

LSTA Public Library System Survey Results

March 5, 2007

Background

In the fall of 2006 the Division hired Josh Morrill of MorrillSolutions Research to develop a web survey using SurveyMonkey to gather and analyze information on the LSTA program. The purpose of the survey was to help assess the use of the LSTA funds from 2003-2006 and develop a new five-year plan for the use of LSTA funds for 2008-2012. The survey was distributed to public library system staff and members of the LSTA Advisory Committee, and was posted on the web to get input from librarians in public, academic, school, special libraries, and library trustees.

General Comments

Morrill provided details on the survey completed by public library system staff, showing means, standard deviations, and the distribution of responses for each question, as well as comments made by respondents. He provided the following general comments on the public library system survey results:

- *Overall Goals.* Across the three main goals, Technology has the most uniformly strong support. This is followed by Library Improvement and Special Needs goals respectively. While respondents deemed all goals important, Library Improvement and Special Needs had more variability in responses than the Technology goal.
- *Technology Subgoals and Initiatives.* The “facilitation of the development and improvement of shared automation systems at the regional level” was the sub-goal that was rated most important by respondents. In particular, “LSTA support for public libraries joining shared systems” was the specific component of this sub-goal that seemed to resonate with respondents.
- *Special Needs Subgoals and Initiatives.* The “Promote and support the role played by public and institutional libraries in adult and family literacy” was the sub-goal that was rated most important by respondents for this goal. In particular, “LSTA support for adult and family literacy projects” was the specific component of this sub-goal that seemed to resonate with respondents.
- *Library Improvement Subgoals and Initiatives.* The “Provide state level leadership for the development and improvement of public library service.” was the sub-goal that was rated most important by respondents for this goal. Under this goal “LSTA support for library card sign-up projects” was one of the few initiatives in the entire survey that was viewed with relatively strong negatively perceptions.
- *Funding.* The “LSTA support for public libraries joining shared systems” was rated as one of the most important initiatives of LSTA. There was strong support for additional funding for “structural elements” such as improved statewide delivery, telecommunications access and system coordinated electronic databases. There is also great interest in more funding for programs to help individuals learning English as a second language, and in program support for children and teens with reading problems.

1. DEMO: What is your library system?

Note: n = 40.

Library System	Number of Respondents

In the interest of preserving anonymity, the frequency data from each system has been omitted from this report. However, there were responses from each system with the exception of one.

2. DEMO: Which position title best reflects your current system responsibilities?

Note: "Other" respondents include one respondent from reference services, one database manager, one library automation manager, and another respondent who failed to report his or her role.

ROLE	Percentage	Frequency
System Director/ System Coordinator	42.5	17
System Assistant Director	2.5	1
System Technology Consultant	15.0	6
System Continuing Education Consultant	10.0	4
System Special Needs / Youth Services Consultant	20.0	8
Other	10.0	4

TECHNOLOGY

3. As a goal for LSTA, technology is defined as a utilization of technology to improve library services and facilitate access to library materials and information resources. Using this definition, how important do you believe this objective is for LSTA?

Mean = 1.93
 —92.5% (37) respondents rated this objective as ‘very important’
 —7.5% (3) rated it as ‘somewhat important’.

Scale: +2 Very Important -- +1 Somewhat Important -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant -- -2 Very Unimportant

4. The technology goal described above was comprised of several subgoals. Please use the scale below and rate the importance of each of the subgoals for the time period 2003 - 2006.

Table 1: Technology Subgoals

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

SUBGOAL	Mean (SD ¹)	VI	SI	SU	VU
Facilitate the development and improvement of shared automation systems at the regional level.	1.83 (0.50)	35	4	1	0
Promote direct Internet access for staff and patrons in all public library systems and public libraries and provide adequate and affordable bandwidth to use advanced services via the Internet.	1.75 (0.71)	34	4	2	0
Support libraries in their efforts to make electronic content and information available to their patrons from libraries and homes	1.75 (0.59)	32	7	1	0
Provide state-level leadership, planning, coordination, consultation, and support services to enable libraries to utilize current and new technology	1.68 (0.62)	29	10	1	0
Encourage and coordinate physical and electronic delivery and sharing of resources and information among public and other types of libraries at the local, system, state, and national level.	1.65 (0.48)	26	14	0	0
Ensure properly-trained staff and patrons for the effective use of technology to access electronic information and materials	1.55 (0.75)	26	12	2	0
Link local, regional and statewide automation systems and other resources to form a statewide electronic network.	1.23 (1.12)	22	12	5	1
Facilitate and promote statewide resource sharing and the sharing of MARC records.	1.13 (1.22)	21	12	5	2

