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Evaluation Summary

Given Connecticut’s 2015 estimated population of 3,576,452, the state’s annual LSTA Grants to States allotment of approximately $2 million per year translates into less than 56 cents per person per year. LSTA funds alone are inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Connecticut residents. The Connecticut State Library (CSL) challenge has been to find ways to make 56 cents per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a small amount of Federal money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services.

This report provides an evaluation of the Connecticut State Library, Division of Library Development (DLD) activities and assessments from 2013 to 2017 Five-Year Plan. At the heart of the plan is a service-oriented approach that centers on the 3.6 million residents of Connecticut and their information access. Its two goals address 1) the methods for getting access, and, 2) the variety of content services.

Many State Libraries suffered losses as a result of the Great Recession—and Connecticut is no exception. DLD projected in their Needs Assessment of the five-year plan that the state budget would continue to fluctuate as the budget crisis in Connecticut began before the recession.¹ Growth in the economy was marginal followed by severe deficits in the state budget.² Government and information sectors “shed jobs”³ leading up to the period under review. Funding for public libraries though has been increasing slightly since 2012.

DLD has made all the right choices in a very difficult environment. The closing of one of their facilities was a key strategic decision that would allow them to transform and continue to thrive in the future. Similarly, some of the objectives that were not pursued were guided by the principle of focusing resources on institutional capacity building and access to resources. If there is a phrase to characterize their strategy that phrase is “building on our strengths.” From supporting statewide services like the databases, the shared catalog, and delivery system to supporting sub-grants, an ambitious program of professional development and a network of partnerships, DLD is strengthening the capacity of libraries in CT to create a better future for them. Elements of distinction are noteworthy in the superb work the consultants provide through training, workshops, and reference questions and consultations. A systematic effort is taking place so sub-grants highlight outcomes and emphasize impact captured in the agencies reporting documents.

Library Context

There are two goals in the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five-Year Plan for Connecticut 2013 – 2017 listed below. These goals have some interesting characteristics. They are all active in nature, emphasizing a spirit of engagement and results-orientation.

Goal 1. Connecticut libraries will have every opportunity to provide reliable access to library-centered public access computer environments that feature high-quality library and information resources and delivery systems.

Goal 2. Connecticut libraries will be able to offer their patrons access to library resources that promote literacy, education, and lifelong learning and enhance workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills.

These goals target primarily the Information Access and the Institutional Capacity focal areas from the IMLS Measuring Success priorities though through access to resources Literacy efforts are also supported. These goals have been partly achieved, while tough choices were made due to budget cuts. The evaluators’ conclusion was that Goal 1 was PARTLY ACHIEVED and Goal 2 was ACHIEVED.

Expenditure of slightly more than $6 million in LSTA funds over the three-year period (Federal Fiscal Year [FFY] 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015) covered by this evaluation have been looked upon carefully. CSL is being called to preserve and make accessible Connecticut’s history and heritage and to advance the development of library services statewide. There are 195 public libraries in Connecticut. The CSL “serves students, researchers, public libraries and town governments throughout the state. In addition, the State Library directs a program of statewide library development and administers the Library Services and Technology Act state grant. In conjunction with the Department of Higher Education, the State Library also administers researchitct.org—Connecticut’s source for free online resources.”

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

The consultant assessment of DLD progress to-date is that they PARTLY ACHIEVED Goal 1 and that they ACHIEVED Goal 2. While DLD demonstrated progress on each goal, programs that are longstanding, such as Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, resource sharing, and consultations, had the most perceptible progress. The library development activities managed the closing of one of the facilities with agility while strengthening the outreach, training, and community engagement components with their offerings and with sub-grants.

As part of the assessment process, the evaluators asked key staff members from CSL involved with the LSTA program to offer their personal appraisals of progress toward each of the two goals included in the CSL’s 2013–3017 five-year Plan. In the self-assessment, the CSL internal appraisal was that the state library administrative agency (SLAA) had only PARTLY ACHIEVED all Goal 1 and ACHIEVED Goal 2. The evaluators concur and conclude that Goal 1 is PARTLY ACHIEVED and Goal 2 is ACHIEVED. We elaborate on the evidence we collected and our conclusions below.

---

4 http://ctstatelibrary.org/about/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>DLD Self-Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 – Connecticut libraries will have every opportunity to provide reliable access to library-centered public access computer environments that feature high-quality library and information resources and delivery systems.</td>
<td>PARTLY ACHIEVED</td>
<td>PARTLY ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 – Connecticut libraries will be able to offer their patrons access to library resources that promote literacy, education, and lifelong learning and enhance workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills.</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 1 - LSTA EXPENDITURES**

Connecticut invested $2,723,842 (45.24%) of the LSTA funds in Goal 1 activities; financial details for each project areas are included in Appendix G.

**GOAL 1 - ACTIVITIES**

Goal 1 activities include the Statewide Delivery System (deliverIT), Consulting and DLD Administration, Resource Sharing/iCONN/request services. The key services are the delivery system and the iCONN, recently rebranded as researchIT, services. Part of the delivery system was under contract and the contractor was not able to deliver services as needed any more. CSL stepped up to the plate and assumed the delivery services while also initiating an effort for more efficient delivery in the future. This challenge presents an opportunity for CSL to achieve some major collaborative break throughs in the near future. It also emphasizes the need for strong collaboration between CSL and all the libraries in Connecticut.

**GOAL 1 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion the evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that Goal 1 has been PARTLY ACHIEVED:

1. CSL has strengthened the content provision of electronic databases in the face of continuing challenges with price increases and reduced budgets; these investments continue to provide reliable access to information resources successfully.
2. CSL was able to step up to the plate and assume the activities of a delivery sub-contract that could not deliver anymore; this has contributed to the evaluators concluding that CSL can provide reliable access through its delivery systems.
3. CSL is lacking a technical collaborative infrastructure; CSL can benefit from a structure that would facilitate communication related to system changes that are taking place locally so
adverse effects and re-adjustments can be minimized in the future as a result. Similarly, the agency can proactively communicate the challenges it faces and develop scenarios that would allow it to adjust quickly within a range of technological possibilities in the future. Agility is going to be crucial for the future maintenance of high quality services for the libraries in Connecticut and for the CSL.

In summary, the evaluators found evidence that many of the objectives were achieved but not all of them. As a result, this goal is PARTLY ACHIEVED.

**GOAL 2 - LSTA EXPENDITURES**

Connecticut invested $3,078,719 (51.13%) of the LSTA funds in Goal 2 activities; financial details for each project areas are included in Appendix G.

