

Iowa Library Services / State Library of Iowa

Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)

Grants to States Implementation Evaluation

FFY 2013 – FFY 2017

Evaluators:

Martha A. Kyrillidou, Ph.D.

William Wilson, M.L.S

Shana Hattis, M.S.Ed.

Ethel Himmel, Ph.D.



QUALITYMETRICS

Helping libraries achieve success

www.qualitymetricsllc.com

March 8, 2017

Commissioned by

Michael Scott, State Librarian



**STATE LIBRARY
OF IOWA**

INFORMATION • CONSULTATION • DESTINATION

WWW.STATELIBRARYOFIOWA.ORG



INSTITUTE *of*
Museum and Library
SERVICES

Table of Contents

Evaluation Summary	3
Evaluation Report	8
A. Retrospective Questions	8
B. Process Questions	25
C. Methodology Questions	26
Appendix A: List of Acronyms	29
Appendix B: List of People in Focus Groups and Interviews	30
Appendix C: Bibliography of All Documents Reviewed.....	33
Appendix D: Focus Group Protocol.....	34
Appendix E: Survey Instrument	35
Appendix F: Summary of Survey Results	57
Appendix G: LSTA Funding Allotments 2013-2015 Mapped to Goals	69
Appendix H: Iowa’s LSTA Goals Mapped to Grants to State Priorities Addressed	72

Evaluation Summary

Iowa Library Services/State Library of Iowa receives the thirtieth largest Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States allotment, an amount determined based on a population formula. (NOTE: For simplicity's sake, the LSTA Grants to States program will be referred to simply as LSTA in this report rather than constantly using the "Grants to States" designation.) The Iowa Library Services/State Library of Iowa was responsible for the expenditure of slightly more than \$5.4 million in LSTA funds over the three-year period (Federal Fiscal Year [FFY] 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015) covered by this evaluation. However, this small allotment comes with significant challenges, as it is being called upon to serve 544 public libraries, 77 academic libraries, 64 special libraries, and 49 other types of libraries.

The population of the state (estimate as of July 1, 2016) is 3,134,693 million, a slight increase of 2.9 percent since the 2010 census; we would characterize this as very slow growth. Persons under 5 years old decreased slightly from 6.6 percent in 2010 to 6.3 percent in 2015. A similar decline was noted for persons less than 18 years of age; this fell from 23.9 percent in 2010 to 23.3 percent in 2015. On the other hand, the proportion of persons age 65 years and over increased from 14.9 percent to 16.1 percent. In racial and ethnic groups, the proportion of Black or African Americans increased slightly from 2.9 percent to 3.5 percent, the proportion of Asians increased from 1.7 percent to 2.4 percent, and the proportion of Hispanic or Latinos increased from 5 percent to 5.7 percent. Median household income (in 2015 dollars) for 2011-2015 was \$53,183 and per capita income \$27,950.¹

Library Context

Iowa Library Services was established in 2011 by joining two different agencies, the Library Service Areas and the State Library of Iowa. As of 2016, the agency went back to using the established name of State Library of Iowa. The new agency played a critical role in maintaining the strength of all the public libraries in the state while also providing important access to databases for both academic and public libraries. The number of public libraries is especially large, as it represents on average one library for every 5,762 people. Many of these libraries deploy less than 2 FTEs and the need for professional support services is a major one as a result.

In Iowa, there is increased demand for children and youth services during the summer in rural areas where children visit relatives and grandparents on their farms. There are also increased demands for services for older adults throughout the year. Small libraries are often the only local government institution left in town after schools and businesses close and relocate to other areas. Consequently, small public libraries, especially those located in rural settings, play an important role in supporting the

¹ QuickFacts uses data from the following sources: National level - Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC); State level - American Community Survey (ACS), one-year estimates; County level - The Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE), one-year estimates; Sub-county level: Cities, towns and census designated places; - ACS, five-year estimates: <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/19> and <https://factfinder.census.gov>

local residents and providing a social hub for the community. On the other hand, the needs of urban centers are slightly different, due to the growth trajectories of their populations and the need to absorb a greater portion of the ethnic and linguistic diversity that is emerging in Iowa. Academic and research libraries have many specialized needs for content and access as well. Some of these needs are being met with additional collaborative activities.

The need for collaboration continues to be strong, and regional collaboration is encouraged through the LSTA 2013-2017 plan. Regional and statewide collaborations need to be encouraged more aggressively. The recently revised standards do a superb job of codifying the needs of libraries for maintaining quality services at a variety of staffing levels. Institutionalizing the requirement of a director with a master's degree is an important first step in ensuring quality services are established in all regions. Collaboration needs to be emphasized more aggressively as a cornerstone for supporting high quality library services. Libraries that cannot support their own full-time director with a master's degree may subcontract or participate in larger networks with credentialed leadership.

Iowa's LSTA allotment translates into less than 58 cents per person per year. It is obvious that LSTA funds alone are inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Iowans. Meeting these needs requires, and will continue to require, a partnership that involves local governments and school districts, public and private institutions of higher learning, and a vast array of governmental and non-profit agencies. IaLS's main challenge through the evaluation period has been to establish the agency as an effective vehicle for making 58 cents per person transformative in terms of library services.

Overcoming this roadblock requires leveraging a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and obtaining other public and private monies in support of library and information services. In the opinion of the evaluators, IaLS has largely conquered this difficulty by effectively carrying out the specific goals that are contained in its five-year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017.

There are five goals in the ***Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five Year Plan for Iowa 2013 – 2017*** listed in Table 1.

These goals have several interesting characteristics. First and foremost, many of the goals focus on strengthening libraries. Meeting the needs of libraries speaks to the fact that the state has a very large number of libraries, which makes it harder to focus on end-user outcomes-based evaluation. Some of the goals are aspirational in nature (Goal 1 and 5 especially). While it is possible to assess progress and real achievements, fully attaining such a goal demands ongoing attention and effort. This is the kind of goal that an institution may need to achieve today but must be "re-achieved" tomorrow.

A. Retrospective Questions

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

As part of the assessment process, the evaluators asked the IaLS State Librarian and Program Director to offer their personal appraisals of progress toward each of the five goals included in IaLS’s 2013-2017 Five-Year Plan. Because the state was only three years into the implementation of a five-year plan, it was unlikely that any of the goals would be completely or finally achieved. In recognition of this reality, IaLS’s internal assessment was that the state library agency ACHIEVED almost all of its goals and PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 3. The evaluators share the viewpoint that fully achieving several of the goals will remain elusive and will require ongoing efforts. The evidence we collected concurs with this viewpoint. Goal 3 focuses on the databases and technology investments. There has not been as much progress achieved with the school libraries in this front. The databases are also challenging for the large number of small public libraries in Iowa, which do not have professional staff to maximize the use of these resources. Overall, this indicates issues of efficiency and the need to address the structural issue of what is an accredited library. The recent revision of the Accreditation Standards addressed this issue. However, this is an evolving need, and plans for the next revision of these standards should be ongoing.

Table 1 offers a summary of both IaLS’s internal assessments and the evaluator’s conclusions.

Table 1 - IaLS Assessment of the Goals

GOAL 1: Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.	ACHIEVED
GOAL 2: Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to Iowans	ACHIEVED
GOAL 3: Maximize library service for Iowans through enhanced collaboration to benefit Iowa libraries of all types	PARTLY ACHIEVED
GOAL 4: Deliver access to Iowa Library Services’ collections.	ACHIEVED
GOAL 5: Foster a culture of innovation and collaboration within Iowa Library Services.	ACHIEVED

More specifically for each goal we have the following observations to make:

The full evaluation will show that the evaluators believe that IaLS has been mostly successful in its accomplishments related to Goals 1, 2, and 4, that it has (and sufficiently to qualify as ACHIEVED) met Goal 5. Goal 3 is characterized as Partly Achieved because there was not as much progress achieved in school libraries, and because the very large numbers of small public libraries do not utilize the database resources to their full potential. However, the evaluators would like to highlight that the large number of small public libraries in the state is a structural issue of emphasizing library-specific metrics. The evaluators encourage the agency to emphasize library patron outcomes assessment metrics in the future.

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 evaluators believe that Iowa has done a good job of addressing the Measuring Success focal areas. In fact, in our considered opinion, having worked with more than two dozen states on LSTA evaluations, Iowa is among the leaders in regard to strengthening the library infrastructure with its Continuing Education efforts supported with LSTA funds. The emphases on capacity building, lifelong learning, and literacy are especially noteworthy given the uneven socio-economic landscape in the state. While efforts have been made in strengthening collaboration and technology utilization, this is an area where more strategic emphasis and action needs to take place.

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

- YES Library workforce (current and future)
- NO Individuals living below the poverty line
- NO Individuals that are unemployed/underemployed
- NO Ethnic or minority populations
- NO Immigrants/refugees
- NO Individuals with disabilities
- NO Individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills
- NO Families
- YES Children (aged 0-5)
- NO School-aged youth (aged 6-17)

While it is possible to cite individual programs that target ALL of the target audiences, only the Library Workforce and Children (aged 0 – 5) met the 10% of funding test imposed by IMLS. This is primarily because the two largest programs (databases and the suite of SILO services) account for forty-three percent (43%) of LSTA expenditures and capacity building for twenty-nine percent (29%) of expenditures. Staff development and consulting efforts targeting the library workforce do meet the 10% benchmark, as do programs targeting young children (when Summer Reading and a variety of related activities are taken as a whole).

B. Process Questions

B-1. How have you used data from the old and new State Program Report (SPR) and elsewhere to guide activities included in the Five-Year Plan? Data has primarily been used to inform decision-making on adjustments to LSTA initiatives.

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

B-3. How and with whom have you shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources? SPR data has been shared directly with key staff internally and indirectly with the Advisory Group, Library Commissioners, the library community, and state governmental entities.

C. Methodology Questions

C-1. Identify how you implemented an independent Five-Year Evaluation using the criteria described in the section of this guidance document called Selection of Evaluators.

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation, IaLS issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and selected an evaluator based on a competitive process that used the IMLS criteria.

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.

QualityMetrics, LLC, Library Consultants employed a mixed-methods approach that included a review of the SPR, documents and statistics, focus groups, personal interviews and a web-based survey.

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

IaLS staff was engaged through personal interviews. Library staff and stakeholders were engaged through focus groups, personal interviews, and a web-based survey.

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

IaLS will share the findings of the evaluation with a variety of partner agencies in Iowa (governmental, other public, and non-profit) and with the larger public. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website.

Evaluation Report

A. Retrospective Questions

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is based on a review of three years of performance. It reflects activities undertaken by Iowa Library Services / State Library of Iowa (IaLS) using Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States funding for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015. The challenges associated with evaluating this period were significant. The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) transitioned from a legacy State Program Report (SPR) system to a new SPR system, which represented a major change in the way in which State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) reported on their projects and activities.

Changes built into the new system, which enhanced the ability to track outcomes, focal areas, and targeted audiences in the long term, affected the ways in which States reported their projects in the short term. In fact, the structure with which SPR data was captured during the three-year period differed somewhat each year. IaLS reported the same or similar activities in slightly different ways in different years due to the new reporting protocols established by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

This, as well as the fact that the SPR system itself was still undergoing revision during the period covered by the evaluation, often resulted in a lack of parallel reporting. While the change in the SPR was long overdue and should enhance reporting in the future, it nevertheless often left the evaluators with a difficult task in making “apples to apples” comparisons. Fortunately, the mixed methods evaluation approach used by the evaluators, which incorporated interviews, focus groups, and a web-based survey, in addition to a review of the SPR and other statistical reports provided by the state library agency, proved invaluable and successfully dealt with most of these challenges.