¹ SD= Standard Deviation

5. Open-Ended Reports: "What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the overall technology goal or any of the subgoals?" (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*I believe that LSTA funds in technology should be used to build upon regional expertise and primarily build on a regional foundation. Increasing strength of regional systems rather than funding a statewide, linked network should be the emphasis. Resource sharing can more successfully be realized through regional sharing, including all types of libraries within a region. Regional concentration could potentially save on costly delivery. It would also open the door to technology planning and sharing among various types of libraries. Regional systems are closer to a particular patron base and can better determine needs. I don't believe the Statewide linking model does too well in a cost/benefit analysis. I do think we would get more bang for the buck if we use LSTA funds for helping improve services at regional level, improve multi-type sharing within a region, improve regional ILS systems, improve regional WANSs (increase bandwidth for Internet), and improve end-user electronic content at the regional level. Not all regions have the same needs. Innovative uses of technology should be emphasized. The remaining subgoals goals may be desirable (B,C), but likely drain too many resources that could be better used for regional efforts. Subgoal H is important for library technology and digital services, but not RLL. Eliminate RLL and try to fund library technology and digital services via State funding.

*I think some LSTA funds should be held in reserve each year until ALL WI libraries are involved in their respective systems' shared automation systems.

*MARC records--should a more generic term be used as MARC may be evolving

*I would like to see a state-wide network for training - similar to the system network for South Central and in Illinois, where systems can share state-wide training.

*All of the above subgoals are important, however, some of them are largely accomplished and may not require the further use of LSTA funds. It is not clear to me if we should view the subgoals as purposes for spending LSTA funds or not.

*The sharing of MARC records is no longer a crucial role of LSTA -- in C above, that aspect reduces my response. The resource sharing role is still primary.

*I believe that the inavailability of bandwidth will continue to be a major stumbling block in providing high speed Internet access. At the state-level, a more assertive approach in dealing with Internet service providers for a guaranteed, long-term solution to bandwidth issues will go a long way in solving problems for small and medium-sized libraries. Efforts to link individual patrons to the broader Web-based world we are asked to live in, is a primary function of libraries now and will continue to be in the foreseeable future.

*It often seems like our system's services related to technology are driven by system staff not the state. If we waited for the state to do some of the subgoals above, we would have to wait too long. Many of the subgoals are things we are providing ourselves, probably without LSTA support. What we really need is more bandwidth at an affordable rate.

*As is typical of the WI LSTA program, systems that were at the head of the pack were not able to tap into LSTA funds as much as systems at the rear of the pack. For example, systems that took the initiative to get all of their libraries automated early on were able to tap into the LSTA shared automation funding.

*LSTA funds for technology have been very important, and we have been able to utilize them to not only meet the stated goal, but to enhance the products and services that we have been able to make available to our libraries and their users.

*Subgoals A and B would seem to be the most important and most cost-effective.

* I am not sure I am answering this correctly. I support LSTA funds being used for resource sharing, but not to create our own database and resource sharing network. Utilize what is available on the open market.

*It would be nice if some funds could be used to obtain greater bandwidth.

Table 2. Specific Activities under Technology Subgoals

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

	Mean (SD ²)	VI	SI	SU	VU
LSTA support for telecommunications access and WANs <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$484,000].</i>	1.84 (0.55)	34	3	1	0
LSTA support for public libraries joining shared systems. <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$1,223,000].</i>	1.81 (0.57)	32	4	1	0
LSTA support for broadband connections <i>[component of telecommunications access funds].</i>	1.79 (0.58)	32	5	1	0
LSTA support for system coordinated electronic databases <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$196,000].</i>	1.76 (0.59)	31	6	1	0
LSTA support for statewide intersystem delivery <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$345,000].</i>	1.74 (0.60)	26	14	0	0
LSTA support for state level technology consultant services/workshops <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$515,000].</i>	1.73 (0.61)	29	7	1	0
LSTA support for BadgerLink staff <i>[component of RLL state level technology budget].</i>	1.66 (0.85)	30	6	1	1
LSTA support for system level IT consulting and troubleshooting <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$65,000].</i>	1.53 (0.86)	25	11	1	1
LSTA support for IT training for public library staff and patrons <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$148,000].</i>	1.53 (0.56)	21	16	0	0
LSTA support for wireless connections <i>[component of telecommunications access funds].</i>	1.34 (0.94)	21	13	4	0
LSTA support for system coordinated virtual reference <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$64,000].</i>	1.32 (0.93)	20	14	4	0
LSTA support for system downloadable E-books, audio books and videos <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$55,000].</i>	1.32 (0.96)	21	12	1	4
LSTA support for state level virtual reference <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$66,000].</i>	1.27 (1.10)	21	11	4	1
LSTA support for state level digitization <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$56,000].</i>	1.26 (0.92)	18	16	4	0
LSTA support for Wisconsin Document Depository digital archives <i>[component of RLL state level technology budget].</i>	1.21 (1.02)	18	15	3	1
LSTA support for ILL and reference services from RLL <i>[component of RLL state level technology budget].</i>	1.19 (1.24)	21	10	2	3

