

# The Missouri State Library Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States Implementation Evaluation FFY 2013 – FFY 2017

Evaluators:

William Wilson

Martha Kyrillidou, Ph.D.

Amy Forrester

Shana Hattis



**QUALITYMETRICS**

Helping libraries achieve success

[www.qualitymetricsllc.com](http://www.qualitymetricsllc.com)

Date: March 14, 2017

Commissioned by The Missouri State Library

Barbara Reading, State Librarian



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation Summary	1
Evaluation Report	6
Introduction	6
Background	7
Retrospective Questions (Section A)	9
Goal 1	9
Goal 2	16
Goal 3	24
Process Questions (Section B)	29
Methodology Questions (Section C)	30
Appendix A: Acronyms	A-1
Appendix B: Interviewees/Focus Group Participants	B-1
Appendix C: Bibliography of Documents Reviewed	C-1
Appendix D: Focus Group Questions	D-1
Appendix E: Web-Survey Instrument	E-1
Appendix F: Measuring Success Table	F-1
Appendix G: Targeted Audience Table	G-1
Appendix H: Expenditure Tables	H-1
Appendix I: Web-Survey Report	I-1

## Evaluation Summary

Given Missouri's 2015 estimated population of 6,083,672, the state's annual LSTA allotment of approximately \$3 million per year translates into slightly less than 48 cents per person on an annual basis. LSTA funds alone are obviously inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Missouri residents. The Missouri State Library's challenge has been to find ways to make 48 cents per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services.

Missouri's primary approach to using LSTA funding has been to deploy Federal funding as close to the end-user as is feasible. Although, out of necessity, there are a few centralized programs such as the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library as well as a few others that provide a statewide service (e.g., components of the Show Me the World program), Missouri's practice is to push statewide initiatives out to the libraries through a combination of quality training, practical support (through technology and collection development grants) and sub-grants. For example, this has been the case with the statewide Racing to Read initiative; the program is designed as a statewide initiative, but is largely carried out on a local level.

In the opinion of the evaluators, the Missouri State Library has, using the measure of leveraging a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds, accomplished a great deal by very methodically and effectively carrying out the specific goals contained in its five-year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017. In the evaluators' considerable experience, few, if any, states have been as diligent in the implementation of their five-year plans. Furthermore, having worked with several dozen states on LSTA evaluations over the course of more than a decade, in our opinion, Missouri is exemplary in its management of a large and complex sub-grant program. The Missouri State Library has done what it said it would do in its five-year Plan and the state library agency's tracking of the outcome targets contained in the Plan is second to none.

There are three goal statements in the Missouri State Library's *LSTA Program Five-Year Plan for Years 2013 – 2017*. They are:

***GOAL 1: Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services, and technology to support individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.***

***GOAL 2: Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal, and social development needs of Missourians particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.***

***GOAL 3: Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.***

For purposes of this summary, the evaluators will look at the accomplishments of the Missouri State Library in implementing their Plan at the Goal level. In the body of the evaluation, details supporting the conclusions that are reached regarding whether goals have been achieved, partly achieved or not achieved will be provided.

**A. Retrospective Questions**

**A-1. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s 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 key Missouri State Library staff involved with the LSTA program to offer their personal appraisals of progress toward each of the three goals included in the Missouri State Library’s 2013-2017 five-year Plan. The evaluators prefaced their request for this internal assessment by noting the fact that the State was only three years into the implementation of a five-year plan. Consequently, it was acknowledged that it was unlikely that any of the goals would be completely or finally achieved. In completing the assessment, some liberty has been taken in using the current level of accomplishments and the current trajectory of accomplishments to assess whether success will likely be achieved by the end of the planning horizon.

In the self-assessment, the Missouri State Library’s internal appraisal was that the state library agency had advanced enough to qualify as having PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 1 and that it had progressed sufficiently to warrant a rating of ACHIEVED on Goals 2 and 3. In fact, the evaluators find evidence that suggests that Missouri has ACHIEVED all three goals. Table 1 offers a summary of both the Missouri State Library’s internal assessments and the evaluators’ conclusions.

<b>Table 1 – Missouri State Library and Evaluator’s Assessment of Progress</b>		
<b>Goal</b>	<b>Missouri State Library Assessment</b>	<b>Evaluator’s Assessment</b>
GOAL 1: Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services, and technology to support individuals’ needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.	Partly Achieved	Achieved
GOAL 2: Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal, and social development needs of Missourians particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.	Achieved	Achieved
GOAL 3: Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.	Achieved	Achieved

**GOAL 1**

***Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services, and technology to support individuals’ needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.***

Goal 1 expenditures represent 55.10% of Missouri’s total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period. The evaluators have identified ten different project categories that have been carried out in support of Goal 1. This includes both statewide programs such as the Show Me the World resource sharing effort and major sub-grant programs such as Technology Mini Grants.

The evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 1. They are:

1. Components of the Show Me the World resource sharing program expand equitable access to resources by providing a comprehensive interlibrary loan system that includes finding tools, courier service, and the opportunity for libraries that might otherwise not be able to participate in a shared integrated library system to do so.
2. The Missouri Digital Heritage program greatly enlarges the resource base available to libraries and the people they serve. The output of this program is impressive and its coordination and the promulgation of appropriate standards ensure the quality of the digital resources and their availability to a wide audience.
3. Technology Mini Grants help to meet technology needs that would not otherwise be met.

While efforts will have to continue on an ongoing basis, the evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 1.

## **GOAL 2**

***Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal, and social development needs of Missourians particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.***

Goal 2 expenditures represent 40.22% of Missouri's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period. The evaluators have identified ten different project categories that have been carried out in support of Goal 2. This includes both statewide programs such as the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library and major sub-grant programs including those that support the Racing to Read initiative.

The evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 2. They are:

1. The Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library has been highly successful not just in maintaining its user base, but in expanding it. Missouri's outreach efforts are truly exemplary and should serve as a model for other states. Book discussion groups for Talking Book and Braille Library patrons and an extension of the Racing to Read early literacy program are just a few examples of the innovative approach that is producing real results and expanding the availability of library services to "Missourians... with difficulty using the library."
2. The Missouri State Library's early literacy efforts are also exemplary. The Racing to Read statewide initiative was modeled on an already successful effort by the Springfield-Greene County Library District's program of the same name. The state library has leveraged this strength by providing training and grant assistance that enables libraries across the state to replicate this highly structured (but delightfully whimsical) program. This program also addresses important target audiences by reaching children at risk in both urban and rural areas.
3. While collection development grants are not particularly innovative, awards to school and public libraries have expanded the quality of resources available in many communities. This program also addresses equity concerns that are related to Goal 1.

Again, efforts along these lines will need to continue on an ongoing basis, however, the evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 2.

### **GOAL 3**

***Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.***

Goal 3 expenditures represent only 4.52% of Missouri's total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period. The evaluators have identified just one project category that includes activities that have been carried out in support of Goal 3. Efforts are primarily related to staff development. While a small number of sub-grants are included, they fall under Goal 3 because they relate to building the capacity of libraries and library staff to serve the public.

The evaluators find a single compelling reason to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 3. It is:

1. Both the scope and the careful design of continuing education efforts undertaken in support of Goal 3 are impressive. The evaluators find that training efforts are closely tied to needs and to specific initiatives. This fact, in turn, helps to ensure the success of the States substantial sub-grant activity. The evaluators also find ample evidence that suggests that participants in training have internalized what they have learned and that they are using it on an ongoing basis.

The evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 3.

#### **A-2. To what extent did MISSOURI STATE LIBRARY's Five-Year Plan activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?**

Appendix F shows that ALL the Measuring Success Focal Areas were impacted in some way by the Missouri State Library's LSTA-funded activities. The most significant impacts can be reported in the Lifelong Learning (early literacy), Information Access (Show Me the World and Missouri Digital Heritage) and Institutional Capacity (staff development) focal areas. Less, but not insignificant, impact can be demonstrated in the Economic and Employment Development, Human Resources, and Civic Engagement areas.

#### **A-3. Did any of the groups identified by IMLS as target audiences represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No)**

Two identified target audiences reach the 10% expenditure threshold established by IMLS as representing a substantial focus. They are:

- Individuals with Disabilities (The Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library)
- Children (aged 0 – 5)

Many of the other identified audiences such as the Library Workforce, School Aged Youth, and Individuals Living Below the Poverty Line are the focus of specific projects and activities; however, expenditures for these efforts do not approach the 10% threshold.

### **B. Process Questions**

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

The Missouri State Library has used SPR data to adjust and refine grant programs such as the School Nonfiction Development and Racing to Read/ Racing to Read Story Time Plus grants. Poverty assessments and library budget data from the Public Library Statistical Report were used to determine eligibility for the most recent Public Library Collection Development grant round.

**B-2. Specify any changes the Missouri State Library made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred.**

No formal changes or amendments were made to the Plan. However, some adjustments were made within the spirit of the original Plan to reflect staffing realities. The five-year Plan was written with flexibility in mind and at a time when the State Library had a larger staff than it has today.

**B-3. How and with whom has the Missouri State Library shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources?**

SPR data has been used internally for planning and evaluation purposes and has been shared directly with Secretary's Council on Library Development. Summary information has also been shared with the Secretary of State's Office and, as appropriate, with other stakeholders. Access to SPR data was also provided to QualityMetrics for the purpose of conducting the LSTA evaluation.

**C. Methodology Questions**

**C-1. Identify how Missouri State Library 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 Missouri State Library's implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, the Missouri Office of Administration issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a "Library Services and Technology Act Study." The RFP was initially issued on July 13, 2016 with a due date for proposals of July 29, 2016. An Addendum to the RFP was subsequently issued on July 25, 2016 with a deadline for submission of August 4, 2016. As a result of this competitive bidding process, QualityMetrics LLC, a library consulting firm familiar with LSTA and with considerable expertise in evaluation methodologies, was awarded the contract in October 2016 to conduct the independent LSTA evaluation in a manner that was consistent with IMLS guidelines.

**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 employed a mixed-methods evaluation approach that included a review of the SPR and other relevant documents and statistics, focus groups, personal interviews and a web-based survey to collect information from stakeholders.

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

Missouri State Library staff were engaged through personal interviews during a site visit to the agency, via telephone calls, and through frequent e-mail exchanges. Stakeholders were engaged through focus groups and a web-based survey.

**C-4. Discuss how the Missouri State Library will share the key findings and recommendations with others.**

The Missouri State Library will share the findings with the Secretary's Council on Library Development, with the Secretary of State's Office, and with other agencies within state government. Key findings will also be shared with the library community by alerting the libraries in Missouri of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will be publicly available on the state library agency's website as well as on the IMLS website.

# Evaluation Report

## INTRODUCTION

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

Changes built into the new system to enhance the ability to track outcomes, focal areas and targeted audiences in the long-term affected the ways in which states reported their projects in the short-term. In fact, the structure in which SPR data was captured during the three-year period varied somewhat from year to year. This was particularly true in reporting for FFY 2015. The Missouri State Library appropriately reported the same or similar activities in different ways in different years due to new reporting protocols established by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

This change in reporting protocols as well as the fact that the SPR system itself was still undergoing revision during the period covered by the evaluation often resulted in a lack of parallel reporting. 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 QualityMetrics that incorporated focus groups, a web-based survey, and interviews in addition to a review of the SPR and other statistical reports provided by the state library agency proved invaluable and successfully dealt with most of these challenges.