Five key activities were evaluated through a web survey distributed to public libraries: Summer Reading, the Iowa Center for the Book, Continuing Education, Resource Sharing, and E-resources. Two hundred and thirty-three people in public libraries responded to the LSTA web survey. The two hundred and nine libraries represented were in eighty-four of Iowa’s ninety-nine counties. The analysis divided the respondents into three sizes of libraries based on the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members. Small libraries had less than two FTE; mid-size libraries had two to four FTE; and large libraries had more than four FTE.

The evaluation that follows is structured around the IMLS’ **“Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation”** and the five goals that appeared in the Iowa Library Services / State Library of Iowa Five-Year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017. We will first report on the “Retrospective Questions” (Section A) posed by IMLS for each of the five goals. We will then proceed to respond to the “Process Questions” (Section B) and “Methodology Questions” (Section C) as a whole, noting any differences that apply to individual goals.

There are five goals in the *Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five Year Plan for Iowa 2013 – 2017*:

GOAL 1: Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.

GOAL 2: Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to Iowans

GOAL 3: Maximize library service for Iowans through enhanced collaboration to benefit Iowa libraries of all types

GOAL 4: Deliver access to Iowa Library Services' collections.

GOAL 5: Foster a culture of innovation and collaboration within Iowa Library Services.

More specifically for each goal we have the following observations to make:

GOAL 1

Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.

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

This goal had five objectives and multiple activities under each objective and accounted for \$649,150 (13%) of the LSTA funds expended over FFY13-15. All five objectives served under this goal were achieved and detailed descriptions of activities are available in the State Program Reports (SPR) submitted to IMLS:

Objectives:

1a) Stimulate and promote public interest in books, reading, literacy and libraries through programs such as the Iowa Center for the Book and the statewide annual Summer Library Program.

1b) Help librarians meet the special library-related needs of English language learners, job seekers, Iowans living in poverty and Iowans with disabilities.

1c) Take a leadership role in communicating the essential roles Iowa libraries play as physical places for community gatherings and centers of early literacy skill development, lifelong learning, workforce development and economic enhancement.

1d) Provide training and tools to support local libraries in building civic engagement in their communities.

1e) Collect statistical information about Iowa libraries and help librarians use statistics to tell the library story.

Highlighted Activities: A brief summary of highlighted activities is offered here to be illustrative of the types of projects supported (Table 2) and fulfilling the objectives listed here.

Table 2: Goal 1: Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.

	Objective	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
GOAL 1. Projects			
Iowa Center for the Book	1A	125,528	2%
Summer Reading Program	1A	244,034	5%
Help Librarians Meet Special Needs	1B	77,677	2%
Library Grants	1B	29,624	1%
Communicate Essential Role of Libraries / Enhancing Library Services - Physical Places (23 Reasons)	1C	116,972	2%
Collect Information to Tell Library Story	1E	55,315	1%
TOTAL		649,150	13%

The plan identifies the following output and outcome measures for this goal:

Table 3. Output and Outcome Measures for Goal 1 Activities

	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL
# of librarians attending Summer Library Program workshops	488	388	387	1,263
Use of Online Career Development Resource - sessions	10,912	10,997	13,663	35,572
Use of Online Career Development Resource - searches*	108,941	149,317	10,197	268,455
Size of large print collection	11,516	11,582	11,772	34,870
Circulation of large print collection	21,408	27,905	27,876	77,189
# of librarians attending early literacy skill development	154	535	37	726
% of librarians better able to serve Iowans after taking Public Library Management 1 and 2	100%	100%	100%	
% of Iowans who improve their knowledge of/confidence by taking classes through the Smart Investing grant	76%	n/a	n/a	
% of large print readers who indicate the service enhances their quality of life	88%	100%	94%	

*(FY15 – Learning Express had a software issue in counting searches)

Two key activities were examined more closely in relation to public libraries: Summer Reading and the Iowa Center for the Book.

Summer Reading Program- Summary findings

All the respondents' libraries offered a summer reading program in 2016. All three categories of libraries offered the most complete program (resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs) to school-aged children, although some libraries in each group also offered the complete program to pre-school children, teens, and adults. Only sixteen percent of the small library respondents said their library offered the complete program for adults.

Approximately ninety percent of the respondents from all sizes of libraries said they had used the planning guide and/or other Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) materials. Seventy-four percent of the small library respondents agreed that their staff members have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Eighty-three percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed with the statement. Ninety-one percent of the large library respondents agreed.

Seventy-two percent of the small library respondents agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to carry out an effective summer reading program. Seventy-three percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed with the statement. Sixty-seven percent of the large library respondents agreed.

Eighty-six percent of the small library respondents rated the CSLP Manual as good or excellent. No one rated it as poor. Seventy-nine percent of the mid-size library respondents gave the CSLP Manual a good or excellent rating. Seventy-two percent of the large library respondents rated the CSLP Manual as good or excellent.

Fifty-eight percent of the small library respondents rated the general summer reading program advice and consultation as good. Forty-five percent of the mid-size library respondents gave the advice and consultation a good rating. Among the large library respondents, forty-four percent rated it good.

Small library respondents said help with program planning/curriculum design would make the most difference in terms of improving their summer reading program. Fifty-six percent of the mid-size libraries respondents tied in saying help with program planning/curriculum design and training on public engagement would make the most difference. Large libraries respondents said training on public engagement would make the most difference.

In particular, of the small libraries, ninety (90.7) percent offered the more complete program services (resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs as compared with only self-help guides, reading lists, and other resources provided without staff led events or programs) for school-aged children. Eighty-five (85.3) percent offered this level of program for pre-school children. Forty-two (42.5) percent offered this level for teens and sixteen (16.7) percent offered it for adults.

Seventy-two (72.1) percent of the small library respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to carry out an effective summer reading

program. Seventy-three (73.6) percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-seven (67.6) percent of the large library respondents agreed or strongly agreed.

Clearly, there is a difference in the needs of small, medium, and large libraries. This is corroborated by the comments we received from stakeholders in the survey and during the focus groups and interviews:

Small library group:

:I don't think I need more training, just more time. As a one-person library summer reading is only one of my many duties."

Small library on not having *"enough kids in town to do everything."*

"We have lost many of our children to summer school sports activities."

Large- and medium-size libraries:

'Inventive ways to promote the program," and "better support from our city on staffing and budget items."

Iowa Center for the Book

Awareness of the activities of the Iowa Center for the Book among the respondents to the survey increases as the size of the library increases. Similarly, the percent of respondents saying their library had participated in a program associated with the Iowa Center for the Book during the last three years increases as the size of the library increases. Twenty percent of small library respondents said their library had participated in such a program; thirty-nine percent of the mid-size and fifty-one percent of the large library respondents said their library had participated. The value of the offerings from the Iowa Center for the Book is also captured with the following quotes:

Local Arts Council Board Member on All Iowa Reads:

"In recent years, we've collaborated with our public library and other groups on an All Iowa Reads event. Somehow last year got away from us, but I'm determined to get back on the horse for 2017."

Teacher whose students participate in the Letters About Literature Program:

"We began yesterday with our letter ideas. The kids are fired up! Thank you for all you do."

Library participating in the Traveling Book Exhibit:

"... from our time with the History of the Book Exhibit. We displayed all items in our display case. We had an 'Edible Book' program where kids listened to The Very Hungry Caterpillar and then made caterpillars out of cucumbers, tomatoes and cheese. Thank you for letting us display the books, it was a huge hit."

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?

Projects and activities under Goal 1 have very successfully addressed the Lifelong Learning and Literacy focal area. A case can also be made that specific activities under this goal have had a positive impact in the Institutional Capacity, Workforce Development, Economic Development, and Civic Engagement areas. Specifically, the Summer Reading and other training enable many libraries to far exceed the service levels that they would be able to achieve with local funding.

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

Goal 1 projects and activities have targeted a variety of audiences. While there are individual projects that address the needs of some of the target audiences, the magnitude of funding related to these target audiences is far below the ten percent threshold established by IMLS.

Taken as a whole, the evaluators judge that IaLS has ACHIEVED (and is re-achieving daily) Goal 1.

GOAL 2

Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to lowans

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

This goal had five objectives and multiple activities under each objective and accounted for \$1,572,625 (29%) of the LSTA funds expended over FFY13-15. All five objectives served under this goal were achieved and detailed descriptions of activities are available in the State Program Reports (SPR) submitted to IMLS:

Objectives:

2a) Deliver consulting services and continuing education courses (online & face-to-face) for Iowa library staff and boards that highlight best practices in library governance, management and service delivery. (All IaLS staff)

2b) Define public library standards & administer certification & accreditation programs built on the standards. (LSN)

2c) Take a leadership role in monitoring trends & sharing information on technology & other developments that affect libraries. (All IaLS staff)

2d) Enhance the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program. (LSN, SILO)

2e) Provide training & tools to support local libraries in delivering digital literacy and early literacy training so that lowans can thrive in the 21st century. (LSN)

Table 4. Goal 2: Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to lowans

	Objective	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
GOAL 2. Projects			
Consulting Services	2A	476,336	9%
Leadership Institute	2A	6,000	0%
Library Space Grants	2A	28,286	1%
Certification and Accreditation Programs	2B	586,611	11%
Library Science Collection	2C	47,047	1%
E-rate and Broadband	2D	73,457	1%
Enhance the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program	2D	199,296	4%
Early Literacy (Kids First)	2E	155,591	3%
TOTAL		1,572,625	29%

Highlighted Activities:

The plan identifies the following output and outcome measures for this goal:

Table 5. Output and Outcome Measures for Goal 2 Activities

	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL
Number of librarians who attend training	3,892	4,244	4,284	12,420
Number of consulting contacts each year	5,258	12,378	10,363	27,999
Number of library site visits per year	397	403	540	1,340
Number of library staff attending PLOW training	427	156	160	743
% of participating library staff who report having stronger leadership skills as a result of the Leadership Institute	n/a	100%	n/a	
% of public libraries accredited	64%	65%	65%	
% of participants in early literacy training who report improved skills in early literacy skill development	84%	96%	86%	

Web seminars and in-person meetings were a high priority of Iowa's. The CE offerings have provided libraries with information on how to do daily activities in their libraries and have encouraged them to try new and different initiatives within their communities. These programs have been highly successful and received high ratings in the various evaluation forms that were distributed, including pre- and post-assessments conducted for different workshops and training opportunities.

The data in the following table show the extent of the CE programs among Iowa libraries and library staff due to the variety of training that is provided and the number of Iowa librarians that attend these training sessions. During these three years, the agency provided 524 offerings of continuing education

via in-person, online, or asynchronous offerings, with a total of 12,420 cumulative attendees. The offerings range from how to do reports (for library and for State Library), how to weed collections, and how to utilize various databases, to working with websites, trustee training, developing policies, programming in libraries for all ages, library management, digital literacy, and a multitude of other topics. With the majority of Iowa libraries in towns with population of under 2,500 people, most librarians in the state do not have any knowledge of what is needed to run a library; training and consultations thus help them to serve their patrons more effectively.

Table6 summarizes the offerings and the attendance:

Table 6: Goal 2. Module Offerings and Attendance

Type of module	Number of events	Percent of total events	Number of attendees	Percent of total attendees
In person	206	58.1	5455	38.9
Online	220	36.4	6422	54.6
Moodle		5.5	543	6.4
Total	524)	100.0	12,420	100.0

Continuing Education

Participants representing all three library categories are roughly equally aware of two of the seven continuing education offerings: technology training and education and training in community engagement. However, training in community engagement was in last place (seventh) in terms of awareness for all three categories of libraries.

Among the small library respondents, the highest percents had attended children’s/young adult training and education and technology training and education. The highest percentages of other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education.

The highest percentages of respondents representing mid-size libraries said they had personally participated in adult/information services training and education and technology training and education. The highest percentages of other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education, and technology training and education.

The highest percentages of large library respondents had personally attended trustee training and education and strategic planning. The highest percentages of other staff members had participated in children’s/young adult training and education and adult/information services training and education.

