, measures for identifying distinct communities, and how program services reflect a commitment to all Americans values and concerns.

PROJECT RESOURCES: PERSONNEL, TIME, BUDGET

Through professional development activities, programming resources, model programs, and grant opportunities, ALA PPO supports libraries as community cultural centers and places of cultural and civic engagement. PPO employs a staff of ten and is advised by the ALA Public and Cultural Programs Advisory Committee.

Members of the ALA PPO staff with key involvement in the project are **Deb Robertson** (PPO director), **Mary Davis Fournier** (PPO deputy director & PI), **Sarah Ostman** (communications manager), **Colleen Barbus** (program coordinator), and **Erik Cameron** (director, data applications). The project will also draw on ALA professional staff (**Cathleen Bourdon**, ALA associate executive director, Advocacy and Member Relations, **Kathy Rosa**, director, Office for Research and Statistics, **Emily Plagman**, project manager, PLA's Project Outcome, and **Miguel Figueroa**, director, ALA Center for the Future of Libraries). **Fournier** will oversee ALA project work and coordinate project goals with other ALA-wide efforts. **Bourdon** will supervise reporting and grant management. **Barbus** will assist with committee coordination, administration, and meeting planning. **Cameron** will manage the project website, digital formatting, and technology integration. **Ostman** will implement the communications and distribution strategy. **Fournier, Barbus, Ostman, and Cameron** are grant-funded employees with time allotted to this grant and have no conflict with other grant-funded responsibilities.¹¹

Research coordination and implementation will be led by **New Knowledge Organization Ltd** (NKO), a leading think tank collaborating with cultural associations on strategies for assessing collective impacts. NKO led the NILPPA IMLS-funded planning project and supported PLA's development of Project Outcome, as well as the independent evaluations of the ALA/NEH Bridging Cultures: Muslim Journeys and the Libraries Transforming Communities initiatives. The NKO leadership team developed and is currently leading national research strategies for the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Association of Children's Museums, the American Alliance of Museums, and PBS NewsHour.

NKO staff will work under the direction of **John Fraser, PhD AIA**. Fraser is a psychologist and leading researcher in the study of cultural organizations as social change agents, is editor-in-chief for *Curator: The Museum Journal*, and is an adjunct professor at Indiana University. **Beverly Sheppard**, a leading thinker in the evolution of library and museum practice, an NKO Research Fellow, former CEO of a research institute, and former acting director of IMLS, will help guide the national dialogues relevant to this project. **Rebecca**

¹¹ See attachments for bios, resumes and budget justification for breakdown of staff time

Norlander, PhD, an expert in using digital communication tools for education and conflict resolution theory, will coordinate data collection, analysis, and synthesis reporting.

The following confirmed list of advisors represent a range of expertise and geographical regions. The advisors are organized into four groups: research committee, dissemination strategy, Alpha site advisors, and stakeholders. ALA consulted with IMLS on the stakeholders list and responded to suggestions from the preliminary proposal reviewers.¹²

Research Committee: The research committee comprises two independent teams, each working to advance one of the two core research questions. The entire group will meet at project start-up and continue to work in their question teams through quarterly phone calls during Years 1 and 2.

Committee 1/Question 1. Typology of Program Types

Jennifer Weil Arns, PhD, is associate professor at the School of Library and Information Science at the University of South Carolina. Research interests include the construction of knowledge in public and private settings, organizational theory, public library governance and operations, program planning and evaluation, economics, and cultural heritage institutions. Her systems-level thinking will be central to the design and analysis of the program typology metadata.

Jamie C. Naidoo, PhD, is an associate & Foster-EBSCO Endowed Professor in the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Alabama. Naidoo's research includes services to diverse audiences and diversity in youth media, with focus on inclusive practices and authentic depiction of Latino cultural groups in media and communications materials. His focus on inclusive practices will ensure that the metadata proposals reflect authentic cultural diversity.

Carolyn Anthony retired as director of the Skokie Public Library in 2016 after 31 years of service to a diverse population of 65,000 just north of Chicago. As president of PLA (2013-14), she initiated the development of easy-to-use Outcome Measures that could be widely adopted by public libraries throughout the U.S. She has also been involved in leadership development in PLA and was instrumental in the design and implementation of the first PLA Leadership Academy.