In an effort to fairly evaluate the Missouri State Library’s progress, the evaluators have taken some liberty in standardizing the reporting of projects into fewer, larger categories. The hybrid approach that was used groups projects undertaken to further each goal with similar projects. Charts that appear in Appendix H (Missouri LSTA Grants to States Expenditures – FFY 2013 – FFY 2015), present all the hybrid project categories used as well as expenditures in each of these categories for each of the three years. One chart shows all expenditures for efforts undertaken in pursuit of all goals followed by a breakdown of project categories and expenditures for each of the three goals.

The evaluation that follows is structured around the IMLS’ “*Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation*” and the three goals that appeared in the *LSTA Program Five-Year Plan for Years 2013 – 2017*. After presenting a short background section, we will proceed to report on the “Retrospective Questions” (Section A) posed by IMLS for each of the three 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.

## **BACKGROUND**

Since the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States program uses a formula that is primarily population-driven to determine state allotments, Missouri, as a state with a moderately-sized population, receives a moderately-sized allocation. Missouri’s LSTA funding allotment ranks 18<sup>th</sup> among the states and territories included in the program. The Show-Me State received an average of just under \$3 million (\$2,910,391) per year over the course of the three years (Federal Fiscal Year [FFY] 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015) covered by this evaluation.

Given Missouri’s 2015 estimated population of 6,083,672, the state’s annual LSTA allotment of approximately \$3 million per year translates into slightly less than 48 cents per person on an annual basis. LSTA funds alone are obviously inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Missouri residents. The Missouri State Library’s challenge has been to find ways to make 48 cents per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services.

Missouri’s primary approach to using LSTA funding has been to deploy Federal funding as close to the end-user as is feasible. Although, out of necessity, there are a few centralized programs such as the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library as well as a few others that provide a statewide service (e.g., components of the Show Me the World program), Missouri’s practice is to push statewide initiatives out to the libraries through a combination of quality training, practical support (through technology and collection development grants) and sub-grants. For example, this has been the case with the statewide Racing to Read initiative; the program is designed as a statewide initiative, but is largely carried out on a local level. The Missouri State Library also uses the strategy of contracting with organizations such as MOREnet and MOBIUS for certain services. This enables libraries to access the services and enables the State Library to retain a degree of flexibility that would not be possible if it attempted to provide services directly.

In the opinion of the evaluators, the Missouri State Library has, using the measure of leveraging a small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds, accomplished a great deal by very methodically and effectively carrying out the specific goals contained in its five-year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017. In the evaluators’ considerable experience, few, if any, states have been as diligent in the implementation of their five-year plans. Furthermore, having worked with several dozen states on LSTA evaluations over the course of more than a decade, in our opinion, Missouri is exemplary in its management of a large and complex sub-grant program. The Missouri State Library has done what it said it would do in its five-year Plan and the state library agency’s tracking of the outcome targets contained in the Plan is second to none.

There are three goal statements in the Missouri State Library's *LSTA Program Five-Year Plan for Years 2013 – 2017*. They are:

**GOAL 1:**

***Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services and technology to support individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.***

**GOAL 2:**

***Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal and social development needs of Missourians, particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.***

**GOAL 3:**

***Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.***

The Missouri State Library directs over half (55.10% of total FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015 expenditures) of its LSTA funding to projects that address Goal 1. An additional forty percent (40.22%) of LSTA funds were expended on projects supporting Goal 2. Apart from a very small amount allocated for administrative purposes (less than 1% and far below the four percent threshold established for the program), the balance of the allotment (4.52% of total FFY 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015 expenditures) is spent on projects supporting Goal 3.

Missouri structured its 2013 – 2017 Plan using a framework of goals, outcomes, and typically quantitative targets under each outcome. In total, there are three goals and nine outcomes. Multiple performance targets are established for each outcome. The evaluators have adopted this reporting strategy.

Missouri has done an admirable job of moving toward outcome-based evaluation. Their 2013 – 2017 Plan fully embraced IMLS' Measuring Success even though the focal areas and intents were still under development at the time the plan was written. Missouri's LSTA Plan also incorporates outcome statements that often describe the desired change that is sought in pursuing a goal. Not surprisingly though, many of the targets that are identified under the outcomes are actually outputs or hybrid measures that fall somewhere between outputs and outcomes. For example, one of the targets is:

**“Training will be provided in the area of library services that enhance the understanding of and development of library services pertaining to life skills, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the techniques learned during training.”**

Furthermore, most of the targets measure change at the library or library staff member level rather than assessing impact on end-users. As has already been noted, Missouri has done an extraordinary job of tracking their progress. The evaluators believe that the Missouri State Library is well positioned to take the next step toward outcome evaluation by introducing a few measures in their next plan that attempt to identify impacts on end-users.

Much of what follows in answer to the “Retrospective Questions” is derived from reporting by the State Library. Because Missouri’s tracking of progress is comprehensive, directly aligned with its plan, and up to date, the evaluators were able to adopt a process in which we used information and data collected from other sources, such as the web-survey and focus groups, to merely validate the excellent statistics reported by the State.

### **A. Retrospective Questions**

**GOAL 1 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s Five-Year Plan Goal 1 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?**

**GOAL 1:**

***Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services and technology to support individuals’ needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.***

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

**Projects & Expenditures**

Digital Imaging	\$ 620,396.12
Library Service Improvement Grants (Goal 1 – FFY 2014 only)	\$ 25,038.00
Retrospective Conversion	\$ 105, 857.00
Get Connected Courier Service	\$ 402,562.96
Missouri Digital Heritage	\$ 141,811.36
Missouri Evergreen	\$ 355,184.82
Show Me the World	\$ 1,525,819.09
Technology Ladder	\$472,341.00
Technology Mini Grant	\$ 1,159,175.76
Website Makeover (FFY 2013 only)	<u>\$ 2,951.00</u>
<b>GOAL 1 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 4,811,137.11</b>

Goal 1 expenditures represent 55.10% of Missouri’s total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Two outcomes were identified in the Plan for Goal 1. They are:

- **Missourians have expanded services for learning and knowledge of and equity of access to quality library resources and services.**
- **Missouri libraries use a strong statewide and local technology infrastructure to best meet patron needs**

**GOAL 1 OUTCOME 1:** Missourians have expanded services for learning and knowledge of and equity of access to quality library resources and services.

GOAL 1 OUTCOME 1 TARGETS:

The MOREnet databases are not directly supported with LSTA funds. However, State dollars expended on the program are part of Missouri’s matching funds.

**TARGET 1: MOREnet statistical reports will show a 5% increase in use of the suite of online resources available for statewide access via academic, school and public libraries during the five-year plan**

**Table 2 – Use of online resources**

	SFY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	Difference (16-13)
Gale	1,278,555	1,367,063	1,225,940	N/A	N/A
Newsbank	352,551	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ebsco	69,804,149	85,194,597	82,535,772	76,566,867	9.69%
Learning Express Library	62,401	46,162	45,205	43,418	-30.42%
HeritageQuest	N/A	470,304	1,781,263	5,416,402	1051.68%
Total	71,497,656	87,078,126	84,362,240	82,026,687	14.73%

- Newsbank was discontinued in FY2014 due to low use and high cost.
- The Gale resource was discontinued in FY2016 when the resource ceased. A replacement was not sought due to budget cuts at the state.
- HeritageQuest was added to the statewide resources in FY2014. It has shown steady increase in use.

The period covered by the evaluation has been a transitional one in regard to the MOREnet program. After significant changes in the program in State Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014, the program is now stabilizing with a different mix of resources. Improvements have occurred when the new baseline is used.

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 1:** Partially met

When the databases that were discontinued are removed from consideration, the 5% increase in use has been met for EBSCO and HeritageQuest.

Unfortunately, use of Learning Express Library (LEL) has steadily declined. Promotion of LEL was limited in SFY2016 when the product changed ownership. Its availability and use should be heavily promoted in SFY2017.

In June of 2016, TumbleBook Library's TUMBLDELUXE was added to the mix for public libraries. This resource is already proving to be an extremely popular addition.

**TARGET 2: Training will be provided on the content and search functions of online resources and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Follow-up surveys are administered for most training events and an attempt is made to determine whether participants are applying what they learn to their daily practice. Following are the results of the survey conducted as a follow-up in regard to implementing the concepts that were taught at technology-based services training events. Although samples are very small (and therefore subject to significant swings based on just a few responses), the percentage of library staff members reporting the application of what they learned in these sessions has hovered near or above the 75% target level.

**FY13-** 83.3% (30/36) of respondents implemented the concepts at the "Somewhat," "To a great extent," or "quite a lot" levels. (Q16, 2014 CE Survey)

**FY14-** 100% (17/17) of respondents implemented the concepts at the "Somewhat," "To a great extent," or "quite a lot" levels. (Q19, 2015 CE Survey).

**FY15-**68.5% (13/19) of respondents implemented the concepts at the "Somewhat," "To a great extent," or "quite a lot" levels. (Q21, 2016 CE Survey).

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 2:** Substantially met.

The Missouri State Library met the goal for two out of three years. The 75% level appears to be somewhat arbitrary. Setting a new benchmark based on longitudinal data may be advisable.

**TARGET 3: Instructional curriculum created through State Library and partner efforts will be in use at 10% of Missouri public libraries within 2 years of availability of materials, with continued growth shown throughout the remainder of the five-year plan**

During SFY2014, the Missouri State Library contracted with the Mid-America Library Alliance (MALA) to provide Human Resources webcasts on a variety of topics, to be available for viewing 24/7. These were viewed by staff or trustees from 62 public library districts, 13 academic libraries, 4 institutional libraries and 2 elementary/secondary schools. In SFY2015, an additional 38 public libraries and 1 institutional library viewed the content.

**Table 3 – Use of instructional curriculum by library type**

Library Type	SFY14	SFY15	Unique Overall
Public	62	38	81
Academic	13	0	13
Institutional	4	1	5
School	2	0	2

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 3:** Successfully met in that 62 of 163 public libraries (38%) used the curriculum in SFY2014.

Due to a change in the model used to deliver service in SFY2015, the Missouri State Library is no longer able to determine who or which libraries actually viewed a specific topic (The State Library now contracts for a specific number (100) of “All Access Passes.” These passes provide access to a wider variety of topics, but are still delivered via webcasts. A new metric for tracking this aspect of Outcome 1 is needed.

**TARGET 4: Courier service participation surveys will show an increased acceptance of and satisfaction with the service**

In the web survey conducted by the evaluators, 100 of 111 respondents (90.1%) ranking the importance of the courier service rated it as important or very important. One librarian said

“Interlibrary loan has increased a lot since we have the courier twice a week. It has helped patrons get books that we cannot or will not be purchasing.”

Results from the MALA Get Connected Courier Service survey are consistent with these findings.

**Table 4 - Level of satisfaction with courier service**

	SFY14	SFY15	SFY16
Show Me the World Get Connected Courier Delivery	98.8%	98%	94.3%
Customer service when contacting the MALA office concerning your courier delivery	98.7%	98%	96.4%
Turnaround time	91.0%	96%	94.5%
Problem resolution	92.1%	98%	94.5%
Your courier/driver	93.8%	96%	88.9%

(MALA Get Connected Courier Service survey conducted by MALA to fulfill grant report requirement)

Although satisfaction remains very high overall, some dissatisfaction has been expressed about the current carrier which is reflected in fluctuating satisfaction rates.