Among all three sizes of libraries the training opportunities with the lowest participation were leadership training and training in community engagement.

Children’s/Young Adult services training and education received the highest percentage of satisfaction from respondents in all three library size groupings (see Table 7, which follows immediately).

Table 7. Offerings and Percentage Satisfied with Children’s/Young Adult Services

Offering	% Small Library Satisfied	% Mid-size Satisfied	% Large Satisfied
Children’s/Young Adult services training and education	60.7%	61.5%	72.7%
Adult/Information services training and education	55.8%	58.5%	61.1%
Technology training and education	54.3%	58.5%	48.6%
Trustee training and education	51.8%	53.8%	62.1%
Strategic planning	41.3%	56.6%	66.6%
Training in community engagement	36.9%	44.2%	40.5%
Leadership training	34.7%	45.3%	62.1%

More specifically, the Web survey asked respondents whether they (or a member of their staff) had participated in any of the seven training and education offerings listed above. Among the small library respondents, the highest percentages had attended (in decreasing order) children’s/young adult training and education (75.2 percent), technology training and education (71.2 percent), trustee training and education (67.4 percent), and adult/information services training and education (66.4 percent). The highest percent of small library respondents said other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (26.3 percent). Given that the small library group represents libraries with less than two FTE staff members, this level of participation seems realistic.

The respondents representing mid-size libraries (FTE staff of two to four) said they had personally participated in adult/information services training and education (75.5 percent), technology training and education (71.2 percent), strategic planning (69.4 percent), and trustee training and education (64.7 percent). Other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (69.8 percent), technology training and education (40.4 percent), and adult/information services training and education (30.2 percent).

Large library respondents (FTE staff of more than four) had personally attended trustee training and education (69.4 percent), strategic planning (57.1 percent), adult/information services training, and education (54.1 percent), leadership training (54.1 percent), technology training and education (38.9 percent), and training in community engagement (38.9 percent). Other staff members had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (91.9 percent), adult/information services training and education (64.9 percent), and technology training and education (52.8 percent).

Overall, the evaluators believe that IaLS has achieved most of what is set out to accomplish under Goal 2. While efforts must be ongoing, the projects supported under Goal 2 have made a big difference in the lives of many Iowans.

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? This goal served the Lifelong Learning and Workforce Development focal areas.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities?

(Yes/No) YES. Applying the 10 percent of expenditures test results in the conclusion that the Library Workforce is a key constituency served through these activities.

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

Goal 3 had five objectives and multiple activities under each objective and accounted for \$2,336,845 (43%) of the LSTA funds expended over FFY13-15. All five objectives served under this goal were achieved and detailed descriptions of activities are available in the State Program Reports (SPR) submitted to IMLS:

Objectives:

3a) Increase statewide availability of subscription databases & other digital resources. Research & share developing trends in making e-books & other digital resources available through libraries. (LSN, SLS)

3b) Help libraries stretch their budgets by pursuing & publicizing library discounts & facilitating the development of library purchasing consortia. (LSN)

3c) Support school library programs by collaborating with the Iowa Library Association/Iowa Association of School Librarians, the Department of Education, the Area Education Agencies & others. (LSN)

3d) Enhance the statewide SILO interlibrary loan system & develop a shared lib automation system or systems. (LSN, SILO, SLS)

3e) Encourage & facilitate communication among Iowa libraries aimed at sharing best practices & developing solutions to shared problems. (All IaLS staff)

Table 8: GOAL 3. Maximize Library Service for Iowans Through Enhanced Collaboration to Benefit Iowa Libraries of All Types

	Objective	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
GOAL 3. Projects			
Statewide Databases (EBSCO) / SILO & ILL	3A/3D	2,178,819	40%
Promote Discounts and Consortia / Increasing Access to Materials and Services (Bridges/discounts; cooperative purchasing)	3B	130,219	2%
Share Best Practices	3E	27,807	1%
TOTAL		2,336,845	43%

Highlighted Activities:

Goal 3 aims at providing increased access to library resources and developing technology support services. This goal aims at increasing statewide availability of library materials, subscription databases, and other digital resources. It also provides and supports a statewide inter-library loan program (SILO) to encourage and allow Iowans to find items not available in their community libraries and to help libraries to share their materials. Iowans can collaboratively license electronic resources. IaLS contributes partial funding for the databases and supports a suite of technology services under the SILO brand as well as resource sharing and ILL.

Databases: EBSCOhost is the statewide periodical and reference database provided and supported by IaLS and available to all Iowa libraries. IaLS worked directly with EBSCOHost to obtain library discounts for additional databases that supplemented their standard resource, specifically Auto Repair Reference Center, Consumer Health Complete, Hobbies & Crafts Reference Center, Home Improvement Reference Center, NovelList Plus, NovelList Select, Small Engine Repair, and Library Aware. The State Library subsidized a small portion of the costs for libraries that purchased the additional databases, with preference given to smaller libraries that would not be able to afford to subscribe to these resources on their own. A schedule for publicizing and signing up for EBSCOHost add-on databases was developed and 79 libraries added additional databases to their accounts.

Iowa Workforce Development (IWD) also provided \$150,000 in funding to IaLS “for the purpose of licensing an online resource which prepares persons to succeed in the workplace through programs which improve job skills and vocational test-taking abilities.” Thanks to the funding from IWD, the LearningExpress Library is available at no charge to all Iowa public and academic libraries for all of 2014. The LearningExpress Library provides unlimited access to interactive skill building courses in math, reading, and writing, as well as a broad range of practice tests based on official exams such as the ACT, SAT, GED, ASVAB Core, and EMT Basic, as well as firefighter, police officer, paramedic, Allied Healthcare, U.S. citizenship, postal worker, cosmetology, and real estate agent and broker exams. The service is available 24/7 from any Internet-enabled computer—in the library or from home. This service also is a great foundation for building a closer relation with school libraries.

Unfortunately, one of the objectives, *3c) Support school library programs by collaborating with the Iowa Library Association/Iowa Association of School Librarians, the Department of Education, the Area Education Agencies & others. (LSN)* has not been as successful. New efforts are developed to work more effectively with schools and identifying ways to assist school librarians.

Regarding e-resources, the following summarizes the outcomes from the web survey: **e-resources**

Of the six e-resources listed in the survey, EBSCO clearly provides the most satisfaction for all three categories of libraries, followed by WorldCat. Very few respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with the e-resources but frequently said they were “not familiar with the resource/unable to rate [it].”

Thirty-six percent of the small library respondents, thirty percent of the mid-size library respondents, and forty-five percent of the large library respondents agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the online resources provided by the State Library of

Iowa. Respondents in all three library size categories agreed that the availability of these e-resources broadens the range of services/resources their patrons can access. Sixty-two percent of the small library respondents, seventy-one percent of the mid-size library respondents, and seventy-five percent of the large library respondents said they were satisfied with the online resources. Overall, seventy percent said their library had participated in the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program.

SILO: is a joint program of the [State Library of Iowa](#) and the [Iowa State University Library](#). SILO offers resource sharing services, including the Iowa Locator and SILO ILL to all types of libraries in Iowa. SILO also offers hosted services including DNS, e-mail, e-mail lists, and Web hosting to any public library with a high-speed Internet connection.

SILO Project staff members created a statewide union catalog known as the Locator, which currently includes holdings from 699 libraries. They also developed a Web-based interlibrary loan application that is currently being used by 712 Iowa libraries of all types. Approximately 25 libraries participated in a pilot project that supported searching remote catalogs via the Z39.50 protocol, and 33 libraries used SILO's frame-relay network to access the Internet. The SILO program continues to support the Locator and interlibrary loan program, work with Iowa public libraries to facilitate high-speed Internet access, and provide statewide access to electronic databases, including OCLC's FirstSearch and EBSCOhost.

SILO holdings at the end of FY16 are 4,506,046 bibs, with 17,160,802 items from 673 libraries. As part of the Enrich Iowa Program, the State Library continues to reimburse libraries as an incentive for participating in inter-library loan. The staff members at Iowa State University have been working on updating the software that the SILO program uses, with the goal of providing a better system to librarians in FFY17.

Resource Sharing-Outcomes - Web survey summary

Ninety-four percent of the small library respondents said their library participated in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and ninety-eight percent said they used interlibrary loan (ILL). Ninety-eight percent said their library informed patrons about their ILL options. Ninety-seven percent send physical items to other libraries through the mail. Ninety-five percent fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Only forty-eight percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa and only twenty-two percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

Among the mid-size library participants, ninety-four percent said their library participated in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and ninety-eight percent said they used ILL. One hundred percent said their library informed patrons about their ILL options. Ninety-eight percent send physical items to other libraries through the mail. Ninety-eight percent fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Sixty-seven percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa, and only forty-one percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

Among the large library respondents, ninety-seven percent participate in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and all said they used ILL. All said their library informed patrons about their ILL options, send physical items to other libraries through the mail, and fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Sixty-nine percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa, and only forty percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

While many believe their library suffers no barriers to full participation in ILL, the barriers identified by others were cost, lack of staff time, speed of delivery, and SILO itself.

Seventy-nine percent of the small library respondents, sixty-six percent of the mid-size library respondents and sixty-two percent of the large libraries agreed that their library receives the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to offer the public an effective system of resource sharing.

More specifically, regarding the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program, seventy (70.7) percent said their library had participated in it. This represents seventy-one (71.2) percent of the small library responses, seventy-seven (77.4) percent of the mid-size library responses, and fifty-nine (59.5) percent of the large library responses.

One hundred and forty-six participants responded to the question of what the greatest benefit of participation in the PLOW program had been. Those responses were consistent: “A web presence for patrons...,” “Ability to reach more people,” “Another resource for marketing,” “Everything! The availability of the program, the support, the training.” “FREE WEBSITE!” “It has pushed us to have a Web presence. Which has in turn pushed us to move into the 21st Century with our services.” “We have since moved on to hosting our own Website and CMS, but the PLOW program provided a sort of testing ground for what we wanted our Web presence to be.” The PLOW program is of great value to smaller libraries in Iowa, and useful as it may be, some rethinking needs to take place regarding to the role of smaller libraries that may not have a website available at this day and age.

The plan identifies the following output and outcome measures for this goal:

Table 9. Output and Outcome Measures for Goal 3 Activities	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL
Use of subscription databases (sessions/searches)	12,102,143 105,374,422	15,473,809 627,914,358	18,274,130 1,519,093,961	45,850,082 2,252,382,741
Number of Open Access transactions	3,893,686	3,901,952	3,817,282	11,612,920
Number of ILL transactions	246,047	267,003	251,437	764,487
Description of the discounts and purchasing consortia available to Iowa libraries	EBSCO, AWE Stations, supplies	EBSCO, AWE Stations, supplies	EBSCO, AWE Stations, supplies	

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? All focal areas and their corresponding intent are met through Goal 3: Lifelong Learning, Information Access, Institutional Capacity, Economic & Employment Development, Human Services, and Civic Engagement. Goal 3 is the most ambitious goal in the IaLS plan and absorbs most of the financial resources as well.

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

Overall, the evaluators believe that the IaLS has Partly Achieved Goal 3 because a fuller and more robust utilization of the databases would need to include school libraries in a more effective way. Also, many librarians across the state, especially in smaller libraries, don't fully understand the benefit of their library having the databases for their patrons or how to find information on them, and thus have more difficulty in teaching their patrons how to use them.

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

Goal 4 has five objectives and multiple activities under each objective and accounts for \$508,174 (9%) of the LSTA funds expended over FFY13-15. All five objectives served under this goal were achieved and detailed descriptions of activities are available in the State Program Reports (SPR) submitted to IMLS:

Objectives:

4a) Improve access to & understanding of statistics about Iowa's population & economy. (SDC)

4b) Expand & publicize Iowa Publications Online. (SLS)

4c) Improve access to & add additional collections to Iowa Heritage Digital Collections. (SLS)

4d) Expand & promote Iowa Library Services' collections. (SLS)

4e) Improve access to Iowa's state documents. (SLS)

Table 10: GOAL 4 - Deliver access to Iowa Library Services' collections.