² SD= Standard Deviation

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

TABLE 2 CONTINUED	Mean (SD ³)	VI	SI	SU	VU
LSTA support for public merger of public library shared systems. [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$286,000].	1.08 (1.15)	16	16	1	3
LSTA support for gateway for searching OPACs and managing ILL requests. [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$764,000].	1.05 (0.57)	15	17	3	2
LSTA support for statewide leadership of IT and other services provided by RLL [component of RLL state level technology budget].	1.03 (1.03)	15	14	5	0
LSTA support for system coordinated digitization [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$12,000].	1.00 (1.01)	12	20	4	1
LSTA support for Reference and Loan Library (RLL) state level technology services [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$2,434,000].	0.97 (1.33)	19	9	4	3
LSTA support for ILL management system [component of WISCAT funds].	0.84 (1.57)	20	8	2	7
LSTA support for system coordinated website development [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$55,000].	0.82 (1.11)	10	19	4	2
LSTA support for overall WISCAT program [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$1,930,000].	0.78 (1.40)	14	14	3	5
LSTA support for virtual catalog [component of WISCAT funds].	0.66 (1.44)	13	14	3	6
WISCAT training, documentation and technical support [component of WISCAT funds].	0.58 (1.42)	12	15	3	7
LSTA support for patron initiated ILL [component of WISCAT funds].	0.39 (1.28)	4	23	4	6
LSTA support for physical union catalog [component of WISCAT funds].	0.32 (1.51)	10	13	7	7
LSTA support for method of downloading MARC records [component of WISCAT funds].	0.13 (1.63)	10	11	4	11

³ SD= Standard Deviation

**14. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make about the past technology initiatives?”
(NOTE: Comments left as they were written)**

* Subgoal A—should be more broadly defined. Subgoal B—Would support use of LSTA for seed funding of non-OCLC libraries and/or the establishment of more ILL clearinghouse activities. Subgoal C—support use of LSTA for regional rather than statewide initiatives. Subgoal D—strongly support local and regional sharing primarily, but less so for statewide and national, therefore my response is mixed. Subgoal E—strongly support. Subgoal F—strongly support. Subgoal H—support technology consulting and digital archives but not RLL.

It's time for RLL to change direction on its services. The focus on WISCAT for resource sharing and interlibrary loan needs to end.

*I am concerned that LSTA funding is being used in lieu of state funding. We need to find a way to encourage the state to do better and not rely on LSTA funds.

*Statewide delivery should not be included in technology and LSTA funds should not be used to subsidize this service. Now that there will not be a separate category for libraries to join shared automation systems (due to the success of the program), LSTA funds should be used for other technology purposes. It seems like too much of the LSTA funding is going for on going state level programs rather than for new programs to move forward with technology.

*Obviously, it would be better if state government were funding these state level positions so LSTA funds could be freed up for innovation. It is a direct effect of inadequate state funding that we have the debate about the value of such services as RLL and WISCAT. These are important services and have provided great good for Wisconsin residents, but state government is failing us by foisting these costs onto LSTA.

*In #8 I checked 'very important' because I believe the goal is important. However, I also believe that the Wiscat project, as currently structured, is not the best way to reach these goals.

*Our libraries have expressed concerns about the quality and responsiveness of statewide leadership provided by RLL for our needs and circumstances in the area of resource sharing. WISCAT does not meet our needs, yet a large amount of LSTA dollars go toward supporting it. The system block grants have been very important to us and have allowed us to move ahead in many areas.

*Regarding Subgoal C. While I consider the resource sharing goals very important I believe that the Wiscat program as currently constituted is not the best way to achieve these goals. It was a good program in its day but there are better ways to achieve these goals.

*WISCAT funding should be redirected to more current technology initiatives.

SPECIAL NEEDS

15. As a goal for LSTA, special needs is defined as ensuring access to library and information services for Wisconsin residents who have difficulty using a library because of limited literacy and language skills, educational or socioeconomic barriers, or a disability. Using this definition, how important do you believe this objective is for LSTA?

Mean = 1.67

- 75% (30) respondents rated this objective as ‘very important’.
- 15% (6) rated it as ‘somewhat important’.
- 2.5% (1) rated it as ‘somewhat unimportant’.

Scale: +2 Very Important -- +1 Somewhat Important -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant -- -2 Very Unimportant

16. The special needs goal described above was comprised of five subgoals. Rate the importance of each of the subgoals for the time period 2003 - 2006.

Table 3. Special Needs Subgoals

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

SUBGOAL	Mean (SD ⁴)	VI	SI	SU	VU
Promote and support the role played by public and institutional libraries in adult and family literacy.	1.63 (0.63)	26	11	1	0
Promote and support reading programs in public libraries for school-age children.	1.61 (0.64)	25	12	1	0
Promote and support accessibility of public library facilities and services for people with disabilities.	1.53 (0.95)	26	10	0	2
Provide state level leadership for public and institutional library service to individuals who have difficulty using a library.	1.42 (0.95)	23	12	2	1
Promote and support the role of public libraries in early learning activities for children ages birth to five.	1.39 (1.03)	24	10	3	1

⁴ SD= Standard Deviation

17. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the past special needs initiatives?” (NOTE: Comments were left as they were written)

*I think the competitive grants in this category are difficult for the small libraries to obtain. I think the goals are good. However, I think 'special needs' covers such a large range. Public libraries will never have the ability to reach these goals unless there are funds to put behind the goals. Some systems devote a staff person to assisting libraries in this area. I guess I would like this to be a non-competitive initiative as the funds distributed for system technology initiatives with guidelines for the use of funds.