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 4:** Partially met

**TARGET 5: Staff surveys of the shared integrated library system will show increased acceptance of and satisfaction with the service**

**Table 5 – Satisfaction with integrated library system**

	2014	2015	2016
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	93% (134/144)	92.9% (183/197)	93.6% (160/171)

(MO Evergreen survey by MOBIUS)

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 5:** Successfully met.

Responses to the web survey conducted by the evaluators underscore the importance of Evergreen. One respondent said,

“Missouri Evergreen has allowed our library to service patrons in ways we had not expected... the patrons are happy and so is the library!”

**TARGET 6: Metadata for Missouri Digital Heritage collections will continue to be created in a manner that follows best practices**

Results:

The Missouri State Library requires grantees to adhere to the following guidelines that incorporate best practices in both digitization and access:

[http://s1.sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/LibraryGrantsTemp/MDH\\_MetadataGuidelines.pdf](http://s1.sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/LibraryGrantsTemp/MDH_MetadataGuidelines.pdf)

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 6:** Successfully met.

Missouri Digital Heritage collections continue to adhere to high metadata practices.

The output of digital projects is truly remarkable. A review of a random selection of Digital Imaging grants in FFY 2015 showed production levels ranging from 39,000 to 89,000 pages per grant. Useful historical resources such as newspapers and city directories are among the items digitized and made accessible.

**GOAL 1 OUTCOME 2:** Missouri libraries use a strong statewide and local technology infrastructure to best meet patron needs

**GOAL 1 OUTCOME 2 TARGETS**

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided to enhance skills in technology planning and the effective use of technology, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

**FY13-** 45% (9/20) applied concepts/techniques learned in training (CE Training Survey 2014).

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 1: Program discontinued**

The FCC dropped the requirement of a library having an approved tech plan in order to receive e-rate and the need for this type of training is no longer as great.

This is an example of a program that was eliminated because there was no longer a need for it. The program served its purpose when it was relevant.

**TARGET 2: MOREnet and the REAL Program will maintain its high satisfaction levels on customer surveys of meeting training and technical support needs and value in relationship to cost**

**Table 6 – Satisfaction with MOREnet and REAL programs**

	SFY 14	SFY 15	SFY 16
<b>Price/Value</b>	83%	89%	88%
<b>Customer Service</b>	100%	95.20%	95.5%
<b>Specific Service Needs</b>	83%	91%	89.5%

(Customer surveys conducted by MOREnet)

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 2: Successfully met.**

Satisfaction with MOREnet and the REAL Program remain high according to customer surveys.

**TARGET 3: 40% of Missouri public libraries will implement system software or hardware to improve the operation and flexibility of their technology infrastructure during the five-year plan**

**Table 7 – Library system or hardware upgrade grant participation**

	Total		
	Libraries	Participating	Percent
<b>FY13</b>	150	50	33.3%
<b>FY14</b>	150	66	44.0%
<b>FY15</b>	149	52	34.9%
<b>Total Unique</b>	149	123	82.6%

(Public Library Survey and LSTA technology grants by year)

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 3: Successfully met.**

Approximately 82.6% of public libraries have implemented system or hardware upgrades.

One librarian provided a powerful endorsement of the importance of the technology grants in the statement,

“These grants broaden our services and reduce costs.”



Another said,

“The technology grants have been essential for our library to keep up with changes in technology.”

A third responded to the survey saying,

“Grants such as these make it possible for poor rural libraries to meet our patrons’ ever growing technological needs.”

## **GOAL 1 CONCLUSION**

The evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 1. They are:

1. Components of the Show Me the World resource sharing program expand equitable access to resources by providing a comprehensive interlibrary loan system that includes finding tools, courier service, and the opportunity for libraries that might otherwise not be able to participate in a shared integrated library system to do so.
2. The Missouri Digital Heritage program greatly enlarges the resource base available to libraries and the people they serve. The output of this program is impressive and its coordination and the promulgation of appropriate standards ensure the quality of the digital resources and their availability to a wide audience.
3. Technology Mini Grants help to meet technology needs that would not otherwise be met

The evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 1.

### **A-2. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s Goal 1 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 Information Access and Institutional Capacity focal areas. The Show Me the World program in particular has enabled participation in interlibrary loan and resource sharing and has helped 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 the Missouri State Library’s Five-Year Plan Goal 1 activities? (Yes/No) NO**

The target for most projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 1 was a statewide audience. While many individuals who are part of identified target audiences benefitted from the services offered, they were not directly targeted.

**GOAL 2 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s Five-Year Plan Goal 2 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?**

**GOAL 2:**  
***Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal and social development needs of Missourians, particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.***

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

<b>Projects &amp; Expenditures</b>	
Library Service Improvement Grants (Goal 2)	\$ 100,260.73
Public Library Collection Development (FFY 2014 and FFY 2015)	\$ 422,625.83
Racing to Read	\$ 545,290.44
Racing to Read Story Time Plus	\$ 185,688.21
School Nonfiction Collection Development	\$ 152,757.87
Spotlight on Literacy Grants	\$ 109,631.82
Summer Library Program (Goal 2)	\$ 831,150.24
Racing to Read Early Literacy Initiative (FFY 2014 and FFY 2015)	\$ 72,828.97
Services to Underserved	\$ 82,351.13
Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library	<u>\$ 1,009,387.11</u>
<b>GOAL 2 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 3,511,972.35</b>

Goal 2 expenditures represent 40.22% of Missouri’s total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Five outcomes were identified in the Plan for Goal 2. They are:

- **Missourians with print and other disabilities have access to resources and services to meet their educational, cultural, intellectual, personal and social development needs**
- **Missourians have access to resources and services to meet their educational, cultural, intellectual, personal and social development needs**
- **Missourians have improved skills to make informed decisions that affect their life conditions.**
- **Missourians have access to resources and services to meet their workforce skills needs, fostering a competent and productive citizenry.**
- **Persons having difficulty using a library and those in underserved urban and rural communities have improved access to library services that are pertinent to their unique needs.**

## **GOAL 2 OUTCOME 1:**

**Missourians with print and other disabilities have access to resources and services to meet their educational, cultural, intellectual, personal and social development needs**

### **GOAL 2 OUTCOME 1 TARGETS**

#### **TARGET 1: Wolfner Library will maintain its high customer service satisfaction levels**

Results:

On the 2014 Wolfner Patron Survey:

- 97.8% of patrons rated Wolfner Library Staff's helpfulness/courteousness as Excellent (74.6%) or Very Good (23.2%)
- 89.9% were Very Satisfied with the number of books received

#### **PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 1: Successfully met**

A focus group conducted with users of the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library revealed both the passion for the services offered by the Wolfner Library and the wide diversity of the individuals served. It was obvious from the focus group participants' comments that Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library patrons are more than just customers. One participant, simply said,

"We're family."

The evaluators believe that most library for the blind programs limit themselves by depending too heavily on transactional measures. Measures of satisfaction are somewhat better; however, the comment above would suggest that measures of well-being and civic engagement may be more appropriate. Along this vein, the book discussion sessions held via conference call and facilitated by Wolfner Library staff are opening a new world of civic interaction with this special needs community. The fact that participants decided on their own that a non-fiction discussion was needed signals an interest in more than just "passing the time of day."

#### **TARGET 2: The number of people served through Wolfner Library will increase by 3% from 2012 levels**

Results:

- In 2012, Wolfner Library served about 8,200 people. Four years later, that number has increased to 11,875, far surpassing the 3% increase.
- Additionally, institutional users have increased by over 60% during that same timeframe.

#### **PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 2: Successfully met**

The success in increasing patrons served is directly attributed to an increase in outreach events conducted by staff, which has more than doubled over the last four years. Library staff speak with groups and attend events for potential library patrons, plus those for caregivers, teachers, and those who work with visually-impaired or disabled persons. The Library has also strengthened connections to social service organizations, other government agencies, schools, and public libraries.

The Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library has been highly successful not just in maintaining its user base, but in expanding it. Missouri's outreach efforts are truly exemplary and should serve as a model for other states. Book discussion groups for Talking Book and Braille Library patrons and an extension of the Racing to Read early literacy program are just a few examples of the innovative approach that is producing real results and expanding the availability of library services to "Missourians... with difficulty using the library."

**TARGET 3: Training of library staff will be provided on opportunities pertaining to disability awareness and library services, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

**FY14-** 80% (4/5) of respondents implemented the concepts at the "Somewhat," "To a great extent," or "Quite a lot" levels. (Q24, 2015 CE Survey)

**FY15-** 83.3% (5/6) of respondents implemented the concepts at the "Somewhat," "To a great extent," or "Quite a lot" levels. (Q25, 2016 CE Survey)

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 3:** Successfully met

While this type of training does not have high attendance, those who do attend find the information helpful and generally put the lessons learned into practice.

The web-survey conducted by the evaluators reveals that some work remains to be done with the library community. Although the level of awareness of various talking book programs such as Braille and Audio Reading Download (BARD) is higher than most states in which we have conducted similar surveys (53.08% said they were either aware or very aware of the service), over one-quarter of librarians (26.15%) said that they were unaware or only slightly aware of the service. An awareness target related to library staff (and actions to address higher awareness) may be advisable.

On a related issue, only half (50.0%) of library staff responding to the evaluator's web-survey indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "library staff have the skills and training they need to inform patrons about the Talking Books program and to help them register for the service." Again, this is higher than we have observed in many other states, but is still less than optimal.

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 2:**

**Missourians have access to resources and services to meet their educational, cultural, intellectual, personal and social development needs**

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 2 TARGETS**

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided in the areas of literacy services and cultural programming, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

**FY13-** 98.4% (62/63) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q20, 2014 CE Survey)

**FY14-** 98.2% (107/109) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q16, 2015 CE Survey)

**FY15-**97.4% (37/38) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q17, 2016 CE Survey)

**PROGRESS ON MEETING TARGET 1:** Successfully met.

Training in literacy services remains a popular training request and receives high marks from attendees.

There is ample evidence that Missouri libraries have internalized what they have learned about literacy and the impact of the programs associated with the training is significant and reaches a broad audience.

The Missouri State Library’s early literacy efforts are exemplary. The Racing to Read statewide initiative is modeled on an already successful effort by the Springfield-Greene County Library District’s program of the same name. The state library has leveraged this strength by providing training and grant assistance that enables libraries across the state to replicate this highly structured (but delightfully whimsical) program. This program also addresses important target audiences by reaching children at risk in both urban and rural areas.

As you can see from the chart drawn from data collected by the evaluators in the web-based survey, the magnitude of early literacy programming that is offered is significant. There is evidence here that most librarians who receive Racing to Read training in turn implement the programming.