**GOAL 2 -- ACTIVITIES**

Goal 2 includes the LBPH services, Library Service Centers (used to be two but now there is only one in the Middletown facility), Professional Development, Summer Reading, and Sub-grants targeting teens, adult and senior services among others. The sub-grants served as a capacity building mechanism which in the current year have been replaced with consulting services and assessment tools like the ASPEN Institute, EDGE assessment, etc. CSL is constantly reinventing itself especially in the area of capacity building in the face of complex and challenging circumstances.

**GOAL 2 -- CONCLUSIONS**

In conclusion the evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that Goal 2 has been ACHIEVED:

1. CSL continues to consolidate and strengthen service provision; the closing of the Willimantic location allows the agency to build on its strengths during complex and challenging times. Introducing online services like Evanced Solutions Summer Reader software, for example, allowed continuing and increased participation in the face of the closing of the Willimantic facility which was located in an impoverished area.
2. CSL is rising to the challenge – a challenge that will continue given the state’s economy; the efforts to engage the community through the ASPEN initiative, EDGE, and other assessment tools allows the agency to build on the strengths of the community of libraries it serves
3. CSL is innovating while consolidating; the establishment of a new interface for collecting data and the deployment of Tableau indicate how during complex and challenging times the capacity to innovate is there due to the skills and attitudes staff bring to service delivery.

In summary, the evaluators found evidence that Goal 2 is ACHIEVED even in the face of adversity and re-adjustment. As a result, this goal is ACHIEVED. CSL is constantly reinventing itself especially in the area of capacity building in the face of complex and challenging circumstances.
A-2. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities achieve results that address national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and their corresponding intents?

The evaluators believe that Connecticut has done a great job of addressing the Measuring Success focal areas. In fact, in our considered opinion, the variety of activities supported with LSTA funding in Connecticut has touched on most of the focal areas and its breadth is larger than we have seen in most other states. The emphasis on access, literacy and lifelong learning, and institutional capacity are noteworthy.

Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No) IMLS specifies a 10% threshold on expenditures for identifying substantial focus. The following subgroups met the threshold:

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

Process Questions

Data has primarily been used to inform decision-making on adjustments to LSTA initiatives as well as in managing reorganization that affected the fulfillment of some of the goals. SPR data has been shared directly with key staff internally and indirectly with partners, Advisory Groups, the library community, and state governmental entities.

Methodology Questions

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation the Connecticut State Library participated in an RFP that COSLINE issued for conducting LSTA evaluations across ten states in the Northeast part of the US. QualityMetrics, LLC, Library Consultants employed a mixed-methods approach that included a review of the SPR, documents and statistics, focus groups, personal interviews and a web-based survey.
Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is based on a review of three years of performance. It reflects activities undertaken by DLD 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 State Program Report (SPR) 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 differed somewhat each year. These variations in reporting coupled with variations in the codes assigned to different projects and activities makes it challenging to report SPR data in a consistent manner across the three years we have SPR data.

DLD offered competitive grants which is noteworthy. The DLD philosophy for these grants is to spur innovation in the libraries. This is evident from the outcomes assessment evaluation emphasis in the reporting of the sub-grants. However, different ways of reporting in different years makes the reporting of sub-grants in the SPR files the challenging due to new reporting protocols established by the IMLS. This, and 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. All in all, the challenges with the SPR data in Connecticut were overcome to a large part due to the excellent records DLD staff have above and beyond what is captured in the SPR.

While the change in the SPR was long overdue and should enhance reporting in the future, it nevertheless repeatedly left the evaluators with a difficult task in making “apples to apples” comparisons. Fortunately, the mixed methods evaluation approach used by the evaluators that incorporated interviews, focus groups, and a web-based survey, in addition to a review of the SPR and other statistical reports, websites and social media links provided by the state library agency, proved invaluable and successfully dealt with most of these challenges.

BACKGROUND

Connecticut has the largest income gap between the top 1% and the other 99% according to a 2015 analysis.5 Framed for its rural loveliness, Connecticut derived most of its wealth from industry including manufacturing which has been a major draft for the economy recently. Historically, Connecticut manufactures for the military; “firearms and ammunition, first produced here at the time of the

American Revolution, are still made, and Gorton is still a center for submarine building. Declines in federal defense spending, however, have adversely affected the state’s economy. Agriculture is a small part of the economy whereas insurance industries’ are a big part of the economy with Hartford being one the industry’s world centers.

Connecticut’s economic growth is not keeping up with the rest of the country. “The strongest sectors in the state, the Bureau of Economic Analysis says, are companies that provide expertise to other firms, such as engineering, accounting and information technology; and management consulting and expert consulting, such as on health care benefits.” Coupled with the fact that Connecticut has the fourth-highest GDP per person, the picture of the communities libraries serve in Connecticut is complex and challenging with a population that is older compared to the rest of the country and aging faster than the rest of the country with very high density.

The population of the state (estimate as of July 1, 2016) is 3,576,452 million, an increase of 0.1% since the April 1, 2010 census. Connecticut’s population is not growing and this can affect the LSTA allotment in future years. Persons under 5 years old decreased slightly from 5.7% to 5.2% from 2010 to 2015, and similarly from 22.9% to 21.3% for persons less than 18 years. On the other hand, persons 65 years and over increased from 14.2% to 15.8%. Black or African Americans increased slightly from 10.1% to 11.6%, Asians from 3.8% to 4.6%, and Hispanic or Latino from 13.4% to 15.4%. Median household income (in 2015 dollars), 2011–2015, was $70,331 and per capita income $38,803.

The Connecticut State Library (CSL) has been through a time of adjustment for more than a decade now. The five-year period covering the previous evaluation cycle for the SLAA, 2008-2012, showed a staff reduction of 24% in FTE staff. Re-adjustments continue to be made with the closing of a facility during the current five-year period, 2013-2017.

CSL had successfully deployed three different strategies during 2008-2012:

- Direct service (e.g., ICONN, LBPH)
- Capacity Building/Enabling (e.g., Leading Libraries, Connecticar)
- Sub-Grants

---


8 QuickFacts uses data from the following sources: National level - Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC); State level - American Community Survey (ACS), one-year estimates; County level - The Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE), one-year estimates; Sub-county level: Cities, towns and census designated places; - ACS, five-year estimates: [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/09](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/09)
During 2013-2017, CSL continued to rely on these three strategies (see Appendix G, H, J, and K) while closing a facility to re-adjust to the continuing declines in the state budget.