Committee 2/Question 2. Library Programming Competencies

Michele Besant, PhD, is associate director, instructor, and senior special librarian at the University of Wisconsin-Madison who focuses on social justice and libraries, information access, intellectual freedom, prison libraries, tribal libraries, archives, and museums. She will be central to challenging orthodoxy and ensuring that competencies and definitions reflect the needs of unique cultural groups.

Janine Golden, PhD, is associate professor in the USC Marshall School of Business and co-editor of *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*. Her research focuses on strategies for career development success for library emerging leaders, succession planning, employee retention, and mentoring for people in leadership and management fields. Her expertise will ensure the results are actionable for academic institutions and library administrators.

Terrilyn Chun is the senior manager for Programming and Community Outreach at Multnomah County Library in Portland, Oregon. She oversees development, resource allocation, and evaluation of public programs for adults, youth, and families for the system's 19 libraries.

¹² See attachments, Supportingdoc4.National Research and Advisory Team.pdf, Supportingdoc5.Research Committee Letters of Commitment.pdf, and Supportingdoc6.Advisor Biographies and Resumes.pdf

Alpha site advisors: **Susan Feller**, president/CEO of Association of Tribal Archives, Libraries and Museums, Oklahoma Department of Libraries (Oklahoma City, OK); **Annie Norman**, state librarian, Delaware Division of Libraries (Dover, DE); **Manju Prasad-Rao**, head, Instructional Media Center, Liu/Schwartz Memorial Library (Greenville, NY); **Ken Stewart**, school librarian (retired), Blue Valley High School (Kansas City, MO).

Stakeholders: **Theresa A. R. Embrey**, chief librarian, Pritzker Military Museum & Library (Chicago, IL); **John Horrigan**, senior researcher, Internet and Technology, Libraries and e-Reading, Pew Research Center (Washington, DC); **Colleen Leddy**, director, Stair District Library (Morenci, MI); **Amita Lonial**, principal librarian, San Diego County Library (San Diego, CA); **Emily Plagman**, project manager, ALA (Chicago, IL); **Kathy Rosa**, director, Office of Research and Statistics, ALA (Chicago, IL); **Rebecca Teasdale**, principal, Rebecca Teasdale Consulting (Chicago, IL); **Sarah Goodwin Thiel**, head, Center for Community/Affiliate Initiatives and Engagement, University of Kansas Watson Library (Lawrence, KS).

Dissemination Strategy Advisors: **Miguel Figueroa**, director, Center for the Future of Libraries, ALA (Chicago, IL); **Robert Horton**, Archives Center chair, Smithsonian National Museum of American History (Washington, DC); **Marsha L. Semmel**, principal, Marsha Semmel Consulting (Arlington, VA); and **Angel Ysaguirre**, executive director, Illinois Humanities Council (Chicago, IL).

Budget: The IMLS request of \$513,409 includes grant-funded staff salaries (\$103,108), travel (\$33,112: airfare and lodging for travel to meetings), supplies, materials, and equipment (\$6,140: Meeting AV, Web-Ex subscription, Supplies, Direct costs), Contracts and Subawards (\$265,112: research committee- 6/\$7,000; advisors: 15/\$600; New Knowledge Org: \$214,112); communication and distribution (\$15,000), and meeting costs (\$6,107), Total Direct costs: \$462; Indirect (22.88% of eligible expense) \$50,805; Total Project Costs: \$513,409.

The budget¹³ for the project represents time and resources necessary to engage external expertise to support ALA's work and to cover the incremental cost of travel. This project seeks funding for one primary consulting firm, secondary consultation fees for six advisory researchers, stipend for other advisors, travel for planned meetings, print costs for designed reports and publications, web microsite design and enhancement, and substantial staff time. Costs for each of the consultant and meeting components have been negotiated on existing nonprofit rates for staff expertise from New Knowledge (NKO). NKO fees include staffing, materials, publication costs, data collection, and travel. Raw data and results will be provided to ALA for future use and record-keeping.

Research and advisory meetings are essential to ensure valuable input for this project. The budget will cover all costs for attendance by the named advisors. The budget includes funding for working meetings, but ALA will ensure cost effectiveness and reduce scheduling conflicts by using dedicated meeting space at ALA headquarters and conferences. The budget includes stipend, travel, lodging, and meals for attendees, with all costs based on actual lodging and catering cost estimates by ALA.