**Table 8 – Racing to Read participation and awareness**

<b>Programs/Initiatives</b>	<b>Count of participating libraries</b>	<b>Count of non-participating libraries</b>	<b>Libraries unaware of program</b>	<b>Not applicable/ libraries not eligible for program</b>
Racing to Read or other early literacy training	84	37	7	1
Racing to Read and Racing to Read Story Time Plus Grants	69	45	8	1
Activities/ programs for babies	70	36	14	1
Activities/ programs for toddlers	85	29	10	1
Activities/ programs for preschoolers	91	22	10	1
Storytimes	103	14	9	0
Other (Please specify below.)	18	9	3	3

**TARGET 2: Participation in teen and children summer reading programs will increase by 3% during the course of the five-year plan**

**Table 9 – Summer Reading Program participation/attendance**

	2013	2014	2015	2016	Difference (16-13)
<b>Children</b>	187,538	213,216	156,536	143,599	-28.07%
<b>Young Adult</b>	32,767	61,483	29,492	25,484	-24.69%

(Annual Summer Reading Program survey)

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 2: Not met**

In SFY2015, a large library system went to an online only summer reading program model. This greatly reduced that library’s participation numbers. In SFY2016, two large library systems had branches that were closed during the summer reading months, also impacting participation numbers.

The Missouri State Library should closely monitor this situation to determine whether there is truly a downward trend or if the decline is due to these specific factors.

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 3: Missourians have improved skills to make informed decisions that affect their life conditions.**

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 3 TARGET**

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided in the area of library services that enhance the understanding of and development of library services pertaining to life skills, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the techniques learned during training**

Results:

**FY13-** 96.3% (26/27) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels (Q24, 2014 CE Survey)

**FY14-** 75% (12/16) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q10, 2015 CE Survey).

**FY15-**100% (2/2) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q13, 2016 CE Survey).

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 1: Successfully met.**

While this type of training does not have high attendance, those who do attend find the information helpful in developing or improving life skills services at their libraries.

As was noted earlier, the 75% threshold seems arbitrary. As the Missouri State Library proceeds to develop its new five-year LSTA plan, it should explore a variety of learning

assessment models and should consider the development of new, more meaningful measures that more accurately assess behavioral changes in participants.

Questions that explore institutional change as well as personal change may be worthy of consideration. Following is a question on institutional change related to the Racing to Read program that was asked in the evaluator’s web-survey.

**Table 10 – Impact of Racing to Read program participation**

<b>Results of participating in the Racing to Read program</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Increased the number of young children and families using library.	3.1%	17.1%	49.6%	30.2%
Changed the public’s perception of what a public library can be.	2.3%	20.2%	48.1%	30.0%
Families and caregivers are gaining valuable information about how to help their children develop reading and learning skills.	2.3%	8.5%	58.1%	30.5%
Library expanded its partnerships with other organizations in the community	4.7%	17.1%	48.1%	30.8%
Increased amount of outreach library is doing in the community	5.4%	20.0%	43.8%	30.8%

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 4:  
Missourians have access to resources and services to meet their workforce skills needs, fostering a competent and productive citizenry.**

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 4 TARGETS**

**TARGET 1: 25% of Missouri public libraries will offer or partner with other entities in offering workforce and economic development training opportunities by 2017**

**Table 11 – Libraries participating in workforce and economic development training**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Participating Libraries</b>	<b>Total Number of Libraries</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>SFY13</b>	36	150	24.00%
<b>SFY14</b>	37	150	24.70%
<b>SFY15</b>	40	149	26.85%
<b>Total</b>	53	149	35.57%

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 1:** Successfully met.

The number of libraries that provide workforce and economic developing training has increased each year with 35.57% offering such programs.

**Statistical reports will show a 10% increase in use of online tools provided to libraries to support efforts in fostering workforce skill building**

**Table 12 – Use of online workforce skill building tools**

	<b>SFY13</b>	<b>SFY14</b>	<b>Percent change</b>
<b>Tests and Courses</b>	62,401	46,162	-35.18%
<b>Resumes</b>	451	313	-44.09%
<b>Job Searches</b>	12,077	6,138	-96.76%
<b>Computer Skills</b>	148	80	-85.00%

Note: The online resource Job and Career Accelerator was discontinued in October 2014 due to low use.

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 1:** Program discontinued due to low use.

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 5:**  
**Persons having difficulty using a library and those in underserved urban and rural communities have improved access to library services that are pertinent to their unique needs.**

**GOAL 2 OUTCOME 5 TARGETS**

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided in ways to improve, expand and/or develop library services to targeted and underserved populations, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

**FY13-** 96.3% (26/27) implemented the concepts/techniques either “Somewhat,” “To a great extent” or “quite a lot.” (Q24, CE Survey 2014)

**FY14-** 80% (4/5) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q23, 2015 CE Survey).

**FY15-**83.3% (5/6) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q25, 2016 CE Survey).

**PROGRESS ON REACHING TARGET 1:** Successfully met.

See other comments regarding measurement of training implementation

The evaluators believe that moving toward measures of perception and behavioral change that could be administered among staff and perhaps even among end-users would be consistent with Missouri’s philosophy of pushing LSTA funds out into the libraries of the State.

Exploration of measures of the impact of both training and competitive grants on outreach and the perceptions of the public may provide more information than simply measuring whether an individual says that they are acting on what they learned. Following is an example from the web-survey conducted by the evaluators that shows that technology grants are having an impact on end users.



**Table 13 – Impact of receiving grant(s) on libraries**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Receiving an LSTA technology grant from MSL has increased the number of people using my library.	2.3%	12.4%	68.2%	17.1%
The technology that my library implemented with the grant we received has changed the public's perception of what a public library can be.	2.3%	9.3%	71.3%	17.1%
My library has increased our presence in the community as a result of receiving an LSTA technology grant.	3.1%	8.7%	71.7%	16.5%

**TARGET 2: 50% of Missouri public libraries will have at least one staff member participate in youth services training**

Results:

75 out of 149= 50.3% (Included in the totals are: Winter Institute 2013, Summer Institute 2013, Make it Pop 2013, Learning about Your Teen 2016, Passive Programming 2015, Uke Can Do It – Missouri Library Association Preconference 2014).

**PROGRESS IN REACHING TARGET 2:** Successfully met.

This participation total does not include early literacy training. If early literacy training was included the percentage of libraries participating would be even higher.

**GOAL 2 CONCLUSION**

The evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 2. They are:

1. The Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library has been highly successful not just in maintaining its user base, but in expanding it. Missouri’s outreach efforts are truly exemplary and should serve as a model for other states. Book discussion groups for Talking Book and Braille Library patrons and an extension of the Racing to Read early literacy program are just a few examples of the innovative approach that is producing real results and expanding the availability of library services to “Missourians... with difficulty using the library.”
2. The Missouri State Library’s early literacy efforts are also exemplary. The Racing to Read statewide initiative was modeled on an already successful effort by the Springfield-Greene County Library District’s program of the same name. The state library has leveraged this strength by providing training and grant assistance that enables libraries across the state to replicate this highly structured (but delightfully whimsical) program. This program also addresses important target audiences by reaching children at risk in both urban and rural areas.
3. While collection development grants are not particularly innovative, awards to school and public libraries have expanded the quality of resources available in many communities. This program also addresses equity concerns that are related to Goal 1.

The evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 2.

**A-2. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s Five-Year Plan activities under Goal 2 achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?**

Appendix F displays how activities under the Plan map to the Measuring Success Focal areas. Several of the focal areas were impacted to some degree by the LSTA-funded activities carried out in support of Goal 2. However, impact was by far most significant in the Lifelong Learning (primarily early literacy initiatives) and Information Access (Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library). There was certainly some impact in the Institutional Capacity focal area as well.

**A-3. Did any of the groups identified by IMLS as target audiences represent a substantial focus for your Goal 1 Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No)**

Two identified target audiences reach the 10% expenditure threshold established by IMLS as representing a substantial focus. They are:

- Individuals with Disabilities (The Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library)
- Children Aged 0 – 5 (Multiple Programs)

Some other identified audiences such as the School Aged Youth (e.g., Summer Reading), and Individuals Living Below the Poverty Line (e.g., Public Library Collection Development) are the focus of specific projects and activities; however, expenditures for these efforts do not come anywhere near the 10% threshold.

**GOAL 3 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did the Missouri State Library’s Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities make progress towards the goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over-ambitious goals, partners) contributed?**

**GOAL 3:**  
***Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.***

Following are the titles of the projects and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities undertaken in support of Goal 3.

**Projects & Expenditures**

Library Skills/ Services Development/ CE (Continuing Education)	<u>\$ 394,220.07</u>
<b>GOAL 3 TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 394,220.07</b>

Goal 3 expenditures represent 4.52% of Missouri’s total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Two outcomes were identified in the Plan for Goal 3. They are:

- **Library staff members have enhanced skills that improve service delivery to the public.**
- **Library directors, managers and trustees possess enhanced skills to effectively lead Missouri libraries.**

**GOAL 3 OUTCOME 1: Library staff members have enhanced skills that improve service delivery to the public.**

GOAL 3 OUTCOME 1 TARGETS

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided in skills to advance the delivery of library and information services, and 75% of participants will report on follow up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

FY13- 93.8% (303/323) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels (Cumulative 2014 CE Survey).

FY14- 92.9% (315/339) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels (Cumulative 2015 CE Survey).

FY15- 89.4% (144/161) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels (Cumulative 2016 CE Survey).

**PROGRESS IN REACHING TARGET 1: Successfully met**

Training remains a high priority. The Missouri State Library tries to offer a variety of topics that are not readily available from other resources.

Please see earlier comments regarding the measurement of the impact of training on implementation in the field. The Missouri State Library is clearly meeting the target that was established; however, a more robust measure of impact would be more informative and helpful in designing new staff development offerings.

**TARGET 2: 90% of libraries with at least 3 FTE will participate in one or more continuing education events during the course of the five-year plan**

Results:

**FY13-** 90.7% (88/97) Qualifying libraries have attended continuing education events.

**FY14-** 91% (91/100) Qualifying libraries have attended continuing education events.

**FY15-** 95% (96/101) Qualifying libraries have attended continuing education events.

**PROGRESS IN REACHING TARGET 2:** Successfully met

Library Development staff are making extra effort to encourage staff from small to mid-sized libraries to attend specific trainings that might be of high interest to them. That tactic seems to be working well.

The penetration represented by these percentages is remarkable. They are a testament both to the quality and the variety of staff development offerings.

**TARGET 3: Number of subscribers to Missouri State Library discussion lists and newsletters will continue to grow each year from 2013 to 2017**

**Table 14 – Number of subscribers to discussion lists and newsletters**

	2013	2014	2015	2016
MOYAC	285	285	285	323
Show Me Express	1,535	1,404	1,404	1,354
MOLIB Training				119
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,820</b>	<b>1,689</b>	<b>1,689</b>	<b>1,796</b>

(Discussion and newsletter email lists)

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 3:** Not met

The Missouri State Library needs to identify ways to let library staff know about the State Library discussion lists and newsletter. One issue may be that as staff retire or otherwise leave the library, they may not be picking up their replacements.

Interaction with Missouri librarians reveals that better mechanisms for sharing successes (and failures) in carrying out competitive grants would be welcomed. Missouri offers a good mix of competitive grants. Some of these grants, Technology Mini Grants for example, promote innovation. Others, such as grants in the Racing to Read categories are more prescriptive in nature. This combination of funding to replicate success and seed money to try something new is healthy and desirable. However, providing mechanisms that allow many libraries to learn about and benefit from the efforts of other grantees offer the promise of even more innovation and improvement.