CSL receives the 29th largest Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States allotment, an amount determined based on a population formula, a place that put Connecticut between Oklahoma and Louisiana. Expenditure of slightly more than $6 million in LSTA funds over the three-year period (Federal Fiscal Year [FFY] 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015) covered by this evaluation have been looked upon carefully. CSL is being called to preserve and make accessible Connecticut's history and heritage and to advance the development of library services statewide. There are 195 public libraries in Connecticut. The CSL “serves students, researchers, public libraries and town governments throughout the state. In addition, the State Library directs a program of statewide library development and administers the Library Services and Technology Act state grant. In conjunction with the Department of Higher Education, the State Library also administers researchitct.org— Connecticut’s source for free online resources.”

A. Retrospective Questions

In this section of the report, findings are organized according to the evaluation plan and the terms of reference of the evaluation study. The evaluation is based on three years of performance: 2013 through 2015. Information for years 2016 and 2017 were not readily available for analysis. Due to the change in reporting in the State Program Report (SPR) that began in 2014, the data below will show aggregate comparisons for years before 2014, and more detailed figures for after.

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

This report provides an evaluation of the Connecticut State Library, Division of Library Development (DLD) activities and assessments from 2013 to 2017 Five-Year Plan. At the heart of the plan is a service-

9 http://ctstatelibrary.org/about/ used to be known as iCONN.
An oriented approach that centers on the 3.6 million residents of Connecticut and their information access. Its two goals address 1) the methods for getting access, and 2) the variety of content.

Many State Libraries suffered losses as a result of the Great Recession—and Connecticut is no exception. DLD projected in their Needs Assessment of the five-year plan that the state budget would continue to fluctuate as the budget crisis in Connecticut began before the recession. Growth in the economy was marginal followed by severe deficits in the state budget. Government and information sectors “shed jobs” leading up to the period under review.

As part of the assessment process, the evaluators asked key staff members from CSL involved with the LSTA program to offer their personal appraisals of progress toward each of the two goals included in the CSL’s 2013–2017 five-year Plan. In the self-assessment, the CSL internal appraisal was that the state library administrative agency (SLAA) had only PARTLY ACHIEVED all Goal 1 and ACHIEVED Goal 2. The evaluators concur and conclude that Goal 1 is PARTLY ACHIEVED and Goal 2 is ACHIEVED. We elaborate on the evidence we collected and our conclusions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
<th>Consultant Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1 – Connecticut libraries will have every opportunity to provide reliable access to library-centered public access computer environments that feature high-quality library and information resources and delivery systems.</td>
<td>PARTLY ACHIEVED</td>
<td>PARTLY ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 – Connecticut libraries will be able to offer their patrons access to library resources that promote literacy, education, and lifelong learning and enhance workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills.</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultant assessment of DLD progress to-date is below. While DLD demonstrated progress on each goal, programs that are longstanding, such as Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped and resource sharing, had the most perceptible progress. Programs and projects that are varied or new had smaller footprints towards success.

Below we review the two goals of the Connecticut State Library based on their own usage statistics, available data SPR data, and program evaluations.

Goal 1 – Connecticut libraries will have every opportunity to provide reliable access to library-centered public access computer environments that feature high-quality library and information resources and delivery systems.

The Connecticut State Library first goal has 7 objectives:

1. Provide reliable databases and digital repositories
2. Provide a statewide delivery system for patrons (Ccar)
3. Employ a variety of training and professional development opportunities
4. Provide individualized topical consultations to libraries, library organizations, and library consortia.
5. Develop and implement “Small Library Websites” initiative to assist libraries in having adequate web presence.
6. Take a role in Connecticut’s efforts to establish a statewide integrated library system.
7. Promote technological innovation in Connecticut libraries.

Connecticut invested $2,723,842 (45.24%) of the LSTA funds in Goal 1 activities; financial details for each project area are included in Appendix G.

Goal 1 activities include the Statewide Delivery System (deliverIT), Consulting and DLD Administration, Resource Sharing/iCONN/request services. The key services are the delivery system and the iCONN, recently rebranded as researchIT, services. Part of the delivery system was under contract and the contractor was not able to deliver services as needed any more. CSL stepped up to the plate and assumed the delivery services while also initiating an effort for more efficient delivery in the future. This challenge presents an opportunity for CSL to achieve some major collaborative break throughs in the near future. It also emphasizes the need for strong collaboration between CSL and all the libraries in Connecticut.

GOAL 1 OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Objective 1: Provide reliable, high-quality library and Information resources through a robust statewide database program (iCONN), statewide catalog and interlibrary loan (ReQuest) and access to digital repositories (Treasures of CT Libraries)

Objective 6: As needed, take a leading, assisting, supporting, or participatory role in Connecticut’s efforts to establish a statewide integrated library system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$934,984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1. Information Resource and Database Program Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Connecticut State Library is making great progress towards Goal 1, specifically for objectives 1 and 6. By providing access to licensed databases, DLD is connecting Connecticut communities via its primary portal: researchIT (formerly iCONN). researchIT ensures access to verified content published in peer-
reviewed and subscription-based journals and publications not available through web searching. Additional benefits are the savings to local communities of $216 million over five years by providing heavily discounted, licensed databases. This delivery method also saves local library staff time that would otherwise be spent negotiating license fees and maintaining licensed database access and content. Over two years, total funding (state and federal) was $1,995,998 in FFY 2014 (actual) and 1,900,367 in FFY 2015 (estimated) with approximately 18% coming from LSTA funds. This is great leveraging by the DLD to provide a universal tool for citizens. The content available supports research and information needs in health, finances, civic engagement. The material availability is often coupled with training of librarians in addition to training modules DLD makes available for library users on the website. Database training is offered by EBSCO and ProQuest, as well as National Network of Libraries of Medicine (NNLM), to support the library community’s effective use resources.

All Connecticut residents are lifelong learners and via its online portal, researchIT, provides “equitable access to a core level of information resources to all Connecticut residents through their schools, colleges and public libraries” no matter where they reside in the state or the demographics of their community. The researchIT user population is largely composed of students and teachers (62%), from elementary to college, but approximately 12% of users are “other professionals.”

Many Connecticut libraries were forced to cut materials budgets between FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, leading to an increased reliance on researchIT across the state and a jump in usage (24%). While the number of researchIT pageviews has fluctuated, and was below the baseline in FFY 2013, researchIT saw a substantial increase to 9,429,240 pageviews in FFY 2014, exceeding the 3% per year goal for that fiscal year. The number of persons served by iCONN is increasing by 3% each year over a baseline of 1,321,599. The number of logins from outside libraries (e.g., home, office) is increasing by 5% each year over a baseline of 417,896. As of June 2014, 43% of Connecticut libraries relied either “exclusively or heavily” on iCONN to provide licensed databases to patrons. A fall 2014 survey of DLD staff respondents described iCONN as a “critically” or “very” important service to their library.