	Objective	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
GOAL 4. Projects			
State Data Center	4A	345,172	6%
Improve Iowa Publications Online Info.	4B	47,664	1%
Improve Iowa Digital Heritage Collection	4C	27,253	0%
Improve Iowa Library Services Collections	4D	37,390	1%
Improve Access to Iowa State Documents	4E	50,696	1%
TOTAL		508,174	9%

Highlighted Activities:

State Data Center: The State Data Center is a unit of the State Library of Iowa whose mission is to increase the availability of census data in Iowa and to help people use it. The unit provides access to and understanding of Iowa's population and economy through reports available to Iowans on the State Data Center's website. It supports an official Web site of U.S. Census Bureau with demographic, social, economic, and housing statistics about Iowa; answers to quick data requests; custom data tabulations, thematic maps, statistical profiles of Iowa communities, and special population groups; and training on how to find and use these statistics. Outcomes achieved: support for citizens who use information from the State Data Center to apply for grants, justify their budgets, and become informed about their communities and the state in general. In 2015, IaLS redesigned and promoted the State Data Center Web site. The new SDC website was developed and tested. New site was launched with over 100 reports from the Census Bureau, the Iowa Department of Education, and the Iowa Department of Human Services.

Iowa Digital Heritage Collection: Five collections were added from IaLS to IHC. IaLS added 11 collections contributed by 7 partner institutions and discussed IHDC with 27 potential partners. Presentations at the Iowa Library Association Conference about IHDC were given and a session during National Library Week about a number of cultural heritage websites in Iowa.

Iowa Publications Online Info: In 2016, IaLS developed a systematic approach to contacting departments about using IPO as the repository for state documents. IaLS also planned to offer at least one class a year to new state employees about depositing into IPO and to publicize IPO to depositors and users at least six times. 2,335 documents were added to IPO and 14 new depositors were added. IPO was publicized in the December 2015 *State Library Update* with an article about how the Department of Natural Resources Water Quality Bureau archives its *Water Summary Update Reports* in IPO and general information about IPO for all agencies/departments.

Iowa Library Services Collections: The State Library of Iowa works with ByWater Solutions for the hosting and maintaining the Koha database for the library's catalog. This allows for consistent and frequent updating, cataloging, and retrieval of records so that patrons, whether Iowa residents or Iowa libraries, can find and borrow materials that are owned by the State Library. The State Library also makes the collection available in OCLC's WorldShare database that allows patrons and libraries to borrow items via inter-library loan. Library Technology software is used for cataloging to ensure that the records in the collection are concise and accurate.

Table 11: Items Circulated and Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Statistics

	2013	2014	2015	2016
Items Circulated	698	3,473	5,570	4,962
ILL	3,119	611	531	461

Access to Iowa State Documents: Working with Legislative Services Agency, IaLS added high-value, legacy documents to IPO. IaLS ensured redundancy and back-ups for the IPO data and explored working with agencies to digitize microfilm of unique, legacy state docs to add to IPO.

The plan identifies the following output and outcome measures for this goal:

Table 12. Output and Outcomes Measures for Goal 4 Activities

	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL
Number of state agencies adding documents to IPO	33	51	51	59
Number of reports on the SDC website	207	255	243	243
Number of items in IPO	13,321	15,916	18,300	20,608
Number of depositors adding collections to IHDC	33	12	6	13
Web hits for IPO	98,752	70,589	82,137	251,478
Web hits for SCD	147,845	136,509	165,078	449,432
Web hits for IHDC	16,878	142	749	17,769

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? Goal 4 addresses a number of Measuring Success focal areas through the SDC, IPO and IHDC services such as:

- Lifelong Learning, by improving users’ general knowledge and skills
- Information Access, by improving users’ ability to discover, obtain and/or use information resources
- Economic & Employment Development, by providing vital statistics for employment support, and improving users’ ability to use and apply business resources
- Human Services, by improving users’ ability to apply information that furthers their finances
- Civic Engagement, by improving users’ ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern by providing information about their communities
- Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No) NO. The collections developed under Goal 4 are useful to all groups and do not target a specific group from the list IMLS identified.

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

Goal 5 had five objectives and multiple activities under each objective and accounted for \$172,814 (3%) of the LSTA funds expended over FFY13-15. All five objectives served under this goal were achieved and detailed descriptions of activities are available in the State Program Reports (SPR) submitted to IMLS:

Objectives:

Objective 5a. Provide exemplary library service in the Main Library, the Law Library & the State Data Center. (SLS, SDC)

Objective 5b. Continuously upgrade the knowledge & skills of IaLS staff so that they are equipped to manage change with flexibility & provide high quality leadership, consulting & information services to our constituents. (All IaLS staff)

Objective 5c. Experiment with pilot projects and implement successful ones. (All IaLS staff)

Objective 5d. Share Iowa Library Services successes with stakeholders. (All IaLS staff)

Objective 5e. Build & enhance partnerships with the Ia Lib Assn, Ia DE, AEAs, IPTV & other agencies & organizations whose mission complements that of IaLS.

Table 13: GOAL 5 - Foster a Culture of Innovation and Collaboration Within Iowa Library Services.

	Objective	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
GOAL 5. Projects			
Provide Exemplary Library Services	5A	82,265	2%
State Library Staff Professional Development	5B	79,809	1%
Build and Enhance Partnerships	5E	10,740	0%
TOTAL		172,814	3%

Highlighted Activities:

State Library Staff Professional Development: The State Library of Iowa strives to continuously upgrade the knowledge and skills of State Library of Iowa staff in order to equip them to manage change and innovation with flexibility and to allow them to provide high-quality leadership, consulting, and information to their constituents by:

- Ensuring that staff participate in professional development activities and offer opportunities for staff to attend conferences, workshops, webinars and other educational events.
- Encouraging State Library staff to be involved with organizations or associations that further the mission of Iowa Library Services.
- Building and enhancing partnerships with associations and organizations whose mission complements that of the State Library.
- Developing the staff to be proactive in developing pilot projects and implementing successful ones.

The State Library of Iowa has had staff involved in the Executive Board of the Association for Rural and Small Libraries, as well as the Iowa Library Association; a staff member was also involved on the Iowa Library Association Foundation Board.

Many staff presented sessions at conferences, including ARSL, the Iowa Library Association, and some smaller regional conferences. Several staff attended the ILA Annual Conference, ALA-Midwinter, ARSL, Library Technology Conference, PLA Conference, and ALA Annual Conference.

The PLA Virtual Conference was offered to staff members who did not attend the conference in person. All staff that did not attend the actual conference watched 5 out of the 10 sessions offered virtually, and

wrote a short report allowing for a fit to each person's job. Many staff also attended webinars on a variety of subjects relevant to their job duties and to the furthering of their knowledge of libraries.

The major outcome of this project is that the staff of the State Library of Iowa has participated in other associations that further the State Library of Iowa's purpose. They learn valuable skills that they then bring back to this organization.

Data for the following output indicators identified in the plan are available:

Table 14. Output and Outcome Measures for Goal 5 Activities

	2013	2014	2015	TOTAL
# of reference questions	9,839	10,110	9,453	29,402
# of new library cards	726	818	648	2,192

Several pilot projects were started but not put into place as long-term offerings, such as the statewide delivery system and statewide ILS. Various attempts were tried over the years to provide delivery with different methods, none of which were accepted well by the libraries.

There was also a leadership transition, with two key leadership positions (including the head of IaLS) being new.

Overall, the evaluators judge that this goal was Achieved and continuing efforts to foster innovation will be critical. This goal thus needs to be re-achieved on an ongoing basis by ensuring active participation in planning and strategy formulation by key staff members who can act as champions and engage every member of the organization.

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? Goal 5 supports the following focal areas: Lifelong Learning by improving IaLS staff members’ formal education, general knowledge and skills and Civic Engagement by equipping Iowa Libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans with well-trained leaders and professionals at IaLS.

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

B. Process Questions

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

New and old SPR data is used annually by the Director and other SLAA staff. Elements are included in a variety of the agency’s reports to the public, to the library community, and to state government. Data

from the SPR is also used to establish benchmarks that are reviewed on a periodic basis to assess progress toward the goals stated in the LSTA 2013 – 2017 Five-Year Plan. SPR data has also been shared with specific outside evaluators, such as QualityMetrics Library Consultants for this assessment, in their roles in evaluating specific projects.

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

Iowa's Five-Year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017 was not changed or amended after its submission in 2012 to the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS). While some specific activities mentioned in the Plan were discontinued and others were added, these changes were well within the intent of the plan.

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

Data derived from the State Program Report (SPR) is used internally for both planning and evaluation purposes. It is shared directly with key SLAA staff and various advisory groups and is shared indirectly with legislators and other public officials through periodic reports from the agency. SPR data has also been shared with outside evaluators including QualityMetrics Library Consultants.

C. Methodology Questions

C-1. Identify how you implemented an independent Five-Year Evaluation using the criteria described in the section of this guidance document called Selection of Evaluators.

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation of the SLAA implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, the agency issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on June 30, 2016 to solicit proposals to conduct a "Library Services and Technology Act Evaluation." Proposals were due July 29, 2016.

As a result of a competitive bidding process, QualityMetrics Library Consultants, a library consulting firm headquartered in Silver Spring, Maryland, was awarded the contract to conduct the independent LSTA evaluation. QualityMetrics Library Consultants does not have a role in carrying out other LSTA-funded activities and is independent of those who are being evaluated or who might be favorably or adversely affected by the evaluation results.

QualityMetrics Library Consultants have in-depth evaluation experience and have demonstrated professional competency. Dr. Martha Kyrillidou of QualityMetrics has developed many well-known protocols for value and outcomes assessment for libraries. She has deep experience in library evaluation over her 22 years of service at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL); has taught Research Methods, Assessment, and Evaluation courses at the University of Maryland and at Kent State University; and has extensive practical experience in mixed methods, evaluation, and outcomes assessment. Kyrillidou is a current member of the Library Statistics Working Group (LSWG), chair of the NISO Z39.7 standard, and a mentor of the next generation of public and academic library staff and evaluators. Co-principal

consultant, Bill Wilson of QualityMetrics has implemented evaluation studies for three previous cycles of LSTA evaluations starting in 2002. Wilson is experienced in both quantitative and qualitative methods and has participated in 28 previous five-year LSTA Grants to States evaluations. Shana Hattis is an experienced writer and editor and served as the communications associate for the evaluation project. Ethel Himmel wrote the survey analysis section of the report.

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

QualityMetrics Library Consultants deployed a mixed methods protocol for data collection that is multi-faceted and rigorous. After conducting an initial telephone conference call with representatives of the SLAA, QualityMetrics completed a site-visit to the state library administrative agency (SLAA) on October 28, 2016. In person interviews were held with the agency Director and with key staff engaged in both LSTA and the specific projects carried out under the LSTA Five-Year Plan. A total of three virtual focus groups were conducted on November 28, December 5, and December 13, respectively. Wilson held a total of two in-person focus groups: on December 12 in Johnson and one on December 13 in Coralville. These data gathering efforts were supplemented with site observations data. The site visit and the focus groups provided qualitative evidence and context.

The State Program Reports (SPRs) were reviewed in detail and additional reports, documentation, fliers, newspaper articles, and social media feeds were consulted selectively as corroborating evidence. A Web-based survey conducted November 29 – December 23, 2016 provided additional quantitative and qualitative information. The survey was reviewed for representativeness to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additional corroborative evidence from comments collected in the survey served to triangulate the evidence gathered.