**TARGET 4: Use of the Library Science Resources Collection will increase by 15% between 2013 and 2017**

**Table 15 – Usage of Library Science Resource Collection**

Year	Checkout	Renewal	Total	% Change
2013	314	249	563	
2014	353	291	644	12.58%
2015	419	342	761	26.02%
2016	495	421	916	38.54%

(Reference Services automation library system statistical report)

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 4**

Use of this collection continues to grow. It has been helpful to run articles in *Show Me Express* when new titles are added to this collection.

**TARGET 5: Annual Statistical Report Survey data will be posted on the Missouri State Library’s website each year for use by the public library community in planning**

Results: <http://s1.sos.mo.gov/library/development/statistics/>

**PROGRESS IN MEETING TARGET 5: Successfully met.**

The data files are added annually, after the review and approval is completed.

**TARGET 6: 15% of grants awarded will receive onsite grant monitoring visits**

**Table 16 – Onsite grant monitoring visits**

	Visits	Grants	Percent
<b>FY13</b>	27	152	17.7%
<b>FY14</b>	44	199	22.1%
<b>FY15</b>	31	169	18.34%

**PROGRESS ON REACHING TARGET 6: Successfully met**

Monitoring is on eligible grants only. Grant programs with a very limited grant period, such as Show Me Steps, are not monitored.

GOAL 3 OUTCOME 2: Library directors, managers and trustees possess enhanced skills to effectively lead Missouri libraries.

**GOAL 3 OUTCOME 2 TARGETS**

**TARGET 1: Training will be provided in skills to advance library leadership and management, and 75% of participants will report on follow-up surveys having implemented the skills learned during training**

Results:

**FY13-** 94.9% (37/39) of respondents implemented the skills learned during the training (Q28, 2014 CE Survey).

**FY14-** 96.7% (59/61) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q8, 2015 CE Survey).

**FY15-**89.2% (58/65) of respondents implemented the concepts at the “Somewhat,” “To a great extent,” or “quite a lot” levels. (Q9, 2016 CE Survey).

**PROGRESS IN REACHING TARGET 1: Successfully met**

The Missouri State Library uses a variety of training resources and providers to address this goal. A special focus in SFY2016 was in addressing community engagement and strategic planning as foundational issues for the library moving forward. These sessions were held by webinar and were recorded and archived for later viewing. Of special note is the [Community Engagement Toolkit](#).

**TARGET 2: 50% of Missouri public libraries will have trustees participate in training opportunities during the course of the five-year plan**

Results:

**FY13-14** - 15 out of 152= 10%

**FY16** - 27 out of 149= 18.1%

**Total (Unique)** - 39 out of 149 = 26.2%

**PROGRESS ON REACHING TARGET 2:** Progressing toward meeting goal

There was a gap in training while the Public Library Services Consultant position was vacant. Training resumed December 2015. A strategic approach is being used by the Missouri State Library to add libraries to the list of those that have had trustees participate in training, with specific libraries targeted each year.

**GOAL 3 CONCLUSIONS**

The evaluators find a single compelling reason to conclude that the Missouri State Library has ACHIEVED Goal 3. It is:

1. Both the scope and the careful design of continuing education efforts undertaken in support of Goal 3 are impressive. The evaluators find that training efforts are closely tied to needs and to specific initiatives. This fact, in turn, helps to ensure the success of the States substantial sub-grant activity. The evaluators also find ample evidence that suggests that participants in training have internalized what they have learned and that they are using it on an ongoing basis.

The evaluators conclude that Missouri has ACHIEVED Goal 3.

**A-2. To what extent did the Missouri State Library's Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?**

Because the focus of Goal 3 is staff development, the only focal area directly impacted by Goal 3 activities is Institutional Capacity.

**A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for the Missouri State Library's Five-Year Plan Goal 3 activities? (Yes/No) NO**

Goal 3 is almost solely devoted to staff development and while projects and activities clearly target the Library Workforce, expenditure do not approach the 10% identified by IMLS as constituting a substantial focus.

**B. Process Questions**

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

The Missouri State Library has used SPR data to adjust and refine grant programs such as the School Nonfiction Development and Racing to Read/ Racing to Read Story Time Plus grants. Poverty assessments and library budget data from the Public Library Statistical Report were used to determine eligibility for the most recent Public Library Collection Development grant round.

**B-2. Specify any changes the Missouri State Library made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred.**

No formal changes or amendments were made to the Plan. However, some adjustments were made within the spirit of the original Plan to reflect staffing realities. The five-year Plan was written with flexibility in mind and at a time when the State Library had a larger staff than it has today.

Adjustments were also made that reflect changes in the library landscape in the State. Assessments are made on an ongoing basis to determine what is most critical to keep libraries moving forward and to enable them to best serve their communities and actions are taken consistent with these assessments. As a result, during the period covered by this evaluation, early literacy support became a higher priority than pursuing discovery services or cultural programming grants.

**B-3. How and with whom has the Missouri State Library shared data from the old and new SPR and from other evaluation resources?**

SPR data has been used internally for planning and evaluation purposes and has been shared directly with Secretary's Council on Library Development. Summary information has also been shared with the Secretary of State's Office and, as appropriate, with other stakeholders. Access to SPR data was also provided to QualityMetrics for the purpose of conducting the LSTA evaluation.

## **C. Methodology Questions**

### **C-1. Identify how Missouri State Library 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 Missouri State Library's implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, the Missouri Office of Administration issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a "Library Services and Technology Act Study." The RFP was initially issued on July 13, 2016 with a due date for proposals of July 29, 2016. An Addendum to the RFP was subsequently issued on July 25, 2016 with a deadline for submission of August 4, 2016. As a result of this competitive bidding process, QualityMetrics LLC, a library consulting firm familiar with LSTA and with considerable expertise in evaluation methodologies, was awarded the contract in October 2016 to conduct the independent LSTA evaluation in a manner that was consistent with IMLS guidelines.

### **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 employed a mixed-methods evaluation approach that included a review of the SPR and other relevant documents and statistics, focus groups, personal interviews and a web-based survey to collect information from stakeholders.

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

Missouri State Library staff were engaged through personal interviews during a site visit to the agency, via telephone calls, and through frequent e-mail exchanges. Stakeholders were engaged through focus groups and through a web-based survey.

### **C-4. Discuss how the Missouri State Library will share the key findings and recommendations with others.**

The Missouri State Library will share the findings with the Secretary's Council on Library Development, with the Secretary of State's Office, and with other agencies within state government. Key findings will also be shared with the library community by alerting the libraries in Missouri of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will be publicly available on the state library agency's website as well as on the IMLS website.



**Appendix A - Acronyms**

## Missouri State Library – Acronym List

<b>CIPA</b>	= <b>C</b> hildren’s <b>I</b> nternet <b>P</b> rotection <b>A</b> ct
<b>DMH</b>	= Missouri <b>D</b> epartment of <b>M</b> ental <b>H</b> ealth
<b>E-rate</b>	= <b>E</b> lectronic <i>telecommunication discount program for libraries regulated by FCC</i>
<b>IMLS</b>	= Institute of <b>M</b> useum and <b>L</b> ibrary <b>S</b> ervices
<b>LSTA</b>	= <b>L</b> ibrary <b>S</b> ervices and <b>T</b> echnology <b>A</b> ct
<b>MALA/KCMLIN</b>	= <b>M</b> id- <b>A</b> merica <b>L</b> ibrary <b>A</b> lliance / Kansas City Metropolitan Library and Information Network
<b>MOBIUS</b>	= <b>M</b> iss <b>O</b> uri <b>B</b> ibliographic <b>I</b> nformation <b>U</b> ser <b>S</b> ystem
<b>MOREnet</b>	= <b>M</b> iss <b>O</b> uri <b>R</b> esearch and <b>E</b> ducation <b>N</b> etwork
<b>MOSL</b>	= <b>M</b> iss <b>O</b> uri <b>S</b> tate <b>L</b> ibrary
<b>MPLD</b>	= <b>M</b> issouri <b>P</b> ublic <b>L</b> ibrary <b>D</b> irectors
<b>OCLC</b>	= <b>O</b> nline <b>C</b> omputer <b>L</b> ibrary <b>C</b> enter (for bibliographic services, provides WorldCat)
<b>REAL Program</b>	= <b>R</b> emote <b>E</b> lectronic <b>A</b> ccess for <b>L</b> ibraries
<b>RSMO</b>	= Missouri Revised Statutes
<b>SLAA</b>	= <b>S</b> tate <b>L</b> ibrary <b>A</b> ministrative <b>A</b> gencies
<b>SOS</b>	= The office of the Missouri <b>S</b> ecretary <b>O</b> f <b>S</b> tate
<b>WorldCat</b>	= <b>W</b> orldwide <b>U</b> nion <b>C</b> atalog (provides online bibliographic records)

**Appendix B – Interviewees and Focus Groups**

## **Appendix B – Interviews and Focus Groups**

### **State Library Agency Interviews**

Barbara Reading, State Librarian (by telephone – on leave)

Shay Young, LSTA Grants Officer

Debbie Musselman, Library Development Director

Becky Wilson, Public Library Services Consultant

Terry Blauvelt, Statistical Research Consultant

Jennifer Thompson, Technology and Resource Sharing Consultant

Matt Butler, Digitization Consultant

Donna Riegel, Wolfner Library Director

Wolfner Library Staff (as a group)

Abbey Rimel, Deputy Director for Public Service

Lisa Hellman, Youth Services Librarian

Amy Nickless, Special Services Librarian

Diann Stark, Reader Advisor and Outreach

Deborah Stroup, Coordinator of Volunteers, Recording Program, Print/Braille Project

### **Physical Focus Group - Wolfner Library Users**

Darla Rogers

Rita McGuire

Dan Flasar

### **Physical Focus Group - Secretary's Council on Library Development**

Karla L. Geerlings, Chair, Representing: Citizens Using Wolfner Library

Beth Caldarello, Representing: Academic Libraries

Regina Cooper, Representing: Public Libraries

Rita Gulstad, Representing: Citizens

James Diel, Representing: Citizens

Melissa Hopkins, Representing: Library Trustees

Christie Lundy, Representing: State Employees

Rebecca Marcum Parker, Representing: School Libraries

Mary Beth Revels, Representing: Public Libraries

Michelle Schmitt, Representing: School Libraries

Eight Missouri State Library staff members were also present for this session

### **Virtual Focus Group – (Academic Libraries/ MOBIUS)**

Rebecca Hamlett

Emily Jaycox Gail

Staines Candice

Baldwin Abigail

Broadbent

## **Virtual Focus Group – (General Session)**

Pamela Withrow

Marie Conlin

Tony Benningfield

Vickie Lewis

Nancee Dahms-Stinson

Rebecca Maddox

Linda Allcorn

Susan Burton

Glenda Pate

Hallie Yundt Silver

Emily Slama

Jacque Gage

Debbie Musselman

Teresa Tidwell

## **Appendix C – Bibliography of Documents Reviewed**

## Appendix C – Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

Institute of Museum and Library Services  
***Guidelines for IMLS Grants to States Five-Year Evaluation***  
OMB Control Number: 3137-0090,

Institute of Museum and Library Services  
***Purposes and Priorities of LSTA***

Institute of Museum and Library Services  
***LSTA Grants to States State Program Reports***

***Missouri FFY 2012*** (for context and longitudinal purposes)  
***Missouri FFY 2013***  
***Missouri FFY 2014***  
***Missouri FFY 2015***

Missouri State Library  
***LSTA Program Five-Year Plan for Years 2013 – 2017***

Missouri State Library  
***Missouri State Library Website***  
<http://www.sos.mo.gov/library/>

Missouri State Library  
Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library  
***Wolfner Library Website***  
<http://www.sos.mo.gov/wolfner/>

University of Missouri, Assessment Resource Center  
***Missouri State Library Evaluation of Library Services and Technology Act  
Funding in Missouri 2008–2012***



In addition, the evaluators reviewed many internal documents including:

- Workshop Attendance and Evaluations
- Webinar Evaluations
- Wolfner Patron Survey 2014
- REAL Program and MOREnet Annual Reports
- Racing to Read Summary and Spreadsheet of Participating Libraries
- Grant Monitoring Spreadsheets
- Annual CE Surveys
- Trustee Training Spreadsheet
- Missouri LSTA Plan Progress
- Library Science Collection Spreadsheet

**Appendix D – Focus Group Questions**

## Appendix D – Missouri Focus Group Questions

### Focus Group Protocol

Please introduce yourselves and indicate who you are, which library you represent, what job you hold or role you fulfill and, finally, tell us how long you have been in Missouri

A brief introduction was provided about the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States Program and basic information was given regarding the total amount of LSTA funding that is received per year by the Missouri State Library and a sampling of the larger programs and categories of projects that have been funded in recent years.