To allow patrons and librarians to search across institutions, DLD maintains a statewide library catalog called findIT (formerly reQuest). The tri-part system of researchIT, findIT, and deliverIT (see below) supports the access all patrons have to library materials. In 2015, DLD discontinued reQuest and replaced it with findIT which uses an open source platform. This change was in part due to budget cuts.

New ILS system is being developed that is much more user friendly and provides a platform that is more conducive to sharing other resources such as databases. This is currently work in progress.

**Objective 2: Provide a statewide delivery system for library materials (Ccar); enhance and improve services when possible.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$1,002,485</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 2. Statewide Delivery System for Library Materials Expenditures*
Objective Activities

According to DLD’s 2016 Annual Report, 93.9% of circulation across public libraries was physical items. One way that DLD accomplishes this is through the statewide delivery system round trip car service (formerly Connecticar, or Ccar, now deliverIT CT). The delivery system ensures that Connecticut residents have equitable access to materials by providing a delivery system for interlibrary loan requests from any public or academic library in the state. Two hundred twenty-four public and academic libraries in the state received either the state-sponsored delivery system or Avant Business Services (by contract) for interlibrary loan services. In 2015, DLD found that the car delivery volume increased by 29% with both volume and ILL delivery trends increasing year on year.

At 17.8%, the statewide delivery system makes up the third largest percentage of LSTA funding from 2012 to 2015. This makes sense given the volume of materials that circulate. Total funding (state and federal) was $600,481 in FFY 2014 and $704,803 in FFY 2015. The system supports the Connecticard (Ccard) program, which allows any patron to borrow an item from any public library and return the item to any other public or academic library in the state, with cars providing item delivery back to the owning library. Without state-sponsored delivery, a potential 36% increase in interlibrary loan requests are projected, placing volume demands well beyond DLD’s capacity at current funding levels. Without this program, Connecticut academic libraries would be unlikely to absorb the costs of loaning their materials via ILL.

When compared to a commercial delivery service, state-sponsored delivery saved Connecticut libraries $36 million between 2010 and 2015 (based on a $2.50 per package shipment per item). Eighty-nine percent of Connecticut library staff rate it as either “critically important” or “very important” according to a survey conducted in fall 2014.

While the program’s winter 2015 program report card asserts a decreasing delivery turnaround time trend, the April 2008 average is reported as 1.42 delivery days (median 1 day) and the April 2013 average is 1.84 delivery days (median 2 days), indicating an increasing trend. According to DLD’s stated goal in its five-year plan (Appendix D), the goal was to decrease service by 5% per year with an average of 1.51 deliver days. This increasing delivery time trend indicates that according to this metric, the Connecticut DLD did not meet its delivery system goal to wean service.

Additionally, according to the survey conducted by the consultants for this evaluation, we recorded in several free text fields that librarians noted the importance of a statewide transit delivery and ILL. Even unprompted, Connecticut librarians stress that Summer Reading Programs and access to materials are all dependent on the borrowing network and circulation of physical materials, which is all handled through deliverIT CT.

As noted in the deliverIT CT assessment from January 2017, the program requires retooling in order to meet demand and continue to work on efficiency. While the future of the program is still under review, this program helps DLD and all Connecticut libraries achieve on of their overarching goal to make access to information possible.
The notion of working collaboratively came across in many of the focus groups and interviews. Here are a few representative quotes:

“Creating a strong Connecticut network is vitally crucial”

“Creating a statewide network would be good but a lot would fight it because they want to be autonomous ... but ideally everyone would be part of one network”

“From my perspective, being part of Bibliomation -- we rely on the network to be the innovative force; they are incredible; very service oriented” (Bibliomation in Waterbury)

“Networks is where the leadership is happening”

Objective 3: Employ a variety of training and professional development opportunities including online events (e.g., webinars, online classes, web conferences) and professional collections to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015 (this is under Goal 2 in Appendix G)</th>
<th>$152,015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3. Professional Development for Connecticut librarians Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 4: Provide individualized topical consultations to libraries, library organizations, and library consortia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$786,373</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 4. Consulting and DLD Administration for Connecticut librarians Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Activities

DLD included professional development as a core component of its plan under both goals. Objective 3 and 4 of Goal 1 and objectives 1, 2, and 7 of Goal 2 have overlapping or identical activities and measures. For this reason, the progress is grouped together for the most part with measures that account for all activities.

Through a multi-platform approach of in-person classes, resource library collections, webinars, and consultations targeted at library staff, DLD made significant progress towards these objectives. DLD intended to set targets for increasing the number of offerings and attendance at these events by 1% starting at the beginning of this plan. The evaluators reviewed an excel file that listed all the programs delivered and the number of participants attended as well as evaluation data from the participants. Table 5 summarizes some of the activity on professional development:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Attendees</th>
<th># of workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 partial</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Professional Development Offerings for Connecticut librarians*

SPR data from 2013 to 2015 shows that DLD spent $272,856 on professional development activities and $727,257 on individualized consultations for a total of $1,000,113. Professional development represents 14.6% of all LSTA funding only behind Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (LBPH) funding.

Professional development is focused on civic and community engagement through workshops, the ASPEN Action Guide, the Edge Toolkit, community assessment training, and EXCITE Innovation training. Goal 2, objective 9 focuses on partnerships, and some of the work with ASPN is described there, as well as work related to the EXCITE pilot.

Connecticut was one of seven state libraries to participate in the EDGE pilot assessment with 49 libraries participating. After the pilot, DLD subscribed to the tool on a statewide basis and currently have 110 libraries registered and in various stages of the assessment. There has been a strong emphasis to capture the story of the library through outcomes assessment. Many of the professional development outcomes are captured in the following workshop evaluation data:

**Workshop: Protecting your Patrons' Privacy**

Twenty-six (100%) respondents reported an increase in knowledge of major surveillance programs and authorizations, and 21 (80.8%) respondents reported that they will definitely use their new skills on the job in the next six months to use privacy-protecting tech tools on public computers or teach them to patrons.

**Workshop: Capital and Facility Development Planning**

Eighteen (100%) respondents reported an increase in knowledge of how to employ architectural, engineering, and consultant assistance in assessing or improving their buildings. Twelve (66.7%) respondents reported that they will definitely use their new skills on the job in the next six months to describe the planning and construction process for renovated or new facilities.