Validity and reliability analysis reflect a positivist worldview and in a qualitative naturalistic approach they are being redefined with some divergent views on whether and how one ensures quality and rigor in qualitative inquiry. The notion that naturalistic inquiry needs to exhibit quality, rigor and trustworthiness is more widespread nowadays. The evaluators engaged in conversations through phone interviews. The quality and rigor of the phone interviews in the LSTA evaluation of IaLS has been enhanced by asking interviewees to allow for the conversation to be recorded with assurances for confidentiality by the evaluators. This approach has allowed evaluators to refine their inquiry and tailor it as knowledge of IaLS was accumulating from one interaction to the next. Recorded conversations also allow the evaluators to reflect and refine their interpretations in a reliable manner. The validity of the inquiry was strengthened with the informed selection of the subjects and inclusiveness of the process. Knowledge of the utilization of LSTA by the interviewee was provided enhancing the interaction and depth of the conversation. Furthermore, Wilson and Kyrillidou participated jointly in the focus groups and the onsite agency interviews allowing for the concept of triangulation to be implemented as evaluators debriefed and compared interpretation and understandings.

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

Key state library agency staff engaged in LSTA activities were interviewed.

SLAA staff recommended and recruited participants for focus groups. Three virtual and two in-person groups were held drawing participation from libraries throughout the state.

Librarians and library staff were engaged through virtual focus groups.

The LSTA Advisory Group members were engaged through a virtual focus group.

Librarians and other library staff were engaged through a Web-based survey.

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

The SLAA will share the findings of the evaluation with a variety of partner agencies in Iowa (governmental, other public, and non-profit) and with the larger public by alerting the libraries in Iowa of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website.

Appendix A: List of Acronyms

CSLP

Collaborative Summer Library Program

IEC

Iowa Educator's Consortium - purchasing program for Iowa schools, libraries and local government

IHDC

Iowa Heritage Digital Collections - an online repository of Iowa history and culture

ILA

Iowa Library Association

IPO

Iowa Publications Online - depository for electronic documents intended for the general public produced by Iowa state agencies

IWD

Iowa Workforce Development - a state agency that provides employment services, education and regulation of health, safety and employment laws

PLM

Public Library Management classes offered for non-MLS public library directors

PLOW

Putting Libraries on the Web - website hosting

SDC

State Data Center - the Iowa affiliate of the U.S. Census Bureau

SILO

State of Iowa Libraries Online - offers resource sharing services, including the Iowa Locator union catalog and SILO ILL to all types of libraries in Iowa.

VAP

Virtual Access Points – software installed on library computers (and computers in other locations) enabling job seekers to access Iowa Workforce Development Services

Appendix B: List of People in Focus Groups and Interviews

SLAA Site Visit Interviews:

10/28/2016

Michael Scott, State Librarian, State Library of Iowa

Nancy Medema, Program Director, State Library of Iowa

Alan Schmidt, SILO Coordinator, Project responsibility: SILO ILL database, Locator, PLOW

Gary Krob, Data Warehouse Analyst, Project responsibility: Census, reports

Scott Dermont, Library Consultant, Accreditation, Annual Survey

Alysia Peich, CE Coordinator, Project responsibility: Continuing Education, Certification

Jay Peterson, Library Consultant, Project responsibility: Databases, Discounts, E-rate

Also, the following SLAA staff were interviewed by phone and listed below:

Merri Monks - Library Consultant, Youth Services and Summer Reading Program;

Marie Harms - Library Consultant, PLOW, SILO ILL

Helen Dagley - Coordinator, Center for the Book, Letters About Literature, All Iowa Reads, and Literacy Grant.

In Person Focus Groups

12/12/16 - Physical - Johnston

12/13/16 - Physical - Coralville

Virtual Focus Groups

11/28/16 - Virtual - LSTA Advisory Committee

12/5/16 – Virtual Focus Group – Public Libraries

12/13/16 – Virtual Focus Group – Public Libraries

Focus Group Participants:
1. Barb Klapperich – Stacyville PL
2. Beth Crow – Gilman PL
3. Beth Thilmany – Camanche PL
4. Betsy Thompson – Sioux City PL
5. Brad Wiles – Clinton PL
6. Carla Dougherty – Rockwell City PL

7. Darlene Richardson – Leon PL
8. Debbie Harris – Graettinger PL
9. Dee Schrodt – Alexander PL
10. Diane Kitzmann – Montezuma PL
11. Ellen Miller – LeClaire CL
12. Gail Richardson – Audobon PL
13. Harriet Peterson – Granger PL
14. Holly Sealine – Norwalk PL
15. Hope Kreykes – Hospers PL
16. Jan Grandgeorge – Eagle Grove PL
17. Janette McJahon – West Liberty PL
18. Jean Bosch – Winterset PL
19. Jeannie Stone – Bayard PL
20. Jennifer Gogerty – Slater PL
21. Jillian Aschliman – DeWitt PL
22. Julie Folken – Aplington PL
23. Kim Jones – Charles City PL
24. Laura Hopper – Schroeder PL
25. Laura Newby – Union PL
26. Lisa Leuck – Elgin PL
27. Lisa Riesenberg – West Bend PL
28. Mandie Roberts – Spencer PL
29. Marilyn Kennett – Drake CL – Grinnell
30. Mary Earll – Sibley PL
31. Mary Fran Nikolai – Garnavillo PL
32. Mary Markwalter – Mason City PL
33. Melissa Kane – Cascade PL
34. Michelle Tunis – Monticello PL
35. Mindy Grimm – Columbus Junction PL
36. Natalie Struecker – Atlantic PL
37. Nicole Annis – Keosauqua PL
38. Nicole Lindstrom – Newton PL
39. Rebecca Vernon- Anamosa Lib

40. Sarah Clendineng – Ft Madison PL
41. Shirley Taylor – LeMars PL
42. Susan Henricks – Carnegie Stout, Dubuque
43. Susan Macken – Oelwein PL
44. Vicki Mohr – Lowden PL
45. Virginia Holsten – Vinton PL

Phone Interviews

1/10/17 - Glenda Mulder

1/10/17 - Alysia Peich

1/11/17 - Maureen Sullivan

1/13/17 - Sandy Long

1/13/17 - Rebecca Funke

1/14/17 - Dale Vande Haar

1/16/17 - Carrie Falk

1/17/17 - Jennie Garner

1/17/17 - Alison Ames Galstad

1/17/17 - Merri Monks

1/18/17 - Sarah Rosenblum

1/19/17 - Helen Dagley

Appendix C: Bibliography of All Documents Reviewed

The Institute of Museum and Library Services. 2016. *State Library Administrative Agencies Survey: Fiscal Year 2014* (IMLS-2016-SLAA-01). Washington, DC: The Institute.

National Center for Education Statistics:
<https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=UT&ct=1+2+3>

Notes from Iowa State Library Interviews

Notes from Focus Group with

Notes from Focus Group with

Iowa LSTA Evaluation Online Survey Summary Data and Report.

Iowa SPR FFY 2013.

Iowa SPR FFY 2014.

Iowa SPR FFY 2015.

US Census QuickFacts: Iowa, accessed online at:
<http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/19>
State Library of Iowa, accessed online at::
<http://www.statelibraryofiowa.org/>

Appendix D: Focus Group Protocol

Interviews with Library Leaders

Each interview included these key questions; follow-up and additional questions were tailored to the specific position and experience of the interviewees and their responses:

1. Describe how you and your library have been involved with LSTA?
2. From your perspective, which LSTA programs have been most impactful to your library and to the state from 2013-2015?
3. How would you assess the process of receiving funding – applying, receiving funding, reporting?
4. Looking forward, where would you like to see more LSTA funding? Where less?
5. Final thoughts?

Focus Group: Public Librarians

1. Which LSTA programs have been most impactful for your library?
2. In Iowa, the State Library has been interested in using LSTA funds to support library collaboration. Is that the right approach?
3. Iowa has offered some long standing programs on a state wide basis. Are efforts related to shared catalog and resource sharing important and how have you benefitted?
4. Are reporting expectations reasonable?
5. How important have LSTA sub-grants been in providing opportunities for innovation?
6. A major focus of IMLS has been on assessing outcomes. Have you been able to document outcomes from your LSTA projects?
7. What impact have LSTA-funded digitization projects had for the residents of your library district?
8. Is it your experience that the State Library has made great efforts to help LSTA grant applicants be successful?
9. Turning forward, the State Library will begin work on the next five-year LSTA plan soon. What new directions should it take? What would make a difference for your library?
10. Finally, what would you like to say about LSTA?

Appendix E: Survey Instrument



Iowa LSTA Survey

WELCOME



Hello!

The State Library of Iowa requests your assistance in helping us evaluate some of the work we do on behalf of Iowa's libraries. The State Library has engaged QualityMetrics, a library consulting firm, to conduct an independent evaluation required by the Institute of Museum and Library Services in order to receive federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) "Grants to States" funding.

QualityMetrics has designed a brief survey to help us understand how libraries are making use of the services and resources provided by the State Library of Iowa and what we might do to improve our services in the future. We are specifically interested in your feedback on the programs the State Library provides that have been partially or fully funded with LSTA dollars. The LSTA Grants to States Program is administered by the federal government through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). This survey should take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the survey. Your responses will go directly to QualityMetrics (not to the State Library) and will not be identified with your library. The QualityMetrics team will review all survey responses and will include the survey results in their report to the State Library of Iowa, which is due in January, 2017. Your assistance with this survey is very important to us and will help us assess the work we have done in the past and will enable us to improve our service to your library in the future.

LIBRARY DESCRIPTION

1) Please provide the name of your library.

2) Please describe the type of Library you represent.

- Public library
- School library
- Academic library
- Special library
- Other (Please specify below.)

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

LIBRARY AND RESPONDENT DESCRIPTION

3) We're interested in the context within which libraries that respond to the survey are operating. In order to help us understand the area served by your library, please indicate the name of the county in which your library is located.

4) Please select the category that most closely describes your role/responsibilities in your library.

- Library director
- Manager/ department head
- Other library administrator
- Children's/youth services librarian
- Reference/information services librarian
- Interlibrary loan/document delivery librarian
- Technical services librarian (cataloger)
- Library technology specialist
- Other library staff
- Library trustee
- Library Friend
- Other (Please specify below.)

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

5) Please indicate the population served by the library you represent.

- Fewer than 250
- 250 - 499
- 500 - 999
- 1,000 - 1999
- 2,000 - 4999
- 5,000 - 9,999
- 10,000 - 24,999

- 25,000 - 49,999
- 50,000 - 99,999
- 100,000 or more

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

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

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

- Less than 2
- 2 - 4
- 5 - 9
- 10 - 19

- 20 - 34
 - 35 - 49
 - 50 - 99
 - 100 - 249
 - 250 - 499
 - 500 - 999
 - 1,000 or more
-

SERVICE MODULE INTRODUCTION

The State Library of Iowa uses its Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States funds to support a number of different programs and initiatives. This survey will explore five areas. They are:

Summer Reading Program

Continuing Education/ Staff Development

Online Resources (Licensed databases and other information tools)

SILO (Statewide union catalog and interlibrary loan system)

PLOW (Putting Libraries on the Web)

SUMMER READING PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

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

Yes

No

The State Library of Iowa undertakes a variety of efforts to stimulate and promote public interest in books, reading, literacy, and libraries including support for local summer reading programs and for the Iowa Center for the Book.

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - NONE

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

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

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

10) Are there services that the State Library of Iowa could provide that would help your library mount a successful summer reading program in the future?

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - BASIC

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

	Only self-help guides, reading lists, and other resources provided without staff led events or programs	Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs	No summer reading program offered for this group
Pre-school children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School-aged children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adults	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12) Did you use the planning guide and/or other Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) materials provided by the State Library of Iowa?

Yes

No

Please tell us the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement.

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

() 1 - Strongly disagree

() 2 - Disagree

() 3 - Neither agree nor disagree

() 4 - Agree

() 5 - Strongly agree

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

Please tell us the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement.