1. Which, if any of the LSTA programs I have mentioned have been most impactful for your library and why do you believe that is true?
2. Which, if any, have had the least impact in your community and why do you believe that is true?
3. One role that LSTA funds often play in a state is to spark innovation. Is that the case in Missouri? Where does innovation come from in Missouri libraries?
4. Has the library you represent received an LSTA grant within the last three years (FFY 2013, FFY 2014, FFY 2015 – roughly calendar years 2014 – 2016)? Talk about the difference that the grant you received has had on your library and the people that it serves.
5. Tell us about the process used to secure a grant. Is the effort worth the reward? Have you received the support from the Missouri State Library that you have needed to apply, implement, and evaluate your grant?
6. 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?
7. FINAL SAY. Each participant was asked in turn to share the single most important thing that they are taking away from participating in the session.

NOTE: These questions were modified depending on the groups involved. Wolfner Library users were asked to indicate how long they had been using the talking book program, which format or formats they have used and their assessment of the quality of services that are offered. Participants were also asked to discuss ways in which the Wolfner Library could engage more qualified individuals and get them to enroll in the program.

The Secretary's Council members were asked to answer the questions on a statewide scale and to discuss the larger importance of LSTA-funded programs on library services in Missouri.

**Appendix E – Web Survey Instrument**

## Appendix E - Missouri LSTA Web-Survey Instrument

---

### WELCOME

---

### LIBRARY DESCRIPTION

- 1) Please provide the name of your library.
- 2) Please describe the type of Library you represent.

Public library

School library

Academic library

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

Adult services/ 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 - 249,999  
250,000 - 499,999  
500,000 or more  
DON'T KNOW

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

Less than \$10,000  
\$10,000 - \$49,999  
\$50,000 - \$99,999  
\$100,000 - \$199,999  
\$200,000 - \$299,999  
\$300,000 - \$399,999  
\$400,000 - \$499,999

\$500,000 - \$999,999  
\$1,000,000 - \$1,999,999  
\$2,000,000 - \$2,999,999  
\$3,000,000 - \$4,999,999  
\$5,000,000 - \$9,999,999  
\$10,000,000 or more  
DON'T KNOW

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

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

---

**SERVICE MODULE INTRODUCTION**

---

**RACING TO READ**

**8) In which, if any, of the following programs/initiatives has your library participated?**

	<b>My library has participated</b>	<b>My library has not participated</b>	<b>I was unaware of this program</b>	<b>Not applicable/ my library isn't eligible for this program</b>
Racing to Read or other early literacy training				
Racing to Read and Racing to Read Story Time Plus Grants				
Activities/ programs for babies				
Activities/ programs for toddlers				
Activities/ programs for preschoolers				
Storytimes				
Other (Please specify below.)				

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



**9) Participation in the Racing to Read program has increased the number of young children and families using my library.**

	<b>1 - Strongly disagree</b>	<b>2 - Disagree</b>	<b>3 - Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>4 - Agree</b>	<b>5 - Strongly agree</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
Library use by young children and families						

**10) The Racing to Read program has changed the public's perception of what a public library can be.**

	<b>1 - Strongly disagree</b>	<b>2 - Disagree</b>	<b>3 - Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>4 - Agree</b>	<b>5 - Strongly agree</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
Perception of the library						

**11) Families and caregivers participating in the Racing to Read program are gaining valuable information about how to help their children develop reading and learning skills.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Learning experiences						

**12) My library has expanded its partnerships with other organizations in the community as a result of our participation in Racing to Read program.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Presence in the community						

**13) My library has increased the amount of outreach it is doing in the community as a result of our participation in Racing to Read program.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Outreach into the community						

**14) What additional resources or services from MSL would help your library serve young children and their families better?**

**15) If you have any additional feedback for MSL regarding its support for Racing to Read program, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.**

**WOLFNER TALKING BOOK AND BRAILLE LIBRARY**

**16) NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE (NLS): That All May Read**  
**MSL is able to provide special-format reading materials and other services through a partnership with the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS), which is a program of the Library of Congress. Are you aware of this national program?**

	1 - Unaware of the program	2 - Slightly aware of the program	3 - Moderately aware of the program	4 - Aware of the program	5 - Very aware of the program
National Library Service Talking Books Program					

**17) TALKING BOOKS COLLECTION**  
**The Talking Books Collection offers a wide range of popular fiction and non-fiction titles for adults, teens, and children in special formats for eligible readers. How aware are you of this service?**

	1 - Unaware of this service	2 - Slightly aware of this service	3 - Moderately aware of this service	4 - Aware of this service	5 - Very aware of this service
Talking Books Collection					

**18) BARD: BRAILLE AND AUDIO READING DOWNLOAD**

This free service, offered by the Wolfner Library, allows eligible patrons with Internet access and an email address to search for and download titles to either a personal flash drive or a digital cartridge for immediate listening. New titles are frequently added to this service. How aware are you of this service?

	1 - Unaware of this service	2 - Slightly aware of this service	3 - Moderately aware of this service	4 - Aware of this service	5 - Very aware of this service
BARD: Braille and Audio Reading Download service					

**19) LARGE PRINT MATERIALS**

The Wolfner Library provides a collection of large print materials to help local libraries supplement their collections in an effort to serve patrons with visual impairments. How aware are you of this service?

	1 - Unaware of this service	2 - Slightly aware of this service	3 - Moderately aware of this service	4 - Aware of this service	5 - Very aware of this service
Large Print Materials					

**20) BOOK CLUBS**

The Wolfner Library sponsors book clubs via telephone conference calls to engage patrons with visual impairments with books, reading, and other people. How aware are you of this service?

	1 - Unaware of this service	2 - Slightly aware of this service	3 - Moderately aware of this service	4 - Aware of this service	5 - Very aware of this service
Large Print Materials					

**21) My staff have the skills and training they need to inform patrons about the Talking Books program and to help them register for the service.**

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

**22) How does the availability of this program/service affect your ability to serve patrons? (Please mark the response that is most important to 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.)

**23) If you answered "other" to the question above, please specify in the text box provided below.**

24) If you have any additional feedback for MSL regarding its support for the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

**TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS**

25) Has your library received a Technology Ladder or Technology Mini-grant in the last five years?

	Yes	No	I was unaware of this program	Not applicable/ I don't believe that my library is eligible for this program
Technology Ladder Grant				
Technology Mini-grant				
Other technology assistance from MSL (Please specify below.)				

If you responded "other" in the question above, please specify the type of technology assistance you received from MSL in the text box provided below.

26) If you indicated that you have not received a Technology Ladder Grant or a Technology Mini-grant in the last five years, please indicate the major reason(s) you have not had a grant. *(Please select no more than two.)*

- Haven't applied for a grant
- Applied for a grant but wasn't approved
- Lack staff time to apply for a grant

Lack the skill needed to apply for a grant

Lack the technology expertise to know what to request

My library doesn't need the assistance

The time required to apply, implement and report on the grant isn't worth the amount awarded

Other (Please specify below.)

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

**27) Receiving an LSTA technology grant from MSL has increased the number of people using my library.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Increase in number of people using the library						

**28) The technology that my library implemented with the grant we received has changed the public's perception of what a public library can be.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Positive change in the perception of the library						

**29) My library has increased our presence in the community as a result of receiving an LSTA technology grant.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
Presence in the community						

**30) How has the availability of an LSTA technology grant affected the ability of your library to serve its patrons? (Please select the response that is most important to YOUR library.)**

- Reduced the overall cost of services to patrons
- Improved the quality of service we can provide to patrons
- Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access
- Increased the ability of my staff to serve the public
- Not applicable; my library has not received a technology grant
- Other (Please specify below.)

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

**31) If you have any additional feedback for MSL regarding technology grants, please insert your comments in the text box provided below.**

---



**RESOURCE SHARING**

**32) The Missouri State Library uses LSTA funds to support the sharing of library resources among libraries in several different ways. The "Show Me the World Resource Sharing Program" consists of several components including FirstSearch and WorldCat, the Get Connected Courier Service, Interlibrary Loan, and the Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium. Please indicate whether or not your library participates in any of the following activities:**

	<b>YES, my library participates</b>	<b>NO, my library does not participate</b>	<b>I was not aware of the program</b>
FirstSearch/ WorldCat			
Get Connected Courier Service			
Interlibrary Loan			
Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium			
Other (Please specify below.)			

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

**33) Please rate each of the following in terms of its importance to your library.**

	<b>1 - Very unimportant</b>	<b>2 - Unimportant</b>	<b>3 - Neither unimportant nor important</b>	<b>4 - Important</b>	<b>5 - Very important</b>	<b>Not applicable/ Do not participate</b>
FirstSearch/ WorldCat						
Get Connected Courier Service						
Interlibrary Loan						
Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium						
Other (Please specify below.)						