**Workshop: Grant Project Series: Rethinking Community Needs Assessment**

Fifteen (100%) respondents reported an increase in knowledge of how to collect input through a Community Needs Assessment and five (33.3%) respondents reported that they will definitely use their new skills on the job in the next six months to gather input from non-users.
And participants’ most useful outcomes are captured in their evaluations as well:

**Workshop: Leadership Series: Managing Library Partnerships**

*Comment:* "This leadership series is an extremely valuable professional development opportunity. Thank you!" Most useful aspects of the workshop: listening to peers’ experiences that failed and succeeded, learning about possible solutions to common problems, what constitutes a good vs. bad partnership

**Workshop: Wordpress Crash Course**

Most useful aspects of the workshop: managing pages and using media, understanding how content is organized and managed, learning to navigate Wordpress dashboard, learning the difference between a post and a page

**Workshop: Improving Your Library’s Mobile Services**

Most useful aspects of the workshop: responsive web design, ideas for mobile services, current trends in mobile technology, examples of mobile website’s technical aspects of designing a mobile site.

**Workshop: RDA Essentials**

Most useful aspects of the workshop: clear explanation of FRBR and RDA, how it relates to current use of AACR2

Table 6 captures the number of consultancies, the range of which is impressive. Consulting is done using Aspen, Edge, Excite, Money Smart week, Health literacy resources, and training offered in partnership with other state agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Consultancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2013</td>
<td>3,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2014</td>
<td>2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2015</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6. DLD and Consulting Transactions per year*

In addition, DLD uses LSTA funds to operate a “library for librarians” network of physical collections items as well as a series of meetings places where DLD consultations, library consortia, community groups and others can meet, share, or collaborate. The meeting spaces are used for the Professional Development in-person classroom instruction, DLD individualized consulting, and houses DLD staff responsible for these and other statewide activities (like iCONN, Goal 1, objective 1). This system supports the activities for Goal 2, objectives 5 and 6 as well providing access to materials for underserved populations.
The multi-modal approach to professional development makes significant progress towards Goal 1 for librarians across Connecticut.

**Objective 6: As needed, take a leading, assisting, supporting, or participatory role in Connecticut’s efforts to establish a statewide integrated library system. (see Objective 1)**

**Objective 5: Develop and implement “Small Library Websites” initiative to assist libraries in having adequate web presence.** According to DLD staff, the initiative to assist small libraries with their web presence was not implemented.

**Objective 7: Promote technological innovation in Connecticut libraries.**
The original intent included funding end-user equipment and technology in partnership with libraries did not occur as expected. The recent data provision though of public library statistics through a new tool as well the Tableau dashboards are adding to the picture of technological innovations CSL can provide.

**GOAL 1 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion the evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that Goal 1 has been PARTLY ACHIEVED:

1. CSL has strengthened the content provision of electronic databases in the face of continuing challenges with price increases and reduced budgets; these investments continue to provide reliable access to information resources successfully.
2. CSL was able to step up to the plate and assume the activities of a delivery sub-contract that could not deliver anymore; this has contributed to the evaluators concluding that CSL can provide reliable access through its delivery systems.
3. CSL is lacking a technical collaborative infrastructure; CSL can benefit from a structure that would facilitate communication related to system changes that are taking place locally so adverse effects and re-adjustments can be minimized in the future as a result. Similarly, the agency can proactively communicate the challenges it faces and develop scenarios that would allow it to adjust quickly within a range of technological possibilities in the future. Agility is going to be crucial for the future maintenance of high quality services for the libraries in Connecticut and for the CSL.

In summary, the evaluators found evidence that many of the objectives were achieved but not all of them. As a result, this goal is PARTLY ACHIEVED.

**Goal 2 – Connecticut libraries will be able to offer their patrons access to library resources that promote literacy, education, and lifelong learning and enhance workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills.**

The Connecticut State Library’s second goal has nine objectives:
1. Provide a variety of professional training opportunities for CT library workforce
2. Provide individualized topical consultations
3. Support the academic progress of children with summer reading programs
4. Support individuals with disabilities through the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped
5. Develop and provide programmatic and/or directed grants for underserved populations
6. Help libraries amplify their services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities
7. Workforce development infrastructure, including continuing education, programmatic support, and virtual infrastructure
8. Develop and implement a program to assist libraries in developing the digital literacy skills of their patrons
9. Encourage libraries to partner and collaborate locally, across towns, and/or regionally with each other and with community-based organizations and agencies

Connecticut invested $3,078,719 (51.13%) of the LSTA funds in Goal 2 activities; financial details for each project area is included in Appendix G. For activities and expenditures related to objectives 1, 2, and 7, please see discussion in Goal 1 above. These objectives are identical or overlap with objectives in Goal 1, and have been grouped and discussed together.

Goal 2 includes the LBPH services, Library Service Centers (used to be two but now there is only one in the Middletown facility), Professional Development, Summer Reading, and Sub-grants targeting teens, adult and senior services among others. The sub-grants served as a capacity building mechanism which in the current year have been replaced with consulting services and assessment tools like the ASPEN Institute, EDGE assessment, etc. CSL is constantly reinventing itself especially in the area of capacity building in the face of complex and challenging circumstances.

**GOAL 2 OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES**

**Objective 1: Employ a variety of training and professional development opportunities including online events (e.g. webinars, online classes, web conferences) and professional collections to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services.**

As noted under Goal 1, objectives 3 and 4, there is overlap in these objectives with Goal 2, objectives 1, 2, and 7. We are highlighting under Goal 2 recent activities as they emphasize a strategic trajectory for CSL shaping the closing months of the Five-Year evaluation. DLD is offering a rich array of continuing education workshops including online events; a relatively recent key offering includes work on the revised Space Planning Guidelines that reflect 21st Century flexible modular space needs. Communities are using their libraries in unique and exciting ways, from makerspaces and robots to Farmer’s Markets, libraries are transforming to meet the changing needs of communities and continuing to serve as the center of learning and knowledge creation. The Aspen Institute describes a “new world of knowledge,” with the public library serving as a “vital learning institution and engine for individual, community, and civil society development.” While each of our communities will approach this new era differently, there
are common benchmarks that can be utilized to ensure that the public library remains “the essential civil society space where this new America will make its democratic character.” DLD is incorporating the findings from the Connecticut Rising to the Challenge events in its training and professional development services to guide libraries toward 21st century practices and principles.