15) My library receives all of the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to carry out an effective summer reading program.

() 1 - Strongly disagree

() 2 - Disagree

() 3 - Neither agree nor disagree

() 4 - Agree

() 5 - Strongly agree

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

Please rate the following products and services made available to libraries for their summer reading programs:

17) Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) Program Manual

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

If you responded "did not use this resource" above, please indicate why.

18) General summer reading program advice and consultation

- 1 - Poor

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

19) Which of the following training opportunities would make the most difference in terms of improving your summer reading program? (Please check all that apply.)

- Help with program planning/curriculum design
- Time/resource management training
- Training on outreach
- Training on public engagement
- Language/cultural competency training
- Assistance with program evaluation
- Other (Please specify below.)

20) If you answered "other" in the question above, please specify in the text box below.

21) How aware would you say you are of the activities of the Iowa Center for the Book?

	1 - Very unaware	2 - Mostly unaware	3 - Neither unaware	4 - Mostly aware	5 - Very aware
--	-------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

			nor aware		
Iowa Center for the Book	()	()	()	()	()

22) Has your library participated in any program associated with the Iowa Center for the Book during the last three years?

() Yes

() No

23) If you have any additional feedback for the State Library of Iowa regarding its support for your library's summer reading program or for the Iowa Center for the Book, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

CONTINUING EDUCATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The State Library of Iowa offers a variety of continuing education/ professional development opportunities to library staff members in Iowa in support of the certification program. The State Library has invested some of its Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) dollars in these activities. Please indicate your library's awareness of each of the activities listed below and share your assessment of the degree to which you feel these offerings are addressing your library's needs.

24) Please indicate the degree to which you are aware of the following continuing education offerings supported by the State Library of Iowa.

	1 - Totally unaware	2 - Somewhat aware	3 - Very aware	Not applicable
Children's/ Young Adult services training and education	()	()	()	()
Adult/ Information services training and education	()	()	()	()
Technology training and education	()	()	()	()
Strategic planning	()	()	()	()
Trustee training and education	()	()	()	()
Leadership training	()	()	()	()
Training in community engagement	()	()	()	()

25) Please indicate whether you or any member of your staff has participated in any of the following continuing education offerings supported by the State Library of Iowa.

	I have personally participated	Other staff members from my library have participated	Neither I nor any of the other staff at my library have participated	Not applicable
Children's/ Young Adult training and education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adult/ Information services training and education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technology training and education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strategic planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trustee training and education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training in community engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26) Please rate each of the following continuing education opportunities offered by the State Library of Iowa:

	1 - Completely dissatisfied	2	3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	5 - Completely satisfied	Not applicable
Children's/ Young Adult services training and education	()	()	()	()	()	()
Adult/ Information services training and education	()	()	()	()	()	()
Technology training and education	()	()	()	()	()	()
Strategic planning	()	()	()	()	()	()
Trustee training and education	()	()	()	()	()	()
Leadership training	()	()	()	()	()	()
Training in community engagement	()	()	()	()	()	()

27) If you have any additional feedback for the State Library of Iowa regarding its support for continuing education and staff development, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

RESOURCE SHARING

28) The State Library of Iowa supports resource sharing in a number of different ways including the provision of the SILO union catalog and coordination of statewide interlibrary loan services. Please indicate whether or not your library participates in any of the following activities:

	YES, my library uses	NO, my library does not use	I was not aware of the program
SILO union catalog/LOCATOR	()	()	()
Interlibrary loan	()	()	()

29) Please indicate your library's practice in regard to each of the following interlibrary loan services:

	YES, this is my library's practice	NO, my library does not do this
Sending physical items to other libraries through	()	()

the mail		
Sending physical items through the courier system/ van delivery	()	()
Filling requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible	()	()
Informing patrons about their interlibrary loan options	()	()
Sending ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa	()	()

30) Please complete the following sentence. The biggest barrier to my library's active or full participation in interlibrary loan is:

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

31) My library receives the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to offer the public an effective system of resource sharing.

() 1 - Strongly disagree

() 2 - Disagree

() 3 - Neither agree nor disagree

() 4 - Agree

() 5 - Strongly agree

32) If you have any additional feedback for the State Library of Iowa regarding resource sharing services, please insert your comments in the text box provided below.

ONLINE RESOURCES

The State Library of Iowa provides a range of e-resources and databases from EBSCO and other vendors to libraries across the state. The availability of these resources is largely dependent on Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States funding.

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

	1 - Completely	2	3 - Neither satisfied	4	5 - Completely	6 - Not familiar
--	-----------------------	----------	------------------------------	----------	-----------------------	-------------------------

	dissatisfied		nor dissatisfied		satisfied	with the resource/ unable to rate
EBSCO	()	()	()	()	()	()
Sanborn Maps	()	()	()	()	()	()
WorldCat	()	()	()	()	()	()
CINAHL (nursing and allied health)	()	()	()	()	()	()
Newspaper Source	()	()	()	()	()	()
Clip Art	()	()	()	()	()	()

34) Which two of the online e-resources offered by the State Library of Iowa do you believe are of the greatest importance to your patrons/ users? (Please select only two.)

- EBSCO
- Sanborn Maps
- WorldCat
- CINAHL (nursing and allied health)
- Newspaper Source
- Clip Art

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

36) Are there e-resources/databases that you wish that the State Library of Iowa included that are currently not available?

Yes

No

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

38) Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: My staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the online resources provided by the State Library of Iowa.

1 - Strongly disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Neither agree nor disagree

4 - Agree

5 - Strongly agree

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

Reduces the overall cost of services to patrons

- () Improves the quality of service we can provide to patrons
- () Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access
- () Builds capacity among my staff
- () Other (Please specify below.)

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

41) Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the online resources provided by the State Library of Iowa.

- () 1 - Completely dissatisfied
- () 2 - Mostly dissatisfied
- () 3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- () 4 - Mostly satisfied
- () 5 - Completely satisfied

42) If you have any additional feedback for the State Library of Iowa regarding online resources, please insert that feedback below.

PLOW (PUTTING LIBRARIES ON THE WEB)

43) Has your library participated in the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program?

Yes

No

PLOW - Yes

44) What do you believe has been the greatest benefit to your library's participation in the PLOW program?

PLOW - No

45) Please indicate the primary reason your library has NOT participated in the PLOW program.

THANK YOU!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.

Appendix F: Summary of Survey Results

Iowa LSTA Web Survey Report

Two hundred and thirty-three people responded to the Iowa LSTA Web survey, which was offered only to public libraries. The responses included a combination school-city library. The respondents represented two hundred and nine different libraries, located in eighty-four of Iowa's ninety-nine counties. Ninety-seven (97.8) percent of the respondents were library directors. Forty-three (43.9) percent of the respondents said their library served a population of 500 to 1,999. Nineteen (19.6) percent served a population of 499 or less. Two respondents were in libraries serving populations of 100,000 or more. The largest group (representing 35.7 percent of the total respondents) had an annual operating budget of \$10,000 to \$49,999. Seven libraries (3.0 percent) had operating budgets of less than \$10,000. Four libraries (1.7 percent) had operating budgets of \$5,000,000 or more.

Sixty-one (61.1) percent of the respondents were in libraries with less than two full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. Another twenty-three (23.1) percent were in libraries with two to four FTEs. Because such an overwhelming number of the respondents' libraries were represented in the less-than-two FTE category, this report is written from the perspective of three staff size groupings. Cross-tabulations were run on the responses from representatives of libraries with less than two FTEs, two to four FTEs, and more than four FTEs. In the report that follows, the responses from libraries with less than two FTEs are labeled "small" libraries, the responses from libraries with two to four FTEs are labeled as "mid-size" libraries, and the responses from libraries with more than four FTEs are labeled as "large" libraries.

Summer Reading Program

All (100 percent) of the respondents' libraries offered a summer reading program in 2016. Of the small libraries, ninety (90.7) percent offered the more complete program services (resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs as compared with only self-help guides, reading lists, and other resources provided without staff-led events or programs) for school-aged children. Eighty-five (85.3) percent offered this level of program for pre-school children. Forty-two (42.5) percent offered this level for teens and sixteen (16.7) percent offered it for adults.

Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs

Age Grouping	Small libraries	Mid-size libraries	Large libraries
Pre-school children	85.3%	96.2%	94.6%

School-aged children	90.7%	94.3%	100.0%
Teens	42.5%	54.9%	94.6%
Adults	16.7%	39.6%	70.3%

The percents for programming at each age level were higher for the mid-size and large survey respondents than for the small libraries.

Eighty-nine (89.9) percent of the respondents from small libraries said they used the planning guide and/or other Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) materials provided by the State Library of Iowa. Ninety (90.6) percent of the respondents from mid-size libraries had used these resources. Ninety-one (91.9) percent of the respondents from large libraries had used the planning guide and/or other CSLP materials.

Seventy-four (74.3) percent of the small library respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Eighty-three (83.1) percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Ninety-one (91.8) percent of the large library respondents agreed or strongly agreed.

Eighty-six respondents from small libraries provided descriptions of the types of skills or training that would help staff plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Nine indicated they were satisfied: "I think I have an effective summer reading program." Several of the comments were related to the performers: "A master list of possible speakers/performers in our area for any given theme." Sometimes the performer comments were related to cost: "Summer reading entertainers have become much too expensive." Several mentioned that having an early childhood education or being an educator helped. Many simply wanted ideas: "Ideas for crafts and games"; "Ideas on encouraging reading without breaking the budget." Time and money are major issues rather than lack of skills or training.

Thirty-five respondents from the mid-size libraries gave similar answers, but also added other thoughts: "My staff lacks training in children's literature. If the State Library could provide a children's literature class resembling a college class of the same title...that would be outstanding!" "Training in fundraising and promotional ideas would be helpful."

Large library responses included: "Knowledge of how to secure library programs that support our mission—supporting literacy, and have a recreational aspect. Knowledge of ways to engage patrons of all ages in supporting literacy of various types (reading, technology, information, etc.) "Story telling organizational tools graphic design reader's advisory volunteer management publicity book discussion skills." *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)*

Seventy-two (72.1) percent of the small library respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to carry out an effective summer reading program. Seventy-three (73.6) percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-seven (67.6) percent of the large library respondents agreed or strongly agreed.

Sixty-six of the small library respondents described the types of additional support that would help their library plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Seven cited needing more funding, financial help. Ten said nothing or none, or not sure. “Not sure what else can be done. Our biggest problem is competing in small towns with summer sports.” Other responses include: “The State Library is great at helping my library, I can’t ask for anything more.” “Better training on using the program manual.” “I have more information than I have time to use.” “More than one scheduled Summer Reading Program that is close to my area. The day that it was scheduled there was a conflict and I was unable to attend and didn’t have the time to drive 2-3 hours away for another class.”

Twenty-three of the mid-size library respondents offered similar answers, but also said: “Coordinate smaller training opportunities for libraries to attend where there is more opportunity for discussion, sharing ideas, and networking. (County level of combination of three counties, not one hundred libraries at once.)” “More feedback from other libraries of the same size.” “Regular updates of new trends in the process of hosting a summer program.”

Twenty large library respondents shared ideas. “A training/webinar on how to use Project Outcome and why it is so important. I think the State pushing the use of it will encourage librarians to use it and take a more in depth look at their programs and what the public is getting from them.” “As a large library trying to meet the unique needs of our city, we felt doing our own program was the best fit and we do not use the state resources.” “Assistance at the top levels to encourage schools to collaborate more with public libraries in the summer.” “Conducting a program that includes outreach to our Hispanic population.” “Honestly, I think the State Library really does a great job in supporting libraries for Summer Reading. We are given the tools and opportunities to learn and find great performers—I don’t know what else you could be doing!” “Stronger content in the workshops.” *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)*

Eighty-six (86.5) percent of the small library respondents rated the CSLP Manual as good or excellent. No one rated it as poor. Nine respondents said they did not use this resource and provided a reason(s). Responses included: “I use the local Iowa State Extension Service. I do not have time/money in the budget to spend the time making elaborate plans and multiple crafts. Extension service does all this in four libraries in the county.” “I am putting together a program specific to our community. I think that it will be a good will to instill pride in our area.” “Too much information in it to go through.” *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)*

Seventy-nine (79.2) percent of the mid-size library respondents gave the CSLP Manual a good or excellent rating. Two respondents said they did not use the manual.