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

**34) My library receives the support it needs from the Missouri State Library 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
MSL offers the support needed to support resource sharing					

**35) My library staff receives the training they need from the Missouri State Library to use FirstSearch/WorldCat.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither agree nor disagree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not applicable
MSL offers the support needed to support resource sharing						

**36) My library staff has the tools it needs to encourage the public to use interlibrary loan to get materials not held by my library.**

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither agree nor disagree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree
MSL offers the support needed to support resource sharing					

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

---

**LIBRARIES OTHER THAN PUBLIC LIBRARIES**

**38) This survey was designed to explore the thoughts and opinions of public library staff about MSL implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States program; however, we are also interested in input from other types of libraries. Please feel free to express your thoughts and ideas about this topic below and/or contact Bill Wilson ([libraryconsultant@icloud.com](mailto:libraryconsultant@icloud.com)) to arrange for a personal interview.**

---

**THANK YOU!**

---

**Appendix F – Measuring Success Table**

## Missouri FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Measuring Success Focal Areas

	Digital Imaging	Library Service Improvement (Goal 1)	Retrospective Conversion	SW Get Connected	SW Missouri Courier Service	SW Missouri Digital Heritage	SW Show Me the World	Technology Ladder	Website Mini Grant	Library Makeover	Public Service Improvement (Goal 2)	Racing to Read	Racing to Read Story Time Plus	School Nonfiction Collection Development	Spotlight on Literacy Grant	Summer Library Program	SW Racing to Read	SW Services to Underserved	Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library	Library Skills/Services Development/ CE
<b>Lifelong Learning</b>																				
Improve users' formal education											Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
Improve users' general knowledge and skills									Yes											
<b>Information Access</b>																				
Improve users' ability to discover information resources		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes												
Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources	Yes		Yes							Yes						Yes	Yes			
<b>Institutional Capacity</b>																				
Improve the library workforce																				Yes
Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure		Yes					Yes	Yes												
Improve library operations																				
<b>Economic &amp; Employment Development</b>																				
Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support																				
Improve users' ability to use and apply business resources																				
<b>Human Resources</b>																				
Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family or household finances																				
Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health & wellness																				
Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills																				
<b>Civic Engagement</b>																				
Improve users' ability to participate in their community																				
Improve users' ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern																				

**Appendix G – Targeted Audience Table**

Appendix G - Missouri LSTA Targeted Audiences

PROGRAM/INITIATIVE	STATE GOAL	Targeted Audiences											
		Library Workforce (current and future)	Individuals Living Below the Poverty Line	Individuals who are unemployed/underemployed	Ethnic or Minority Populations	Immigrants/Refugees	Individuals with Disabilities	Families	Children (aged 0-5)	School-aged Youth (aged 6-17)	General		
Digital Imaging	GOAL 1												Yes
Library Service Improvement (Goal 1)	GOAL 1												Yes
Retrospective Conversion	GOAL 1												Yes
SW Get Connected Courier Service	GOAL 1												Yes
SW Missouri Digital Heritage	GOAL 1												Yes
SW Missouri Evergreen	GOAL 1												Yes
SW Show Me the World	GOAL 1												Yes
Technology Ladder	GOAL 1												Yes
Technology Mini Grant	GOAL 1												Yes
Website Makeover	GOAL 1												Yes
Library Service Improvement (Goal 2)	GOAL 2												Yes
Public Library Collection Development	GOAL 2												Yes
Racing to Read	GOAL 2									Yes	Yes		
Racing to Read Story Time Plus	GOAL 2									Yes	Yes		
School Nonfiction Collection Development	GOAL 2										Yes		
Spotlight on Literacy Grant	GOAL 2									Yes	Yes	Yes	
Summer Library Program	GOAL 2									Yes	Yes		
SW Racing to Read Early Literacy Initiative	GOAL 2	Yes								Yes	Yes		
SW Services to Underserved	GOAL 2							Yes					
Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library	GOAL 2							Yes					
Library Skills/Services Development/ CE	GOAL 3	Yes											



**Appendix H – Expenditure Tables**

**Missouri State Library LSTA Grants to States Expenditures FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 - ALL GOALS**

Title	State Goal	FFY 2013 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2013 Expenditures	FFY 2014 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2014 Expenditures	FFY 2015 Expenditures	Percentage FFY 2015 Expenditures	FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure Total	Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditures
Digital Imaging	1	\$ 202,385.00	7.09%	\$ 207,605.00	7.03%	\$ 210,406.12	7.19%	\$ 620,396.12	7.11%
Library Service Improvement (Goal 2)	2	\$ 11,860.00	0.42%	\$ 36,121.00	1.22%	\$ 52,279.73	1.79%	\$ 100,260.73	1.15%
Library Service Improvement (Goal 1)	1	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 25,038.00	0.85%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 25,038.00	0.29%
Library Skills/ Services Development/ CE	3	\$ 176,060.00	6.17%	\$ 96,552.04	3.27%	\$ 121,608.03	4.16%	\$ 394,220.07	4.52%
Public Library Collection Development	2	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 248,982.00	8.44%	\$ 173,643.83	5.93%	\$ 422,625.83	4.84%
Racing to Read	2	\$ 214,588.00	7.52%	\$ 222,690.00	7.54%	\$ 108,012.44	3.69%	\$ 545,290.44	6.25%
Racing to Read Story Time Plus	2	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 124,157.00	4.21%	\$ 61,531.21	2.10%	\$ 185,688.21	2.13%
Retrospective Conversion	1	\$ 93,395.00	3.27%	\$ 12,462.00	0.42%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 105,857.00	1.21%
School Nonfiction Collection Development	2	\$ 51,778.00	1.81%	\$ 37,405.00	1.27%	\$ 63,574.87	2.17%	\$ 152,757.87	1.75%
Spotlight on Literacy Grant	2	\$ 15,388.00	0.54%	\$ 45,652.00	1.55%	\$ 48,591.82	1.66%	\$ 109,631.82	1.26%
Summer Library Program	2	\$ 265,543.00	9.31%	\$ 252,359.00	8.55%	\$ 313,248.24	10.71%	\$ 831,150.24	9.52%
SW Get Connected Courier Service	1	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 180,388.00	6.11%	\$ 222,174.96	7.59%	\$ 402,562.96	4.61%
SW Missouri Digital Heritage	1	\$ 36,393.00	1.28%	\$ 49,868.00	1.69%	\$ 55,550.36	1.90%	\$ 141,811.36	1.62%
SW Missouri Evergreen	1	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 174,346.00	5.91%	\$ 180,838.82	6.18%	\$ 355,184.82	4.07%
SW Racing to Read Early Literacy Initiative	2	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 15,526.00	0.53%	\$ 57,302.97	1.96%	\$ 72,828.97	0.83%
SW Services to Underserved	2	\$ 29,770.00	1.04%	\$ 25,013.96	0.85%	\$ 27,567.17	0.94%	\$ 82,351.13	0.94%
SW Show Me the World	1	\$ 831,403.00	29.14%	\$ 340,201.00	11.53%	\$ 354,215.09	12.11%	\$ 1,525,819.09	17.48%
Technology Ladder	1	\$ 215,130.00	7.54%	\$ 76,432.00	2.59%	\$ 180,779.00	6.18%	\$ 472,341.00	5.41%
Technology Mini Grant	1	\$ 393,113.00	13.78%	\$ 432,441.00	14.65%	\$ 333,621.76	11.40%	\$ 1,159,175.76	13.28%
Website Makeover	1	\$ 2,951.00	0.10%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,951.00	0.03%
Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library	2	\$ 311,667.00	10.92%	\$ 341,316.00	11.56%	\$ 356,404.11	12.18%	\$ 1,009,387.11	11.56%
LSTA Administration		\$ 2,084.00	0.07%	\$ 7,121.00	0.24%	\$ 4,639.47	0.16%	\$ 13,844.47	0.16%
		\$ 2,853,508.00	100.00%	\$ 2,951,676.00	100.00%	\$ 2,925,990.00	100.00%	\$ 8,731,174.00	100.00%

LSTA Allotment \$ 2,853,508.00                      \$ 2,951,676.00                      \$ 2,925,990.00                      \$ 8,731,174.00

*GOAL 1: Missourians have expanded services for learning and equity of access to quality library resources, services, and technology to support individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, and digital literacy skills.*

Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 1                      55.10%

*GOAL 2: Strengthen and expand both quality and availability of library services appropriate to meet the educational, cultural, intellectual, workforce, personal, and social development needs of Missourians particularly persons with difficulty using the library and underserved rural and urban areas.*

Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 2                      40.22%

*GOAL 3: Current library workforce and leadership possess enhanced skills to advance the effective delivery of library and information services.*

Percentage of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 LSTA expended on Goal 3                      4.52%







**Appendix I – Web Survey Report**

# Missouri LSTA Web-Survey Report

## ***Who participated?***

One hundred thirty-five individuals responded to the LSTA evaluation web survey, representing one hundred sixteen libraries from ninety-nine counties in Missouri. One hundred thirty-three (99.3 percent of the total responses) were in public libraries. One “other” library was described as library consortia. Eighty-eight (88.7) percent of the respondents were library directors. Four were managers/department heads and another four identified themselves as children's/youth services librarians.

Twenty-two (22.7) percent, the highest percent, were in communities of 10,000 to 24,999 population. Two respondents said their library served a community of less than 999 and another two served a community greater than 500,000. Overall, twenty (20.5) percent, had an annual operating budget of \$100,000 to \$199,999. Four libraries had operating budgets of less than \$10,000. Seven libraries (5.3 percent) had operating budgets of \$10,000,000 or more.

The largest group, thirty-one (31.8) percent, had two to four full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. Another twenty-eight (28.8) percent were in libraries with less than two FTE. Five (representing 3.8 percent of the total respondents) reported an FTE of 100-249; one reported an FTE of 500 to 999.

Because more than half of the respondents' libraries were represented by less than four FTE, this report was also analyzed from the perspective of three staff size groupings. Cross-tabulations were run on several of the responses from representatives of libraries with less than two FTE, two to four FTE, and more than four FTEs. In the report that follows the responses from libraries with less than two FTE are labeled ‘small’ libraries, from libraries with two to four FTEs ‘mid-size’ libraries, and from libraries with more than four FTEs ‘large’ libraries.

## ***Racing to Read Early Literacy Initiative***

Respondents were asked to indicate their participation in different activities aimed at promoting early literacy through its Racing to Read program. Survey respondents were also able to check “other” and specify programs or initiatives. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* “Other” responses included programming for young adults and adults, summer reading programs, and cooperation with local schools. However, several “other” early literacy programs were recorded that appear to correspond to the programs listed in the survey, such as “1000 Books Before Kindergarten,” early literacy fairs, and collaborations with daycares and childcare.

<b>Programs/Initiatives</b>	<b>Count of participating libraries</b>	<b>Count of non-participating libraries</b>	<b>Libraries unaware of program</b>	<b>Not applicable/libraries not eligible for program</b>
Racing to Read or other early literacy training	84	37	7	1
Racing to Read and Racing to Read Story Time Plus Grants	69	45	8	1
Activities/ programs for babies	70	36	14	1
Activities/ programs for toddlers	85	29	10	1
Activities/ programs for preschoolers	91	22	10	1
Storytimes	103	14	9	0
Other (Please specify below.)	18	9	3	3

Overall, respondents reported greatest participation in Storytimes while Racing to Read had the lowest. However, among small and mid-sized libraries, participation in activities/programs for babies was the lowest.

### Count of participating libraries

<b>Programs/Initiatives</b>	<b>ALL Libraries</b>	<b>Small Libraries</b>	<b>Mid-sized Libraries</b>	<b>Large Libraries</b>
Racing to Read or other early literacy training	65.1%	48.6%	61.9%	76.4%
Racing to Read and Racing to Read Story Time Plus Grants	56.1%	48.5%	56.1%	58.8%
Activities/ programs for babies	57.9%	39.4%	51.3%	76.0%
Activities/ programs for toddlers	68.0%	50.0%	62.5%	83.0%
Activities/ programs for preschoolers	73.4%	51.5%	72.5%	86.8%
Storytimes	81.7%	69.4%	80.0%	90.4%
Other	54.5%	40.0%	20.0%	70.6%

Questions 9-13 asked respondents to consider the impacts of the Racing to Read program by agreeing or disagreeing with the five statements. In the table below, “agree” represents the sum percent of 4 and 5 ratings, where 5 indicated “strongly agree.” The percent disagree column represents the percent giving the rating of 1 and 2 where 1 indicated “strongly disagree.” Although there is a high percentage (average thirty (30.4) percent) that selected “not applicable,” an average of forty-nine (49.5) percent agree that Racing to Read provides benefits.