*Accessible facilities are very important, but building money is usually what is needed to solve this--a local responsibility?

*Subgoals A, B, and C are important on a local level, not on a state level. LSTA funds should not be used for those subgoals.

*Frankly, special needs efforts have not been well focused, and determining the value of grant outcomes is dubious. Given the social, medical, and psychological factors that affect the personal situations of those with 'special needs', it is difficult to find an effective way for libraries to precipitate change.

*The Infant Brain Development initiative helped SCLS create new programs that radically changed the ways libraries provide/deliver programs for very young children and their parents and caregivers. Many SCLS libraries are now providing developmentally appropriate programs for very young children—intentional programs that strengthen literacy skills in young children and which educate parents and caregivers.

*While these subgoals are worthy, the specifics within the goals were very limiting and made it difficult to apply for project funding.

*The focus on subgoal A has been very important, but it is time to move the focus to older ages of children, as well as to the aged/elderly.

*With the growing older adult population, greater emphasis should be placed on positioning libraries to serve this population segment

Table 4. Specific Activities under Special Needs Subgoals

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

	Mean (SD ⁵)	VI	SI	SU	VU
LSTA support for adult and family literacy projects [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$1,113,000].	1.68 (0.47)	25	10	0	0
LSTA support for people with sensory and mobility disabilities [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$236,500].	1.64 (0.76)	26	9	0	1
LSTA support for early learning projects (\$99,000 for one year, then combined with literacy). [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$99,000].	1.62 (0.76)	26	10	0	1
LSTA support for adaptive accessible computer workstations [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$237,000].	1.39 (1.03)	25	8	5	0
LSTA support for state level consultant services for persons with special needs/workshops [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$208,000].	1.37 (1.10)	25	8	4	1
LSTA support for accessible aids (e.g. wheelchairs, walkers, magnification devices, sound systems, etc.) [2003 - 2006 no exact amounts are available].	1.32 (1.02)	22	11	5	0
LSTA support for retrofitting doors with electronic openers [2003 - 2006 no exact amounts available].	1.18 (1.27)	23	8	5	2
LSTA support for state institution library coordination [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$100,000].	0.92 (1.24)	16	13	8	1

⁵ SD= Standard Deviation

21. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make about the implemented special needs initiatives?” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*Subgoal E - State institution coordination should be paid out of State funds, not LSTA.

*I like the idea of giving grants to libraries to retrofit doors with electronic openers and funding for at least one accessible workstation.

*The above programs are the kinds of things that cost a disproportionately high amount of money and result in a very low return for the libraries. Funds have been spent providing access in various ways yet those items are used by the intended audience very little if at all.

*The big question is: What has our investment bought the residents of Wisconsin in a broad context? I'll agree that in a few cases, a few individuals have been helped. But the 'unit cost' has been high when you look at those who benefit and how many dollars are invested. We need a more appropriate direction for special needs projects -- one that is cohesive and broadly applied. Or else we should reduce what we commit from LSTA to the effort.

*As baby-boomers age, there will be a sharp rise in the need for adaptive devices and physical accessibility. Those types of mini-grants (for accessible doors, ramps, wheelchairs, rolling carts, walkers, large type reader screens etc.) will become more and more desirable and may force LSTA to look at different types of adaptability in regards to the physical aspect of libraries.

*State level consultant services in this area aren't particularly helpful.

*The importance of LSTA funds for special needs cannot be overstated.

*This category is difficult to implement especially in defining the accessible aids needed to accommodate all forms of disabilities in libraries.

LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT

22. As a goal for LSTA, library improvement is defined as ensuring adequate library and information services to all state residents. Using this definition, how important do you believe this objective is for LSTA?

Mean = 1.79
 --80% (32) respondents rated this objective as 'very important'.
 --15% (6) rated it as 'somewhat important'.

Scale: +2 Very Important -- +1 Somewhat Important -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant -- -2 Very Unimportant

23. The library improvement goal described above was comprised of three subgoals. Rate the importance of each of the subgoals for the time period 2003 - 2006.

Table 5. Library Improvement Subgoals.

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

SUBGOAL	Mean (SD ⁶)	VI	SI	SU	VU
Provide state level leadership for the development and improvement of public library service.	1.74 (0.60)	30	7	1	0
Provide support for adequate public library service through training and continuing education for library staffs and trustees.	1.71 (0.61)	29	8	1	0
Coordinate a statewide summer library program.	1.63 (0.85)	30	5	3	0

⁶ SD= Standard Deviation

24. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the overall library improvement goal or any of the subgoals?” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written).

*Subgoal C can be done on a regional level.