**Objective 2: Provide individualized topical consultations to libraries, library organizations, and library consortia.**

Library liaison work touches on essentially every element of success and has effectively utilized tools like Aspen, Edge, and Space Planning Guidelines touching primarily on the IMLS focal area of civic and community engagement. DLD had to close one of the two Service Centers and now operates only the one in Middletown.

The Service Centers, prior to 2014 in Middletown and Willimantic, were funded in FFY 2012 at $103,803 and $160,667 respectively. Their role is to house library materials that can be borrowed for 90 days by any library in Connecticut (public, school, academic, special, hospital, etc.) to supplement their collections. Staff at the service centers provided individualized topical consultations to libraries and advice on a range of topics. This is in addition to providing a shared collection through a combination of a liaison consultant role and a specialty area consultant. The materials cover a broad range of reading topics for children, young adult (YA), large print books, and Bi-Folkal Remembering Kits. Materials also include professional development readings for librarians that supplement continuing education on an individual basis. The Ccar system (under Goal 1, objective 2) ferries materials between the service centers and local libraries.

**Objective 7: Increase libraries capability of implementing activities and providing resources related to workforce development by providing necessary infrastructure (e.g., continuing education, programmatic support, and virtual infrastructure)**

**Objective 3: Support the academic progress of children with summer reading programs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$77,490</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table 7. Summer Reading Program Expenditures**

**Objective Activities**

DLD set specific targets for its Collaborative Summer Reading Program in Appendix E of the five-year plan. These measures are broken into three groups below: programmatic achievements, reading and attainment by children, and reading and achievement by young adults. By most measures, Connecticut libraries exceeded most targets demonstrating success towards Goal 2.

Overall, SRP programs grew during the period under review exceeding DLD’s expectations. DLD projected a target increase of 2% per year of libraries that report usage statistics of collaborative summer library programs (CSLPs) and other target measures.
48.6% of Connecticut libraries responding to the LSTA evaluation survey fielded in December 2016 stated that they felt their staff was well-prepared and trained to plan and conduct successful SRPs with 81.4% using the Connecticut State Library planning guide. The chief complaint and deficiency in SRPs across Connecticut, according to survey respondents, is advance planning. Individual comments stated that better coordination across schools and the State Library could only help to prepare libraries for their summer programming. One respondent also mentioned that deliverIT CT was crucial to their ability to supply children with materials to read, emphasizing again that successful coordination is important overall.

By 2016, Connecticut libraries supported more participation by providing more programs. SRPs for children exceeded its 2% increase target of 111 baseline by hosting 142 programs. The target for teen programs projected 54 programs with a 5% target increase and exceeded with 122 programs for teens. On the importance of teen use of the library and its services, the following quote is telling:

Of the 75 Connecticut libraries that reported book counts, children read 419,525 books, well exceeding the 20% per year increase target. Of the 42 Connecticut libraries that reported counting minutes read by children, children read 11,488,766 minutes, far in excess of the 10% per year increase over a baseline of 2,637,897 minutes. While only three libraries reported counting pages read by children, the target of a 5% per year increase over a baseline of 414,511 was met with 972,235 pages read. The 70 Connecticut libraries that reported counting books read by teens (young adults) reported 50,420 books read, exceeding the target of a 5% increase per year over a baseline of 24,141.

In addition, Connecticut libraries exceeded their targets for teen reading. Twenty-two Connecticut libraries reported that teens (young adults) read 8,736,366 minutes, exceeding the target of a 10% per year increase over a baseline of 746,002. Only five Connecticut libraries reported counting pages read by teens, but with 991,452 pages, those libraries still exceeded the target of a 5% per year increase over a baseline of 630,165.

Overall, the SRP programs at local Connecticut libraries are exceeding the state targets making successful progress towards Goal 2 promoting lifelong learning.

**Objective 4: Support individuals with disabilities through the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$1,820,549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 8. Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped Expenditures*

**Objective Activities**

Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (LBPH) is the largest program supported by LSTA funds at approximately 30% of funding per year and 30% of all LSTA funding from 2013 to 2015. Connecticut librarians indicated in the five-year plan that statewide databases and information delivery are most valuable to them at 37.9% and 39.5%, respectively, but patrons of LBPH demonstrate that they find this
service invaluable. In a survey of patrons, 97% of responses rate LBPH services from “excellent” to “good” and 93% said that they “always” or “mostly” received the assistance they needed.

LBPH conducted an LBPH patron survey during April and May 2016 that sought input from all 705 patrons with an e-mail address on record. The survey objectives included assessing LBPH performance, offering a forum for patron feedback of the program, and addressing the outcome-based evaluation measures as stated in the 2013–2017 Five-Year Plan for Connecticut. The response rate was 18%.

In general, the LBPH patrons that responded to the 2016 survey gave positive reviews of LBPH services and programs. Ninety percent either “agree” or “strongly agree” that the staff satisfactorily answers their questions and 66% either “strongly agree” or “agree” that they get the technical support they need from the LBPH program.

DLD’s target goal for LBPH during the plan period was to improve the quality of life of its patrons by 15% between 2013 and 2017. The 2016 LBPH survey found that 97% of respondents either “agree” or “strongly agree” that LBPH improves the quality of their lives. DLD set outcomes for LBPH’s support of patrons’ lifelong learning to increase by 10% between 2013 and 2017. Ninety percent of 2016 LBPH survey respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” that without LBPH, they would not have access to the library materials they need. Eighty-four percent of 2016 LBPH survey respondents either “agree” or “strongly agree” that LBPH supports their personal growth in education, skill, development, and knowledge. Additionally, DLD’s targets for LBPH include access to free-choice recreational fiction and nonfiction materials to increase by 15% during the plan period. Ninety-four percent of LBPH respondents either “agree” or “strongly agree” that LBPH provides them with recreational reading.

The LBPH program in Connecticut has a distinct flavor that is captured by the following contextual details on the program’s activities:

The volunteer program has remained steady with a core group of about 5–6 regular volunteers performing audio book inspections. Of another dozen or so short-term volunteers, some consist of high school students fulfilling community service requirement and also adults fulfilling court-ordered community service. These volunteers perform very valuable services involving shelf reorganizations and shipping out excess books to the recycle site. Volunteers also offer their time and energy to maintain the outside garden area, help staff with routine data entry, and special projects that otherwise would be difficult to finish.