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Information Reporting and Dissemination: Inclusive dissemination to academics and practitioners in the library field and related fields is a critical component of this project. ALA will disseminate research findings to various constituencies (e.g., public, academic, community college libraries) and related fields (e.g., museums, humanities). Distribution will include public reporting on the ALA website with corresponding social media designed to elicit online feedback. Broad-scale communications activities will take place in Y2/Q3 and Q4 and

¹³ See attachment, Budgetjustification.pdf for additional detail.

continue beyond the project end date (Aug. 31, 2018). ALA will draw upon its many well-established outlets, including member email lists, e-newsletters, the [Programming Librarian website](#), and ALA social media channels.

ALA will also seek feedback from constituents while research is ongoing during Years 1 and 2, fostering conversation among practitioners in the field that can further inform researchers' discussions. Ideas and questions discussed during the committees' quarterly conference calls will be shared with ALA's Programming Librarian Interest Group on Facebook (reach: 6,700); comments gathered on the page will be shared with the committee for future calls.

Digital distribution. ALA will create a NILPPA website housing a description of the project, reports, advisor- and staff-authored blog posts, and research findings. Reports and findings will be shared via social media, encouraging dialogue with library professionals over the project period. (These efforts will mirror ALA's previous work sharing the NILPPA white paper, which elicited more than 170 comments.)

Scholarly publications. With leadership from project advisors, ALA will seek publication in library journals. A tentative list of potential publication opportunities include [The Library Quarterly](#), [Library Trends](#); [Advances in Library Administration and Organization](#), [Library Leadership & Management](#), [College & Research Libraries](#), [Young Adult Library Services](#), [The Journal of Research on Libraries and Young Adults](#), [Children & Libraries](#), [School Library Research](#). ALA will work with the NILPPA Dissemination Advisory Committee to publish findings relevant to fields outside librarianship.

Media outreach. In partnership with ALA's Public Awareness Office, ALA will carry out a comprehensive library media outreach and social media plan that applies the NILPPA findings to topics relevant to library practitioners and educators. While research outcomes cannot be predicted yet, topics may include:

- trends in library programming by region, community size or library type;
- topics and competencies that should be explored by MLIS programs to prepare students for careers as programming librarians; and
- the availability of resources to attain skills needed to lead effective library programming.

In-person and online research presentations. ALA will present key findings in a free online presentation and in a panel discussion of NILPPA advisors, researchers, staff, and participants at the 2018 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans. Proposals will be submitted for future presentation at PLA, Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), and the American Association of School Libraries (AASL) conferences. ALA will also support the dissemination of NILPPA research by advisors in their respective fields (e.g., library, museum, humanities).

American Library Association
National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment (NILPPA): Phase 1
January 13, 2017

Schedule of Completion

NILPPA Project Activities		Current Funding Request							
		Year 1				Year 2			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Coordination									
IRB Review and Modifications									
Program Typology	Project Outcome Data Analysis								
	Advisory Panel Review								
	Survey Distribution and Analysis								
Library Programming Competencies	Three Online Surveys								
	Programming Professionals Survey Report								
	Curricula Contents Collection and Analysis								
	Curricula Contents Survey Report								
	Online Discussion Forums								
	Feedback from Professionals								
	White Paper								
Summative Report									
Research Committee Meetings									
Advisor Meetings (in-person and online)									
Publications, Conferences									
Dissemination/Communication									Continued Dissemination

DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

Introduction

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to federally funded digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, assets, software, and datasets). The products you create with IMLS funding require careful stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and re-use by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. However, applying these principles to the development and management of digital products can be challenging. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

Instructions

You must provide answers to the questions in Part I. In addition, you must also complete at least one of the subsequent sections. If you intend to create or collect digital content, resources, or assets, complete Part II. If you intend to develop software, complete Part III. If you intend to create a dataset, complete Part IV.

PART I: Intellectual Property Rights and Permissions

A.1 What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (content, resources, assets, software, or datasets) you intend to create? Who will hold the copyright(s)? How will you explain property rights and permissions to potential users (for example, by assigning a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, or Creative Commons to the product)? Explain and justify your licensing selections.

A.2 What ownership rights will your organization assert over the new digital products and what conditions will you impose on access and use? Explain and justify any terms of access and conditions of use and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms or conditions.