Seventy-two (72.3) percent of the large library respondents rated the CSLP Manual as good or excellent. Five people said they did not use the Manual (but eight gave a reason for not using it). “Getting it on a flash drive a day before the workshop was not helpful. The manual itself is excellent but next year I will wait and order it as a hard copy from Upstart.” “It seems to be directed to extremely small libraries that do not have professional staff.”

Fifty-eight (58.3) percent of the small library respondents rated the general summer reading program advice and consultation as good. Eight (8.6) percent said they were not aware of the resource and another seven (7.2) percent did not use the resource. Forty-five (45.3) percent of the mid-size library respondents rated the program advice and consultation as good. Eleven (11.3) percent said they were not aware of this resource and another nine (9.4) percent did not use this resource. Among the large library respondents, forty-four (44.4) percent rated the advice and consultation as good. Two people were unaware of the resource and another nineteen (19.4) percent did not use it.

The next question asked which of the following six training opportunities would make the most difference in terms of improving their summer reading program. (Respondents checked all that applied.) The training opportunities are listed below in descending order of their selection by small libraries.

Training Opportunity	% Checking this Opportunity Small Libraries	% Checking this Opportunity Mid-size Libraries	% Checking this Opportunity Large Libraries
Help with program planning/curriculum design	59.8%	56.3%	38.9%
Training on public engagement	37.1%	56.3%	47.2%
Training on outreach	30.3%	50.0%	30.6%
Time/resource management training	29.5%	27.1%	27.8%
Assistance with program evaluation	12.1%	14.6%	41.7%
Language/cultural competency training	2.3%	10.4%	19.4%

Training needs are clearly different for libraries with small staffs compared to those with large staffs. The top choice of small and mid-size library respondents was help with program planning/curriculum design, followed in second place by training on public engagement, although there is a big difference between the percentages of small and mid-size libraries in checking this choice. (37.1 percent for small libraries compared with 56.3 percent for mid-size

libraries). The highest percentage of respondents from large libraries ranked training on public engagement first and assistance with program evaluation second.

Survey respondents were also able to check "Other" and specify an explanation of what would make the most difference. *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)* Among the thirteen small library responses, four cited money/funding and four cited time. "I don't think I need more training, just more time. As a one-person library summer reading is only one of my many duties." Three talked about not having "enough kids in town to do everything." "We have lost many of our children to summer school sports activities."

There were four mid-size library responses and five large library responses: "inventive ways to promote the program," and "better support from our city on staffing and budget items."

Iowa Center for the Book

The question that was asked: How aware would you say you are of the activities of the Iowa Center for the Book?

Library Size Grouping	% Unaware	% Neither Unaware nor Aware	% Aware
Small	46.4%	15.7%	37.9%
Mid-size	35.8%	11.3%	52.9%
Large	27.0%	13.5%	59.5%

Awareness of the activities of the Iowa Center for the Book among the respondents to the survey increased as the size of the library increased. Similarly, the percent of respondents saying their library had participated in a program associated with the Iowa Center for the Book during the last three years increased as the size of the library increased. Twenty (20.9) percent of small library respondents said their library had participated in such a program; thirty-nine (39.6) percent of the mid-size and fifty-one (51.4) percent of the large libraries respondents said their library had participated.

Thirty-six people provided additional feedback regarding support for the summer reading program or for the Iowa Center for the Book. *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)* Feedback from small library respondents included: "I believe the concept of Summer Reading is good. It is just too much work to do all this planning on such a small budget and limited work hours." "I have had no knowledge of the Iowa Center for the Book." "The district reps do a great job with promoting both programs! Very helpful advocates!"

Comments from mid-size library respondents included: "I am sure the Iowa Center for the Book is a great resource for larger libraries with adequate staff, but for small libraries where staff does everything from scooping snow to plunging toilets, sometimes there is no energy/funds for All Iowa Reads or other programming that the State Library wants libraries to pursue."

Generally staff wished for stronger choices for the Iowa Center for the Book’s annual book selection.

Large libraries respondents said: “I appreciate that we have an Iowa author list, but if you want my honest opinion, I don’t feel Center for the Book adds a lot to what the State already offers.” “...On the other hand we do appreciate the yearly webinars on the All Iowa Reads title. We also appreciate the State Library lending out reading club sets of the annual title. We also enjoyed participating in the History of the Book display. If there are more like that, we would love to have those traveling exhibits as well.”

Continuing Education

In the table below, the continuing education offerings supported by the State Library of Iowa are listed in descending order by the percentage of small libraries respondents who said they were very aware of that offering.

Offering	% Small Library Very Aware	% Mid-size Very Aware	% Large Very Aware
Trustee training and education	74.3%	71.7%	77.8%
Technology training and education	65.7%	62.3%	64.9%
Children’s/Young Adult services training and education	62.9%	71.7%	83.8%
Adult/Information services training and education	58.3%	71.7%	67.6%
Strategic planning	56.1%	66.0%	73.0%
Leadership training	51.4%	52.8%	69.4%
Training in community engagement	42.0%	43.4%	43.2%

Participants representing all three library groupings are roughly equally aware of two of the continuing education offerings: technology training and education and training in community engagement. The greatest differences are between small and large library groups in children’s/young adult services training and education and leadership training.

The next question asked respondents whether they or a member of their staff had participated in any of the seven training and education offerings listed in the above table. Among the small library respondents, the highest percents had attended (in decreasing order) children’s/young adult training and education (75.2 percent), technology training and education (71.2 percent), trustee training and education (67.4 percent), and adult/information services training and education (66.4 percent). The highest percent of small library respondents said other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (26.3 percent). Given that the small library group represents libraries with less than two FTE staff members, this level of participation seems realistic.

The number of respondents representing mid-size libraries (FTE staff of two to four) who said they had personally participated in training were as follows: adult/information services training and education (75.5 percent), technology training and education (71.2 percent), strategic planning (69.4 percent), and trustee training and education (64.7 percent). Other staff members from their library had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (69.8 percent), technology training and education (40.4 percent), and adult/information services training and education (30.2 percent).

Large library respondents (FTE staff of more than four) had personally attended trustee training and education (69.4 percent), strategic planning (57.1 percent), adult/information services training and education (54.1 percent), leadership training (54.1 percent), technology training and education (38.9 percent), and training in community engagement (38.9 percent). Other staff members had participated in children’s/young adult training and education (91.9 percent), adult/information services training and education (64.9 percent), and technology training and education (52.8 percent).

Among all three sizes of libraries, the training opportunities with the lowest participation were leadership training and training in community engagement.

The table below lists the continuing education offerings in descending order of the small library respondents’ ratings of satisfaction. The question asked participants to use a five-point scale where one indicated completely dissatisfied and five indicated completely satisfied. The percent satisfied in the table is the sum of the four and five ratings for each offering by each size library. It was also possible to check not applicable if the respondent had not experienced that offering.

Offering	% Small Library Satisfied	% Mid-size Satisfied	% Large Satisfied
Children’s/Young Adult services training and education	60.7%	61.5%	72.7%
Adult/Information services training and education	55.8%	58.5%	61.1%
Technology training and education	54.3%	58.5%	48.6%
Trustee training and education	51.8%	53.8%	62.1%
Strategic planning	41.3%	56.6%	66.6%
Training in community engagement	36.9%	44.2%	40.5%
Leadership training	34.7%	45.3%	62.1%

Children’s/young adult services training and education received the highest percents of satisfaction from respondents in all three library size groupings. If one looks at the tables in the survey compilation, it is apparent that the satisfaction level is impacted by the combination of four and five ratings. Respondents were more likely to rate the offerings at a four than they were at a five. (They were satisfied, just not completely satisfied.) This is especially true of the

large library respondents. Echoing the awareness ratings above, relatively high percentages of respondents checked “not applicable” (i.e., they had not experienced) the leadership training or training in community engagement offerings.

Respondents were encouraged to provide additional feedback regarding State Library support for continuing education and staff development. Forty-one chose to do so. *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)* Respondents from small libraries seem mixed on the best method for delivering training opportunities. “Do wish there were more face to face education opportunities. All the on-line stuff is great but the face to face has and always will be my preferred form of education.” “I really appreciate being able to take classes on-line. Being able to pull up a webinar from the archives is also very beneficial.” Most comments were positive: “The State Library of Iowa bends over backwards to help us in any way they can. They provide many opportunities and help for whatever we need and whenever we need it.” However, “most are set up for larger libraries with full-time staff.”

Comments from other sized libraries include: “Children’s and young adult programming training should be separate. The training should be geared only specific age groups.” “I have never left a c.e. course without learning something of interest.” “We are a larger library with access to many forms of training. We often participate in State training, but many sessions are designed for smaller libraries which I totally understand.”

Resource Sharing

The next question asked participants to indicate whether their library participates in the SILO union catalog and statewide interlibrary loan (ILL). Ninety-four (94.9) percent of the small library respondents said their library participated in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and ninety-eight (98.6) percent said they used ILL. Ninety-eight (98.6) percent said their library informed patrons about their ILL options. Ninety-seven (97.9) percent send physical items to other libraries through the mail. Ninety-five (95.7) percent fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Only forty-eight (48.6) percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa, and only twenty-two (22.4) percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

Among the mid-size library participants, ninety-four (94.2) percent said their library participated in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and ninety-eight (98.1) percent said they used ILL. All (100 percent) said their library informed patrons about their ILL options. Ninety-eight (98.1) percent send physical items to other libraries through the mail. Ninety-eight (98.1) percent fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Sixty-seven (67.9) percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa and only forty-one (41.2) percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

Among the large library respondents ninety-seven (97.3) percent participate in SILO union catalog/LOCATOR and all (100 percent) said they used ILL. All (100 percent) said their library informed patrons about their ILL options, send physical items to other libraries through the

mail, and fill requests from other libraries to the greatest extent possible. Sixty-nine (69.4) percent send ILL requests for out-of-state borrowing to the State Library of Iowa and only forty (40.0) percent send physical items through the courier system/van delivery.

Participants were asked to complete the following sentence: "The biggest barrier to my library's active or full participation in interlibrary loan is..."

One hundred and eighty-nine participants completed the sentence. Thirty-seven said there were no barriers. (*Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.*) Among the small library participants, cost, cost of postage, lack of staff time, and lack of staff were the most frequent responses. Respondents also said, "Limited hours of local postal service (packages must be presented and picked up in person) sometimes causes delays in filling requests." "Our library collection does not get added to SILO often enough. So we do not get enough requests from our library." "We do the best we can."

Mid-size library respondents also said "speed of delivery" and "the SILO program can be unreliable and time consuming especially when requesting multiple copies." Large library respondents also said "refusal to send DVDs, CDs, or audiobooks (understandably so)" and "the size of our collection."

Seventy-nine (79.9) percent of the small library respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their library receives the support it needs from the State Library of Iowa to offer the public an effective system of resource sharing. Sixty-six (66.0) percent of the mid-size libraries respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-two (62.1) percent of the large libraries agreed or strongly agreed.

Forty-one participants shared additional feedback regarding resource sharing services. Small library responses included mostly positive statements. "I think the whole state staff is awesome. You have a great support system and they are always helpful." "Without the van system in our area we would not be able to send as many items out to other libraries. Being Director at two libraries, we are able to share a lot of resources." However, "the holdings do not seem to be accurate at all times, especially for withdrawn items. I often wonder what will happen when space runs out for each library, who will hold the last available copy of a book. I would like more money to cover the cost of postage when loaning to other libraries. I am thankful for this service because we do not have the space or resources to purchase every title."