*A noble goal, but local libraries are really responsible for the level and quality of services provided

*We need state-wide leadership in all of these areas. I would like to see more statewide coordination of training and continuing education, so that systems are not duplicating efforts. A state-wide telecommunication system could be used for this. The statewide summer library program has been a success for many years.

*The library systems provide the training and CE, the state has not been providing CE for staff and trustees.

*The goal is laudable. I'm not sure that the subgoals are particularly effective for achieving a result.

*Because Wisconsin is an enlightened state that mandates public library service for all of its citizens, it needs to take a more proactive role in leadership and innovation at the national level, and become a spokesman for intellectual freedom in the national discussion.

*It is a shame that Wisconsin now depends on federal dollars for state level leadership positions.

*Looking at the subgoals above, it would be better if specific programs were mentioned/formulated as in Subgoal C. For Subgoals A and B, no programs or specifics are listed. Sloppy!

*Subgoal B is good but I think systems need to be held more accountable in providing training and CE for staffs and trustees by the division. I also do not believe the state level leadership has been shown in providing development and improvement of library system directors who are then supposed to provide leadership to public libraries. It is truly a hit and miss in every system.

Table 6. Specific Activities under Library Improvement Subgoals.

Scale : +2 Very Important (VI) -- +1 Somewhat Important (SI) -- -1 Somewhat Unimportant (SU) -- -2 Very Unimportant (VU)

	Mean (SD ⁷)	VI	SI	SU	VU
LSTA support for statewide leadership of public library development <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$384,000].</i>	1.66 (0.58)	27	9	0	0
LSTA support for state consultant services for youth/workshops <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$208,000].</i>	1.50 (0.95)	26	9	2	1
LSTA support for summer library program (multistate contract, handbooks, website, etc.) <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$30,000].</i>	1.61 (0.86)	29	6	3	0
LSTA support for publications, standards, Channel, statistics, directory <i>[2003-2006 no exact amounts available].</i>	1.32 (1.09)	23	10	4	1
LSTA support for school library impact study <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$80,000].</i>	0.53 (1.27)	11	11	11	1
LSTA support for library card sign-up projects <i>[2003-2006 dollars awarded \$77,500].</i>	-0.08 (1.42)	6	11	14	6

⁷ SD= Standard Deviation

27. Open-Ended Reports: “What, if any, comments would you like to make about the implemented library improvement initiatives?” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*Again, it would be better if DLTCL positions were funded by state dollars. The staff and their efforts are important, but it isn't rightly an LSTA responsibility to fund these positions. The money should be there for innovation and broad forward looking statewide initiatives. The studies that have been funded by LSTA have, in my estimation, been universally irrelevant. They never actually get at the issues or move us beyond the problems.

*Don't ever stop support for summer library programs.

*The LSTA support for the summer library program saves *thousands* of System dollars, as well as time and resources of System consultants who no longer have to plan a statewide program each year. System youth services consultants can now focus on new programs and system initiatives instead of spending time planning a summer program (and re-inventing the wheel) every year.

*State level training and continuing education is variable. Coordination of certification and the annual CE meeting is valuable and much appreciated. Some of the specific training and CE provided is excellent, but some of it is irrelevant and out of touch with the world outside of Madison.

*Federal dollars used for state publications could be better used in projects that would have more direct impact on library services. How can we get Wisconsin to pay for state responsibilities again?

PREVIOUSLY FUNDED AND POSSIBLE FUTURE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES

Table 7. Previously Funded Technology Initiatives⁸

Scale: +1=More Future Funding (More), 0=Adequate Future Funding (Adequate), -1 =Less Future Funding (Less) and Future Funding is No Longer Needed (NN).

	Mean (SD ⁹)	More +1	Adequate 0	Less -1	NN -1
LSTA support for telecommunications access and WANs [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$484,000].	0.72 (0.45)	65.0% (26)	25.0% (10)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for system coordinated electronic databases [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$196,000].	0.67 (0.48)	60.0% (24)	30.0% (12)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for statewide intersystem delivery [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$345,000].	0.49 (0.66)	50.0% (20)	30.0% (12)	5.0% (2)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for system level IT Consulting and troubleshooting [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$65,000].	0.35 (0.49)	30.0% (12)	55.0% (22)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for BadgerLink staff [component of RLL state level technology budget].	0.28 (0.57)	30.0% (12)	55.0% (22)	5.0% (2)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for state level digitization [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$56,000].	0.23 (0.69)	32.5% (13)	42.5% (17)	10.0% (4)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for state-level virtual reference [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$66,000].	0.20 (0.68)	30.0% (12)	45.0% (18)	12.5% (5)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for state level technology consultant services/workshops [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$515,000].	0.19 (0.47)	20.0% (8)	67.5% (27)	2.5% (1)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for system downloadable E-books, audio books and videos [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$55,000].	0.17 (0.81)	37.5% (15)	30.0% (12)	17.5% (7)	5.0% (2)
LSTA support for system coordinated digitization [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$12,000].	0.03 (0.70)	22.5% (9)	47.5% (19)	17.5% (7)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for Wisconsin Document Depository digital archives [component of RLL state level technology budget].	0.03 (0.59)	15.0% (6)	52.5% (21)	12.5% (5)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for statewide leadership of IT and other services provided by RLL [component of RLL state level technology budget].	0.03 (0.57)	15.0% (6)	60.0% (24)	7.5% (3)	5.0% (2)
LSTA support for system coordinated virtual reference [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$64,000].	0.00 (0.59)	15.0% (6)	60.0% (24)	12.5% (5)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for system coordinated website development [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$55,000].	-0.12 (0.78)	20.0% (8)	32.5% (13)	20.0% (8)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for gateway for searching OPACs and managing ILL requests [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$764,000].	-0.17 (0.81)	22.5% (4)	30.0% (12)	20.0% (8)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for ILL and reference services from RLL [component of RLL state level technology budget].	-0.23 (0.49)	2.5% (1)	62.5% (26)	15.0% (6)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for Reference and Loan Library (RLL)state level technology services [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$2,434,000].	-0.24 (0.61)	7.5% (3)	50.0% (20)	22.5% (9)	5.0% (2)