A.3 If you will create any products that may involve privacy concerns, require obtaining permissions or rights, or raise any cultural sensitivities, describe the issues and how you plan to address them.

Part II: Projects Creating or Collecting Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

A. Creating or Collecting New Digital Content, Resources, or Assets

A.1 Describe the digital content, resources, or assets you will create or collect, the quantities of each type, and format you will use.

A.2 List the equipment, software, and supplies that you will use to create the content, resources, or assets, or the name of the service provider that will perform the work.

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG) you plan to use, along with the relevant information about the appropriate quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, or pixel dimensions).

B. Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

B.1 Describe your quality control plan (i.e., how you will monitor and evaluate your workflow and products).

B.2 Describe your plan for preserving and maintaining digital assets during and after the award period of performance. Your plan may address storage systems, shared repositories, technical documentation, migration planning, and commitment of organizational funding for these purposes. Please note: You may charge the federal award before closeout for the costs of publication or sharing of research results if the costs are not incurred during the period of performance of the federal award (see 2 C.F.R. § 200.461).

C. Metadata

C.1 Describe how you will produce any and all technical, descriptive, administrative, or preservation metadata. Specify which standards you will use for the metadata structure (e.g., MARC, Dublin Core, Encoded Archival Description, PBCore, PREMIS) and metadata content (e.g., thesauri).

C.2 Explain your strategy for preserving and maintaining metadata created or collected during and after the award period of performance.

C.3 Explain what metadata sharing and/or other strategies you will use to facilitate widespread discovery and use of the digital content, resources, or assets created during your project (e.g., an API [Application Programming Interface], contributions to a digital platform, or other ways you might enable batch queries and retrieval of metadata).

D. Access and Use

D.1 Describe how you will make the digital content, resources, or assets available to the public. Include details such as the delivery strategy (e.g., openly available online, available to specified audiences) and underlying hardware/software platforms and infrastructure (e.g., specific digital repository software or leased services, accessibility via standard web browsers, requirements for special software tools in order to use the content).

D.2 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Uniform Resource Locator) for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

Part III. Projects Developing Software

A. General Information

A.1 Describe the software you intend to create, including a summary of the major functions it will perform and the intended primary audience(s) it will serve.

A.2 List other existing software that wholly or partially performs the same functions, and explain how the software you intend to create is different, and justify why those differences are significant and necessary.

B. Technical Information

B.1 List the programming languages, platforms, software, or other applications you will use to create your software and explain why you chose them.

B.2 Describe how the software you intend to create will extend or interoperate with relevant existing software.

B.3 Describe any underlying additional software or system dependencies necessary to run the software you intend to create.

B.4 Describe the processes you will use for development, documentation, and for maintaining and updating documentation for users of the software.

B.5 Provide the name(s) and URL(s) for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

C. Access and Use

C.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for software to develop and release these products under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What ownership rights will your organization assert over the software you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on its access and use? Identify and explain the license under which you will release source code for the software you develop (e.g., BSD, GNU, or MIT software licenses). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions.

C.2 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users.

C.3 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop:

Name of publicly accessible source code repository:

URL:

Part IV: Projects Creating Datasets

A.1 Identify the type of data you plan to collect or generate, and the purpose or intended use to which you expect it to be put. Describe the method(s) you will use and the approximate dates or intervals at which you will collect or generate it.

A.2 Does the proposed data collection or research activity require approval by any internal review panel or institutional review board (IRB)? If so, has the proposed research activity been approved? If not, what is your plan for securing approval?

A.3 Will you collect any personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information? If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect such information while you prepare the data files for public release (e.g., data anonymization, data suppression PII, or synthetic data).

A.4 If you will collect additional documentation, such as consent agreements, along with the data, describe plans for preserving the documentation and ensuring that its relationship to the collected data is maintained.

A.5 What methods will you use to collect or generate the data? Provide details about any technical requirements or dependencies that would be necessary for understanding, retrieving, displaying, or processing the dataset(s).

A.6 What documentation (e.g., data documentation, codebooks) will you capture or create along with the dataset(s)? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the dataset(s) it describes?

A.7 What is your plan for archiving, managing, and disseminating data after the completion of the award-funded project?

A.8 Identify where you will deposit the dataset(s):

Name of repository:

URL:

A.9 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?