Mid-size library responses included, "It is a shame that our SILO system is so old." "I would love to see all Iowa's libraries' collections on WorldCat, and all able to request items through OCLC ILL."

Large library responses included "an update of SILO and the Locator are badly needed." "Real time union catalog." "If we would receive full reimbursement for the postage we would participate more fully." "Materials on the van sometimes take a long time to get to our library."

This causes frustration with the public and the staff.” “There should be a statewide courier service.”

E-resources

Respondents were asked to describe their satisfaction with each of six e-resources using a five-point scale on which one indicated completely dissatisfied and five indicated completely satisfied. The percent satisfied in the table is the sum of the four and five ratings for each offering by each size library. It was also possible to check “not applicable” if the respondent had not experienced that offering.

E-resource	% Small Library Satisfied	% Mid-size Satisfied	% Large Satisfied
EBSCO	47.8%	75.5%	89.1%
WorldCat	37.6%	43.4%	70.2%
Clip Art	26.1%	15.1%	24.3%
Newspaper Source	10.2%	16.9%	33.3%
CINAHL (nursing and allied health)	5.8%	3.8%	19.5%
Sanborn Maps	3.0%	7.7%	16.2%

Among the six e-resources, EBSCO clearly provides the most satisfaction for all three categories of libraries, followed by WorldCat. *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)* Very few respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with the e-resources. Respondents in each category checked “not familiar with the resource/unable to rate” frequently. Small library respondents were unable to rate Sanborn Maps (88.1 percent), CINAHL (84.6 percent), Newspaper Source (78.1 percent), and Clip Art (56.5 percent). Mid-size libraries respondents were unable to rate Sanborn Maps (86.5 percent), CINAHL (84.9 percent), Newspaper Source (73.6 percent), and Clip Art (71.7 percent). Large library respondents fared somewhat better, but still checked the unable to rate category for these e-resources at high rates: Sanborn Maps (73.0 percent), CINAHL (72.2 percent), Newspaper Source (58.3 percent), and Clip Art (51.4 percent).

When asked which two of the online e-resources listed above were of greatest importance to their patrons/users (select only two), all three categories of libraries cited EBSCO first and WorldCat second. When asked for their reason for the first choice, many of the small library respondents commented that it was the only one they knew about or said they did not use any of the e-resources. General comments from all three categories of libraries were that EBSCO was the most used or easiest to use. “EBSCO’s databases are broad in coverage and trustworthy—excellent value for us.” “EBSCO is a great source for my patrons and they use it quite often.” “It is the most used by students. Most traffic.”

Seventy-four (74.8 percent) of the overall respondents said there were no e-resources or databases that they wished the State Library of Iowa would add to the collection available. Of those fifty-four respondents who did have additions to recommend, the small library respondents listed genealogy databases/search sites and NoveList. Mid-size library respondents listed ancestry, NoveList, and an auto repair source. Large library respondents said genealogical databases, digital magazine subscriptions, downloadable movies, and language learning software.

Thirty-six (36.4) percent of the small library respondents agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to use and teach patrons how to use the online resources provided by the State Library of Iowa. Thirty (30.0) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Thirty (30.0) percent of the mid-size library respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement about their staff skills related to using the online resources. Twenty-six (26.4) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Forty-five (45.9) percent of the large library respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement about staff skills. Thirty-two (32.4) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, respondents in all three library size categories agreed that the availability of these e-resources broadened the range of services/resources our patrons can access.

Fourteen people overall checked the “Other” response related to how the availability of these e-resources/databases affect their ability to serve their patrons. *(Please see the survey compilation for complete responses to this question.)* “Have not used them and haven’t even been approached about any of these services.” “We do not offer these resources.” “Last year, we had 301 uses of EBSCO – compared to 2,864 for databases that we purchase by ourselves. My Head of Circ tells me she spends around 3 hours per month learning, prepping, and doing a class just for staff on databases. The individual staff spend 1 to 2 hours per month on the same. For the amount of time and money that I spend training my staff on how to use it – 301 is a frustrating number.”

However, sixty-two (62.7) percent of the small library respondents reported that they were mostly or completely satisfied with the online resources provided by the State Library of Iowa. Only five (5.1) percent said they were mostly or completely dissatisfied. Seventy-one (71.2) percent of the mid-size library respondents said they were mostly or completely satisfied; only three (3.8) percent said they were mostly dissatisfied (none said they were completely dissatisfied). Seventy-five (75.7) percent of the large library respondents said they were mostly or completely satisfied; only five (5.4) percent were mostly dissatisfied (none said they were completely dissatisfied).

Twenty-one respondents provided additional feedback regarding online resources. “Promotion on the part of the State Library would help immensely in making Iowa residents aware of these

offerings.” “Some of these tools appear to be only available through the State Library Website with a State Library card. I think local libraries are not as aware of these services as they could be so that they could promote them to their customers. I’d love to see some training or promotional materials that could be shared with local library users.” “We don’t know all the resources offered and would like more information about what they are, how to get them, and how to use them. More training would be great.”

Overall, seventy (70.7) percent said their library had participated in the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program. This represents seventy-one (71.2) percent of the small library responses, seventy-seven (77.4) percent of the mid-size library responses, and fifty-nine (59.5) percent of the large library responses. One hundred and forty-six participants responded to the question of what the greatest benefit of participation in the PLOW program had been. Those responses were consistent: “A Web presence for patrons...”; “Ability to reach more people”; “Another resource for marketing”; “Everything! The availability of the program, the support, the training.” “FREE WEBSITE!!!!” “It has pushed us to have a Web presence. Which has in turn pushed us to move into the 21st Century with our services.” “We have since moved on to hosting our own Web site and CMS, but the PLOW program provided a sort of testing ground for what we wanted our Web presence to be.”

Sixty-two respondents indicated the primary reason their library had NOT participated in the PLOW program. Most already had/have a Web site. A few cited the lack of staff time to participate.

Appendix G: LSTA Funding Allotments 2013-2015 Mapped to Goals

	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2015 Expenditures	SPR Goal	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2012 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
LSTA Administration	71,495	4%	73,587	4%	73,236	4%		218,318	4%
Iowa Center for the Book	44,048	2%	58,440	3%	23,041	1%	1A	125,528	2%
Summer Reading Program	99,535	6%	81,481	4%	63,018	3%	1A	244,034	4%
Help Librarians Meet Special Needs	23,895	1%	28,425	2%	25,357	1%	1B	77,677	1%
Library Grants	29,624	2%					1B	29,624	1%
Communicate Essential Role of Libraries / Enhancing Library Services - Physical Places (23 Reasons)	69,313	4%	26,784	1%	20,875	1%	1C	116,972	2%
Collect Information to Tell Library Story	55,315	3%					1E	55,315	1%
Consulting Services	125,128	7%	69,620	4%	281,588	15%	2A	476,336	9%
Leadership Institute		0%	6,000	0%	-	0%	2A	6,000	0%
Library Space Grants	28,286	2%					2A	28,286	1%
Certification and Accreditation Programs	62,689	4%	339,981	18%	183,941	10%	2B	586,611	11%
Library Science Collection	47,047	3%					2C	47,047	1%
E-rate and Broadband		0%	62,390	3%	11,068	1%	2D	73,457	1%
Enhance the Putting Libraries on the Web (PLOW) program	58,998	3%	129,337	7%	10,961	1%	2D	199,296	4%
Early Literacy (Kids First)	30,842	2%	75,799	4%	48,950	3%	2E	155,591	3%
Statewide Databases (EBSCO) / SILO & ILL	318,423	18%	637,670	35%		0%	3A	956,093	18%
Promote Discounts and Consortia / Increasing Access to Materials and Services (Bridges/discounts; cooperative purchasing)	55,758	3%	64,055	3%	10,406	1%	3B	130,219	2%
SILO & Interlibrary Loan	324,859	18%		0%	897,867	49%	3D	1,222,726	22%
Share Best Practices	27,807	2%					3E	27,807	1%
State Data Center	74,200	4%	147,140	8%	123,832	7%	4A	345,172	6%

	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2015 Expenditures	SPR Goal	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2012 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
Improve Iowa Publications Online Info.	47,664	3%					4B	47,664	1%
Improve Iowa Digital Heritage Collection	27,253	2%					4C	27,253	0%
Improve Iowa Library Services Collections	37,390	2%					4D	37,390	1%
Improve Access to Iowa State Documents	22,771	1%		0%	27,925	2%	4E	50,696	1%
Provide Exemplary Library Services	82,265	5%					5A	82,265	2%
State Library Staff Professional Development	12,008	1%	38,967	2%	28,834	2%	5B	79,809	1%
Build and Enhance Partnerships	10,740	1%					5E	10,740	0%
	1,787,353	100%	1,839,676	100%	1,830,898	100%		5,457,927	100%
Goal 1: Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.	321,730	18%	195,129	11%	132,290	7%		649,150	12%
Goal 2: Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to Iowans	352,990	20%	683,127	37%	536,508	29%		1,572,625	29%
Goal 3: Maximize library service for Iowans through enhanced collaboration to benefit Iowa libraries of all types	726,847	41%	701,725	38%	908,273	50%		2,336,845	43%
Goal 4: Deliver access to Iowa Library Services' collections.	209,278	12%	147,140	8%	151,757	8%		508,174	9%
Goal 5: Foster a culture of innovation and collaboration within Iowa Library Services.	105,013	6%	38,967	2%	28,834	2%		172,814	3%
LSTA Admin Fee	71,495		73,587		73,236			218,318	
	1,787,353	100%	1,839,676	100%	1,830,898	100%		5,457,927	100%

Appendix H: Iowa’s LSTA Goals Mapped to Grants to State Priorities Addressed

Table 1 - IaLS Self-Assessment and Evaluator’s Assessment			
Goal	Grants to States Priorities Addressed	IaLS Self-Assessment	Evaluators’ Assessment
<p>GOAL 1 Equip Iowa libraries to build community and enhance quality of life for Iowans.</p>	<p>(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals’ needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;</p> <p>(3) (A) providing training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services; and (B) enhancing efforts to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;</p> <p>(5)targeting library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills;</p> <p>(6) targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 9902(2) of title 42) applicable to a family of the size involved;</p>	Achieved	Achieved
<p>GOAL 2 Strengthen the capacity of Iowa libraries to provide the best possible library service to Iowans</p>	<p>(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals’ needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;</p> <p>(3) (A) providing training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services; and (B) enhancing efforts to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;</p> <p>(7) developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks;</p>	Achieved	Achieved

<p>GOAL 3 Maximize library service for Iowans through enhanced collaboration to benefit Iowa libraries of all types</p>	<p>(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;</p> <p>(3) (A) providing training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services; and (B) enhancing efforts to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;</p> <p>(2) establishing or enhancing electronic and other linkages and improved coordination among and between libraries and entities, as described in section 9134(b)(6) of this title, for the purpose of improving the quality of and access to library and information services;</p> <p>(4) developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;</p> <p>(7) developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks;</p>	<p>Partly Achieved</p>	<p>Partly Achieved</p>
<p>GOAL 4 Deliver access to Iowa Library Services' collections.</p>	<p>(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;</p> <p>(4) developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;</p> <p>(7) developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks;</p>	<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Achieved</p>
<p>GOAL 5 Foster a culture of innovation and collaboration within Iowa Library Services.</p>	<p>(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills;</p> <p>(3) (A) providing training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services; and (B) enhancing efforts to recruit future professionals to the field of library and information services;</p> <p>(4) developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;</p>	<p>Achieved</p>	<p>Achieved</p>