⁸ Yellow-shaded area indicates how means were calculated. To allow for centering around the neutral point of “Adequate”, “Less” and “Not Needed” were both given values of -1.

⁹ SD= Standard Deviation

Table 7 CONTINUED.	Mean (SD ¹⁰)	More +1	Adequate 0	Less -1	NN -1
LSTA support for merger of public library system shared systems [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$286,000].	-0.25 (0.84)	22.5% (9)	22.5% (9)	30.0% (12)	7.5% (3)
WISCAT (includes LSTA support for patron initiated ILL; physical union catalog; virtual catalog; ILL management system; method of downloading MARC records; WISCAT training, documentation and technical support) [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$1,930,000].	-0.51 (0.61)	5.0% (2)	32.5% (13)	30.0% (12)	20.0% (8)
LSTA funding for public libraries to join shared systems [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$1,223,000].	-0.53 (0.65)	7.5% (3)	27.5% (11)	35.0% (14)	17.5% (7)

Table 8. Possible Future Technology Initiatives.¹¹

Scale: 3=High Future Funding Priority (HFFP), 2=Moderate Future Funding Priority (MFFP), 1=Low Future Funding Priority (LFFP), 0=Not a Future Funding Priority (NFFP).

POSSIBLE FUTURE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES	Mean (SD ¹²)	HFFP +3	MFFP +2	LFFP +1	NFFP 0
LSTA support for a single gateway for federated searching (e.g. full text, digitized information, library catalogs, websites).	2.28 (0.96)	42.5% (17)	25.0% (10)	5.0% (2)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for distance learning support for content and access to continuing education (CE).	2.09 (0.92)	32.5% (13)	37.5% (15)	10.0% (4)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for distance learning equipment.	2.00 (0.83)	25.0% (10)	45.0% (18)	15.0% (6)	5.0% (0)
LSTA support for interface of WISCAT with OCLC and other automated systems for ILL purposes.	1.97 (1.07)	27.5% (11)	30.0% (12)	5.0% (2)	12.5% (5)
LSTA support for state level development of databases for historical information (e.g., cemetery records).	1.91 (0.93)	25.0% (10)	35.0% (14)	17.5% (7)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for authentication technologies for access to state level automated systems.	1.77 (0.99)	20.0% (8)	30.0% (12)	17.5% (7)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) investigation and implementation.	1.57 (1.07)	17.5% (7)	22.5% (9)	20.0% (8)	15.0% (6)
LSTA support for school participation in public library shared systems.	1.15 (1.08)	12.5% (5)	17.5% (7)	25.0% (10)	30.0% (2)
LSTA support for school participation in school library shared systems.	1.15 (1.00)	7.5% (3)	25.0% (10)	22.5% (9)	27.5% (11)
LSTA support for encouraging more E-rate participation.	1.15 (0.97)	7.5% (3)	22.5% (9)	27.5% (11)	25.0% (10)

¹⁰ SD= Standard Deviation

¹¹ Yellow-shaded area indicates how means were calculated. To allow for centering around the neutral point of “Adequate”, “Less” and “Not Needed” were both given values of -1.

¹² SD= Standard Deviation

32. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the future funding of technology initiatives? (including any additional technology initiatives you would like considered)” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*It would be good for school districts to be able to join public library shared systems, but we should not create new, school only, shared systems. It may be that rather than spending money to encourage library to use e-rate more, it would be more beneficial to simply allocate the same amount for libraries to be able to use for similar purposes. Distance education is a wonderful concept and has its uses, but from our experience, people do not want it to replace gathering together.

*There should be a state vision of where library technology needs to go, and funds should be used to advance that state vision for all the state. Local projects that don't directly contribute to statewide benefit should be avoided.

*I would like to see technology initiatives funding increased at an incremental level each year until such time that federated searching has become the norm for each library.

*The greatest priority is to make a statewide network infrastructure with sufficient bandwidth available to all libraries in the state.