The LBPH held a highly successful volunteer recognition day on April 10, 2015 in which about 50 volunteers and friends attended. The volunteers represented the five major groups supporting the LBPH: direct LBPH volunteers, the Advisory Committee, the Friends group, the AT&T Pioneers machine repair group, and the Connecticut Volunteer Services for the Blind and Handicapped, Inc. (CVSBH) book recording group. Plaques were presented to the AT&T Pioneers for their 50 years of continuous machine repair services and to each of the five CVSBH recording studios who have recorded nearly 2,700 cassette books over the past 37 years. Forty-nine Certificates of Appreciation were given to individual volunteers.
The LBPH held an open house on May 2, 2015 in conjunction with the Lions Clubs International state convention held in Rocky Hill. CRIS Radio also set up an information table there. The LBPH and the Lions Clubs International have a strong collaborative relationship.

The LBPH donated in September 2015 about 2,300 braille volumes to the American Friends of Kenya (AFK) for shipment to the African nation of Kenya. These braille books will be used for the education of blind children in that country. The AFK volunteers have been working on this project since last fall. All packing and shipping is at their expense.

The Connecticut Volunteer Services for the Blind and Handicapped (CVSBH) has completed its migration to digital recording and book production. Its five studios have recorded about 25 new books this past year. Its major accomplishment this year is the acceptance by the NLS of one of their digital books for inclusion in the downloadable BARD collection thus being available to all patrons nationwide and not just in Connecticut.

The AT&T Telephone Pioneers volunteer group continues to repair and clean cassette and digital playback machines for the LBPH. This is their 51st year supporting the LBPH. In FFY 2015, they worked on 730 playback machines. This volunteer group now consists of five retired AT&T employees with a typical age in the late-80’s. These volunteers are a very valuable resource as the LBPH no longer has in-house repair capabilities.

The library continued outreach efforts including a presentation at the Connecticut chapter of the National Federation of the Blind convention, participation in several senior fairs sponsored by the State Senate, displays of their program at ophthalmologist and Caregiver conventions, and other routine outreach efforts for a total of 35 events. Additionally, extensive efforts were made to call all of the nursing homes/rehabs in the state to promote their program. The State Library Division of Library Development presents the LBPH program information to the public libraries that they visit—about 30–40 libraries per year. Of these, about 20 libraries agreed to be a demonstration library where samples of the books and playback machines are displayed in their library. Also, The Affirmative Action department of the Connecticut Department of Administrative Services has presented LBPH program information at their outreach events.

The State Library's website was migrated to a WordPress-based website which included the LBPH website. With the new website, the LBPH made many improvements and additions to present a much more informative presence on the web. It is also much more accessible to patrons.

Objective 5: According to the schedule in section d., directly below, develop and provide programmatic and/or directed grants for underserved populations which provide for applicable development of literacy, education, lifelong learning, workforce development, 21st century skills, and digital literacy skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$124,009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 9. Sub-grants to targeted populations
Objective Activities

Connecticut State Library's five-year plan included interest in programming that covered a wide variety of Connecticut residents including older adults, children and youth, and persons with disability or other barriers like language or income. From the SPR data, and other evaluation materials, CSL has made some progress towards this objective.

Over the 2013 to 2015 period under review, there are several programs that target populations at the top and bottom of the spectrum: children and older adults. LBPH, discussed above, is arguably addressing the desire to reach persons with disabilities and similarly Summer Reading Programs are addressing the desire to reach children and youth. We covered these programs in other objectives already. The five-year plan treats LBPH and SRP less like grant programs and more like statewide services. Objective 5 reviewed here calls the targeted programming “grants,” that are smaller and lighter in scope than statewide programs like SPR and LBPH.

The plan states the “implementation schedule” for programs addressing this objective is:

- Every Child Ready to Read pre-literacy grants
- Older Adult program grants
- Services to Persons with Disabilities program grants
- Multilingual Populations program grants
- Young adult program grants.

The following is a brief listing of some of the sub-grants that are fulfilling this objective (see Appendix H for a complete listing of them): American Citizenship and Beyond, Wisdom Beyond Years, Inspiration @ Your Library, Every Child Ready to Read, Teen Programming - Bethel Public Library, Growing an Appreciation for the Library - Douglas Library, Movie Makers Project - East Lyme Public Library, and Learning Labs - James Blackstone Memorial Library. From the evaluation data East Lyme PL provided the value of these subgrants is captured in a heartwarming fashion:

> “Best result was 2 of my kids got recognition in the New Haven film festival - Big Boost in confidence; kids were new to the library; some of the kids continue to come to the library; got a lot of good press and helped the reputation of middle schools. It was good for the staff to see successful middle schoolers.”

Programs for older adults were offered in a number of libraries and the variety and success is captured by the following evidence in the SPR reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES for OLDER ADULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Falls Public Library</td>
<td>Three programs as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Wisdom Beyond Years: Healthy Lifestyle Series” was a series of two multi-sessions classes designed to help older adults gain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knowledge and hobbies that would lead to successful aging practices.
- “Tracing Your Family Tree” classes helped participants develop skills to trace their heritage, providing an active learning activity and a connection to other learners and information to share with family members.
- “Healthy Cooking” sessions were designed to increase participant’s knowledge in a social setting while developing healthier eating patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Peck Memorial</td>
<td>iPad educational classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Public Library</td>
<td>Socialization of seniors at Knoll Brook Village in their community room improved by offering chair exercises, craft activities, and movie nights. In addition, a bird walk helped residents realize the diversity of birds living near the housing. The programs offered included Medicare 101, Medicare Parts C &amp; D, Identity Fraud, and New Foods. Additional programming includes: Activities to Keep You Healthy, Declutter Your Life, and a Fall Risk Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien Library</td>
<td>“Senior Moments:” 11 monthly programs during the one-year grant period. These programs alternated between hands-on workshops and academic-style lectures and concerts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour Public Library</td>
<td>Three free series of classes in specific fields that scored high in the surveys: Drawing, Memoir Writing, and Tai Chi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartford Library</td>
<td>Launched the L.A.F.F. Center with a website (<a href="http://www.westhartfordlibrary.org/laff">http://www.westhartfordlibrary.org/laff</a>); creation of a collection of books that focus on topics of interest to this age group; and a program series aimed specifically at this age group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An illustrative set of outputs and outcomes is captured here from the Beacon Falls Public Library:

OUTPUTS targets and results:

a) Twenty-one or more of the 30 available spaces will be filled for the genealogy series. **Twenty-nine spots were filled during signups for the genealogy series.**

b) Seventy percent of those who sign up for the genealogy series will complete it. **Of the 29 who signed up, 20 attended the first meeting. Of those 20 who started, 11 attended at least six of the eight sessions (55%).**

c) Fourteen or more of the 20 available spaces will be filled for each of the cooking series. **See below chart for those who signed up vs those who attended each of the four sessions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># who registered</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># who attended</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Ancestry.com will have at least 175 total uses from September 2015 to June 2016. **There were 2,307 total uses for Ancestry Library Edition during the grant period.**
GenealogyBank will have at least 210 total uses from September 2015 to June 2016. There were 359 total uses of GenealogyBank during the grant period.