<b>Results of participating in the Racing to Read program</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Increased the number of young children and families using library.	3.1%	17.1%	49.6%	30.2%
Changed the public's perception of what a public library can be.	2.3%	20.2%	48.1%	30.0%
Families and caregivers are gaining valuable information about how to help their children develop reading and learning skills.	2.3%	8.5%	58.1%	30.5%
Library expanded its partnerships with other organizations in the community	4.7%	17.1%	48.1%	30.8%
Increased amount of outreach library is doing in the community	5.4%	20.0%	43.8%	30.8%

Twenty-two respondents provided an answer to the question of what additional resources or services from MSL would help your library serve young children and their families better?



*(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* Nine of the comments included some mention of funding/grants both for program support and books and resources. “Financial support for early literacy endeavors allows us to try new approaches and expand popular programs to more families.” “Grants for early learning toys, books and media, and devices.” “The most obvious thing is getting books into the hands of children and families, having the ability to apply for grant funding for book purchases would be a wonderful resource during this time of cutbacks, withholds, increasing costs, and diminishing income.”

Eight additional comments included some mention of workshops and training for programs. “Workshops sponsored by the State Library that provides face-to-face training for librarians on topics including autism, etc.” “Would like more hands on training for staff in working with infants.” Three of those responses specifically cited “Racing to Read Training.”

Fourteen people provided additional feedback for MSL regarding its support for Racing to Read program. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* Ten of the responses were very positive: “As a Director I feel this type of program can help solidify a library in its community by helping provide and support early literacy initiatives.” “Excellent program.” “This is an amazing program that has significantly improved our community partnering and outreach to families unfamiliar with early literacy. We benefit greatly from the financial support, training and programming support these grants offer us. Our service opportunities have greatly expanded thanks to these grants!”

### ***Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library***

Questions 16-20 pertain to awareness of services and resources through the Wolfner Library. Seventy-one (71.3) percent of the respondents rated their awareness of the National Library Service as a four or a five where five meant very aware of the program. Another seventeen (17.1) percent were moderately aware of the program.

Respondents were most aware of the Talking Books Collection. Seventy-two (72.3) percent were aware (rated a four or a five) and another eighteen (18.5) percent were moderately aware. Among mid-sized libraries, participants were most aware of Wolfner Library large print materials collection.

Overall, awareness diminished when they were asked about BARD: Braille and Audio Reading Download and Wolfner Library large print materials collection. Only twenty-seven (53.1) percent rated their awareness as a four or a five and another twenty (20.8) percent were moderately aware of BARD. Sixty-two (62.0) percent rated their awareness of the Library large print materials as a four or a five and another seventeen (17.1) percent were moderately aware.

The program respondents were least aware of the Wolfner Library book clubs. Thirty-three (33.8) percent rated their awareness a four or a five. Thirty-nine (39.2) percent were unaware of this service.

Fifty (50.0) percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: my staff have the skills and training they need to inform patrons about the Talking Books program and to help them register for the service. Twenty-one (21.5) percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 22 asked “how does the availability of this program/service affect your ability to serve patrons?” Respondents were asked to choose the one response that is most important for their library. The majority of respondents, fifty-nine (59.7) percent, said the availability of the program in broadening the range of services and resources their patrons can access is most important for their library. Another thirty (30.2) percent indicated that these programs improve the quality of service the library can provide to patrons. Of the eight respondents who checked other for this question, six explained they do not participate in the program. “Patrons aren't interested in these programs.” “We have not fully taken advantage of the service.” *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)*

Twelve respondents provided additional feedback on MSL support for the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* Several were very positive: “Great program! Very nice people at Wolfner that always answer my questions and concerns.” “We have helped several patrons sign up for this service. It's very important, since we would never be able to meet all of their needs on our own.” Others mentioned need for training/support: “My staff would use more training in knowing what is available with Wolfner and how Wolfner works so that we could offer it to more patrons in need.” “Again, help libraries promote this service by producing social media ready publicity about this service.”

### **Technology Investments**

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the category(ies) of grants that their library had received in the last five years. Ninety-eight respondents (representing 77.2 percent of those answering the question) had received a technology mini-grant in the past five years. Forty-seven (or 42.0 percent) had received a technology ladder grant, although eight (or 7.1 percent) were unaware of the program. Seven respondents checked the “other” box, however only two specified another type of technology assistance: Library Service Improvement Grant and Show Me Steps to Continuing Education. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)*

Survey participants were asked to indicate the reason for not receiving a technology grant in the last five years. Respondent were encouraged to select no more than two choices. The table below lists the reasons for not having a grant in descending order of percent of greatest response. The major reason, sixty-two (62.5) percent, for not having a grant is not applying for a grant. Twenty-two (22.5) percent do not have the staff time to apply for a grant. Seven respondents checked the “other” box in which two responses indicated a lack of awareness of the grants and two suggested they would not qualify for grants. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* However, the greatest reason among large libraries, thirty-three (33.3) percent, for not receiving a technology grant was lack of staff time to apply.

Reasons	Response
Haven't applied for a grant	62.5%
Lack staff time to apply for a grant	22.5%
Lack the technology expertise to know what to request	7.5%
My library doesn't need the assistance	7.5%
Lack the skill needed to apply for a grant	5.0%
The time required to apply, implement and report on the grant isn't worth the amount awarded	5.0%
Other	17.5%

Question 27-29 asked respondents to consider the degree of impacts from receiving an LSTA technology grant from MSL. In the table below, the percent of “agree” responses represent the sum percent of 4 and 5 ratings, where 5 indicated “strongly agree.” The percent disagree column represents the percent giving the rating of 1 and 2 where 1 indicated “strongly disagree.” The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the three statements presented.

Impact	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Not Applicable
Receiving an LSTA technology grant from MSL has increased the number of people using my library.	2.3%	12.4%	68.2%	17.1%
The technology that my library implemented with the grant we received has changed the public's perception of what a public library can be.	2.3%	9.3%	71.3%	17.1%
My library has increased our presence in the community as a result of receiving an LSTA technology grant.	3.1%	8.7%	71.7%	16.5%

The next question asked “how does the availability of this program/service affect your ability to serve patrons?” Respondents were asked to choose the one response that is most important for their library. The table below presents the effect of technology grants by FTE. Across all library sizes, respondents said the most important result of technology grants on their ability to serve patrons was the improved quality of service.

Effect	ALL	Small	Mid-sized	Large
Reduced the overall cost of services to patrons	3.1%	--	4.9%	4.0%
Improved the quality of service we can provide to our patrons	51.2%	40.0%	36.6%	72.0%
Broadens the range of services/resources our patrons can access	25.2%	17.1%	34.1%	22.0%
Increased the ability of my staff to serve the public	1.6%	--	4.9%	--
Not applicable; my library has not received a technology grant	18.1%	40.0%	19.5%	2.0%
Other	0.8%	2.9%	--	--

Fourteen people provided additional feedback for MSL regarding technology grants. (*Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.*) All of the comments were positive providing details on the benefits of technology grants to the library or what would happen without the funding. “Tech Mini Grants are a wonderful asset. We are a small library with not a

large budget and the grants have allowed our library the funds to replace old poorly functioning patron computers and also add additional ones, also to add extended use laptops for career, educational, and job placement purposes and wireless printing. We have also been able to add wi-fi to our list of services. We are able to provide better quality service and more services and resources to our patrons because of these grants.” “Without this funding the quality of the technology we are able to offer patrons would be severely limited. Without this funding the quality of the training and assistance our staff are able to offer the public would be severely limited. Staff must have access to updated hardware and software in order to assist the public with the incredibly wide-range of knowledge and skill level of the patrons who enter our doors each day. People from all walks of life, backgrounds, education levels, ages, literacy levels and levels of sophistication look to the library daily, and/or when their backs are to the wall and we are the community resource that helps to keep them in step day to day. Libraries do good work. We need this essential money to continue to do this good work.”

**Resource Sharing/ Interlibrary Loan**

The next question asked participants to indicate in which of the four "Show Me the World Resource Sharing Program" activities they participate. One hundred-ten respondents (representing 85.3 percent of those answering the question) participated in interlibrary loan. One hundred-six (82.8 percent) utilize Get Connected Courier Service and ninety-six use FirstSearch/WorldCat. Only thirty respondents participate in Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium and nine (7.8 percent) were unaware of this program. “Other” responses included borrowing from Mid-continent library and “loan by email.” *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)*

Survey participants were asked to indicate the importance of each of the resource sharing activity in their library. The table below lists the components in descending order of the percents of respondents who said the category was either important or very important. (Neutral reflects the percent who said the grant category was neither unimportant nor important.) Get Connected Courier Service was rated the most important and FirstSearch/WorldCat received the highest percent of very unimportant and unimportant responses.

Resource Sharing Activities	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Not applicable / Do not participate
Get Connected Courier Service	78.7%	2.4%	6.3%	12.6%
Interlibrary Loan	74.4%	7.0%	10.1%	8.5%
FirstSearch/WorldCat	63.5%	10.3%	11.1%	15.1%
Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium	26.5%	12.8%	6.8%	53.8%
Other	0.0%	10.5%	0.0%	89.5%

Question 34-36 asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they agreed/disagreed with the statements concerning support for resource sharing. Eighty-seven (87.5) percent of those

answering the question either agree or strongly agree that MSL provides the support the library needs to offer the public an effective system of resource sharing. Only fifty-four (54.7) percent agree or strongly agree that their library staff receives the training they need from the MSL to use FirstSearch/WorldCat. But eighty-three (83.3) percent either agree or strongly agree that their library staff have the tools needed to encourage the public to use interlibrary loan.

Fourteen people provided additional feedback for MSL regarding resource sharing services. *(Please see the survey results for the complete answers to this question.)* Several comments mentioned Missouri Evergreen Resource Sharing Consortium ranging from anticipating future use to praising the benefits. “Missouri Evergreen has allowed our Library to service patrons in ways that we had not expected. Because there are nearly 2 million items available, I can still serve my patron without having to buy every item requested. The patron is happy and so is the Library.” “Our library feels very strongly about the effectiveness of the Missouri Evergreen consortium and would encourage its continued support by the State Library.” Additional comments noted the need for more training on services and more funding. “Next to the technology grants, these programs of support expand our patrons' possibilities immensely.” “It would be good if we could receive more financial support to allow more days of courier pickups and deliveries for libraries.”

The final question asked respondents to share any additional feedback about MSL implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States program. One respondent commented. “The LSTA grants have been invaluable to the Mid-America Library Alliance to connect libraries in the State of Missouri for interlibrary loan delivery.

he LSTA grants have also assisted us greatly in developing professional development opportunities for library staff.”

T