*Libraries in Wisconsin are not all at the same level for technology needs at any one time. Preferable to trying to choose specific categories at the state level would be increasing the funding level for library system technology grants. This will allow each system to work with member libraries to plan for their particular needs and priorities. The LSTA-funded staff positions at the state level could help provide leadership and support for these efforts as needed.

*My priorities would be: 1. Subsidizing internet costs related to Badgernet implementation--the slowness and lagtime across the states needs to be addressed as soon as possible. 2. Support for the interface of WISCAT with OCLC and other automated systems for ILL purposes 3. Support for RFID implementations. 4. More support for downloadable E-books, audio books and videos. 5. Support for virtual reference.

PREVIOUSLY FUNDED AND POSSIBLE FUTURE SPECIAL NEEDS INITIATIVES

Table 9. Previously Funded Special Needs Initiatives.¹³

Scale: +1=More Future Funding (More), 0=Adequate Future Funding (Adequate), -1 =Less Future Funding (Less) and Future Funding is No Longer Needed (NN).

PREVIOUSLY FUNDED SPECIAL NEEDS INITIATIVES	Mean (SD ¹⁴)	More +1	Adequate 0	Less -1	NN -1
LSTA support for people with sensory and mobility disabilities [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$236,500].	0.17 (0.61)	25.0% (10)	55.0% (22)	7.5% (3)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for adult and family literacy projects [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$1,113,000].	0.14 (0.63)	25.0% (10)	55.0% (22)	10.0% (4)	2.5% (0)
LSTA support for state level consultant services for persons with special needs/workshops [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$208,000].	0.06 (0.67)	22.5% (9)	50.0% (20)	15.0% (6)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for early learning projects (\$99,000 for one year, then combined with literacy). [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$99,000].	0.03 (0.71)	22.5% (9)	45.0% (18)	15.0% (6)	5.0% (2)
LSTA support for retrofitting doors with electronic openers [2003 - 2006 no exact amounts available].	-0.06 (0.79)	22.5% (9)	32.5% (13)	17.5% (7)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for accessible aids (e.g., wheelchairs, walkers, magnification devices, sound systems, etc.) [2003 - 2006 no exact amounts are available].	-0.09 (0.78)	22.5% (9)	35.0% (14)	20.0% (8)	10.0% (4)
LSTA support for adaptive accessible computer workstations [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$237,000].	-0.11 (0.74)	20.0% (8)	42.5% (17)	25.0% (10)	5.0% (2)
LSTA support for state institution library coordination [2003-2006 dollars awarded = \$100,000].	-0.14 (0.64)	12.5% (5)	52.5% (21)	20.0% (8)	5.0% (2)

Table 10. Possible Future Special Needs Initiatives.

Scale: 3=High Future Funding Priority (HFFP), 2=Moderate Future Funding Priority (MFFP), 1=Low Future Funding Priority (LFFP), 0=Not a Future Funding Priority (NFFP).

POSSIBLE FUTURE SPECIAL NEEDS INITIATIVES	Mean (SD ¹⁵)	HFFP +3	MFFP +2	LFFP +1	NFFP 0
LSTA support for services for individuals and families who are learning English as a second language.	2.54 (0.51)	50.0% (20)	42.5% (17)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for children and teens with reading problems.	2.38 (0.59)	40.0% (16)	47.5% (19)	5.0% (2)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for electronic databases/resources for special needs populations.	2.14 (0.76)	30.0% (12)	45.0% (18)	12.5% (5)	2.5% (1)
LSTA support for services in detention facilities, jails and prisons.	2.00 (0.67)	20.0% (8)	52.5% (21)	20.0% (8)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for collection development in other languages.	1.89 (0.94)	27.5% (11)	35.0% (14)	22.5% (9)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for consultants to help plan accessible buildings.	1.86 (0.89)	22.5% (9)	42.5% (17)	20.0% (8)	7.5% (3)
LSTA support for replication of model projects around the state.	1.74 (0.78)	12.5% (5)	45.0% (18)	25.0% (10)	5.0% (2)

¹³ Yellow-shaded area indicates how means were calculated. To allow for centering around the neutral point of “Adequate”, “Less” and “Not Needed” were both given values of -1.

¹⁴ SD= Standard Deviation

¹⁵ SD= Standard Deviation

35. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the future funding of special needs initiatives? (*including any additional special needs initiatives you would like considered*)” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*While all the initiatives indicated in 34 above are important, most of them cannot be effectively addressed by libraries (especially public libraries), so we need to consider what real, lasting benefit state residents collectively will gain from using LSTA funds in this manner. This is at the core of my concerns regarding special needs as a category -- the contributing factors to the problems faced by those with 'special needs' are so individual and multi-faceted that libraries are not the institutions that can do much to address them.

*I realize the special needs category is just that - for special needs. But I wonder if concepts of universal design could somehow be supported and intergrated into special needs projects - in building accessibility studies, in standards for really adaptable technology, which can serve users with a broad range of needs.

*Special needs would be more useful if broadened to include outreach to any who are unserved, whether because of physical difficulties or for other reasons (POVERTY, ETC.)

PREVIOUSLY FUNDED AND POSSIBLE FUTURE LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES

Table 11. Previously Funded Library Improvement Initiatives.¹⁶

Scale: +1=More Future Funding (More), 0=Adequate Future Funding (Adequate), -1=Less Future Funding (Less) and Future Funding is No Longer Needed (NN).

PREVIOUSLY FUNDED LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES	Mean (SD ¹⁷)	More +1	Adequate 0	Less -1	NN -1
LSTA support for summer library program (funding includes multi-state contract, handbooks, website, etc.) [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$30,000].	0.21 (0.47)	22.0% (9)	70.0% (28)	2.5% (1)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for state public library development team leadership [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$384,000].	0.14 (0.48)	17.5% (7)	70.0% (28)	5.0% (2)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for state consultant services for youth/workshops [2003-2006 LSTA funding = \$208,000].	0.03 (0.54)	15.0% (6)	67.5% (27)	10.0% (4)	2.5% (1)

Table 12. Possible Future Library Improvement Initiatives.¹⁸

Scale: 3=High Future Funding Priority (HFFP), 2=Moderate Future Funding Priority (MFFP), 1=Low Future Funding Priority (LFFP), 0=Not a Future Funding Priority (NFFP).

POSSIBLE FUTURE LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES	Mean (SD ¹⁹)	HFFP +3	MFFP +2	LFFP +1	NFFP 0
LSTA support for leadership training for current and prospective library directors.	2.08 (0.71)	27.5% (11)	47.5% (19)	20.0% (8)	0.0% (0)
LSTA support for recruiting/training of new library directors.	1.71 (0.94)	15.0% (6)	42.5% (17)	15.0% (6)	12.5% (5)

¹⁶ Yellow-shaded area indicates how means were calculated. To allow for centering around the neutral point of “Adequate”, “Less” and “Not Needed” were both given values of -1.

¹⁷ SD= Standard Deviation

¹⁸ Yellow-shaded area indicates how means were calculated. To allow for centering around the neutral point of “Adequate”, “Less” and “Not Needed” were both given values of -1.

¹⁹ SD= Standard Deviation

38. Open-Ended Reports: “What - if any- comments would you like to make regarding the future funding of library improvement initiatives? (including any additional library improvement initiatives you would like considered)” (NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*The state would do better to strengthen standards for libraries that require more formal training for library directors. Local control issues will preclude an LSTA initiative from being effective in recruitment efforts

*LSTA will be funding research into the economic impact of public libraries in 2007. I support this project and believe that LSTA funds should continue to be used for research into questions important to the Wisconsin library community.

*If LSTA funds are used to support leadership training for current and prospective library directors, system directors should also be expected to receive the training.

39. Open-Ended Reports: “Are there any concerns, praise or other feedback that you would like to give the DPI staff administering the LSTA program? If so, please provide your comment(s) below.”
(NOTE: Comments left as they were written)

*I have always appreciated the rapid responses from DPI staff when I have called with a concern or problem with LSTA grants. The LSTA projects and coordination administered by DPI have been innovative and creative. I always feel welcome to contact DPI staff and have always had my questions answered in a professional and timely manner.

*In every case, the people working with LSTA at the state level have been professional and committed, and have tried to satisfy the greatest possible number of constituents. Overall, we can be proud of what we have accomplished with LSTA. But the one thing needed is a strong statewide vision and the leaders to promote that vision, even if it means upsetting someone. Placation of squeaky wheels has usually distracted us from moving forward with a daring and determined agenda.

*Each library system in the state will have differing needs within the LSTA subject categories - some with great differences, others with few. I propose that there be a certain amount of funds that are set aside with a cap of \$15,000 - \$20,000 per grant, (with a total aggregate of 100,000 - \$150,000) meant solely for PROJECTS THAT ARE INNOVATIVE...with as little defining what direction to go other than to stay within a category, or better yet, have an open category for innovation. It is one vehicle for bringing new, fresh and potentially groundbreaking ideas into the light.

*I have found the DPI staff administering the LSTA program to be extremely helpful, addressing questions and concerns promptly, and providing guidance as appropriate. I thank them for their advice and patience.

*I have been impressed with the job that DPI staff, particularly Peg Branson, has done in administering the LSTA program in recent years. However, I continue to believe that too much funding goes into state programs (e.g., WISCAT) at the expense of funding available for individual libraries. I also think that the special needs categories are usually too specific to use without creating elaborate programs that are often somewhat artificial. Finally, LSTA funds are often used to help those libraries that have fallen behind to catch-up with the more progressive libraries. Often the most innovative libraries and systems can't take advantage of LSTA funding. I'd like to see more funding available for innovation.

*I think WISCAT has been a wonderful resource sharing tool for many years and run by a terrific staff. I feel, however, that the time has come for LSTA funds to be used to support other public library services considered important in a changing environment.