Five percent of the participants will be those who have not attended a library program in the last two years. Twenty-six percent of those who attended the first cooking class had not attended a library program in the previous two years. Fifty-five percent of those who attended the first genealogy session had not attended a library program here in the past two years.

OUTCOMES: The outcome survey used the following questions and Likert scale with the results as outlined below (Strongly Agree - SA; Agree - A; Neither Agree or Disagree - N; Disagree - D; Strongly Disagree - SD). The Genealogy series survey was administered on March 5, 2016 (the sixth session of series). The Healthy Cooking survey was administered at the end of each class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
<th>Cooking #1</th>
<th>Cooking #2</th>
<th>Cooking #3</th>
<th>Cooking #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learned something new that is helpful.</td>
<td>80% - SA</td>
<td>59% - SA</td>
<td>38% - SA</td>
<td>62% - SA</td>
<td>45% - SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% - A</td>
<td>35% - A</td>
<td>62% - A</td>
<td>38% - A</td>
<td>50% - A</td>
<td>5% - N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more comfortable about what I just learned.</td>
<td>60% - SA</td>
<td>41% - SA</td>
<td>33% - SA</td>
<td>62% - SA</td>
<td>36% - SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% - A</td>
<td>53% - A</td>
<td>62% - A</td>
<td>38% - A</td>
<td>55% - A</td>
<td>9% - N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to apply what I just learned.</td>
<td>70% - SA</td>
<td>47% - SA</td>
<td>33% - SA</td>
<td>38% - SA</td>
<td>41% - SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% - A</td>
<td>47% - A</td>
<td>67% - A</td>
<td>62% - A</td>
<td>54% - A</td>
<td>5% - N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more aware of applicable resources and services provided by the library.</td>
<td>70% - SA</td>
<td>24% - SA</td>
<td>48% - SA</td>
<td>38% - SA</td>
<td>41% - SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% - A</td>
<td>59% - A</td>
<td>50% - A</td>
<td>54% - A</td>
<td>54% - A</td>
<td>5% - N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% - N</td>
<td>2% - N</td>
<td>8% - N</td>
<td>8% - N</td>
<td>5% - N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every Child Read to Read (ECRR) pre-literacy grants have several corresponding programs funded from 2013 to 2015. In 2013, there were four programs supported in Bridgeport, Norwich, Berlin-Beck and Durham. In at least two cases, the general need for early literacy was greatly important to the community. Having low rates of school readiness for Kindergarten, Norwich and Bridgeport were also addressing CSL’s objective to reach low-income or multilingual students and families. In 2015 in New London with a majority Spanish-speaking population, ECRR reached a similar low-income and multilingual target. ECRR-Bristol and ECR-East Hartford programs from 2014 were more standardized to reach all families.

Programming for older adults were more varied than pre-literacy programs. With the “7th oldest” population in the country and “9% more persons aged over 65 compared to the national average” Connecticut is serving a large portion of its patron and community base with these programs.13

---

Additionally, these grants are no more than $5,000 or $7,500, depending on the year, showing that CSL is able to leverage small dollar LSTA sub-grants to accomplish this goal.

Programming for older adults range from virtual guided tours of museums (Skype-a-Docent: Museum Tours) to cooking classes (Hall Happenings, Wisdom Beyond Years) to oral history collaborative projects (The Ellington Oral History Project) to community conversations (Senior Moments). Many of these opportunities catered to lifelong learning skills and interests via many modalities. Depending on the abilities of these seniors and retirees, programs were either designed to be in-person, virtual, or one-on-one.

In 2015, there were four programs that focused on youth specifically. The program at Bethel Public Library focused on creative writing and improving writing skills, and the program at Douglas Library of Hebron allowed teens to build a community garden and print new items using a 3D printer, contributing to the community service requirement of the school district. Programs were also held at East Lyme and James Blackstone Memorial Library. Another grant went to Ferguson Library for Services to Multilingual Populations in FY 2015.

**Objective 6: Help libraries amplify their services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty line by providing collections of supplemented children’s materials and audio and large print collections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LSTA Funds FFY 2013-FFY 2015</th>
<th>$904,655</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table 10. Library Service Centers/Supplementary Library Collections Expenditures**

**Objective Activities**

To directly address this objective, Connecticut State Library had two service centers in Willimantic and Middletown (mentioned above in Goal 1, objectives 3 and 4) to serve as outposts for circulating materials and resource centers for all Connecticut libraries. Having these two collections helped to supplement materials in circulation for special populations like disadvantaged children and families. As of June 2016, the Willimantic collection was closed and Middletown subsumed all of the materials and staff that worked at Willimantic.

The collection includes children’s and young adult books (fiction and nonfiction), graphic novels, puppets, story hour kits, book discussion sets, audiobooks on CD for all age levels, large print books, and professional development books for use by librarians. Most often, these materials are borrowed by small, rural libraries with modest budgets or limited shelving space who in turn lend the materials to their patrons. Librarians can either visit the Service Centers in person to select items, request them via the online catalog, or call Service Center support staff with special requests. Delivery services are provided through deliverIT. Support staff handles all circulation tasks, reshelving, and weeding under the management of Service Center supervisors.
New materials are selected and cataloged by subject experts, including the State Library’s Children’s Consultant, Children’s/Young Adult Services Consultant, and Professional Development Coordinator. Support staff process and shelve the new materials.

Before its closure, the Willimantic Library Service Center specialized in children’s and young adult collections that are particularly helpful for preK-5 librarians who are building reading readiness and maintaining literacy skills with their students. This collection supported ECRR programs discussed above in objective 5. Programming resources promote literacy development in children who live in predominantly rural, impoverished, and/or distressed communities. In addition, the materials available through the Willimantic collection support school library media centers by supplementing summer reading lists and providing multiple copies of titles on high school reading lists. This system was considered vital by the Connecticut librarians that answered the LSTA evaluation survey.

Because the demand for alternate format materials is high and their high cost strains the budgets of local libraries, the Service Centers provide large print materials and unabridged audio collections on CD. These alternate formats are especially useful to patrons who have difficulty using traditional print media.

This project served an estimated 27,328 people statewide in 2013, including people who attended meetings at the Service Centers (not counting attendance at Continuing Education workshops) and an estimate of 100 patrons at each of 264 borrowing libraries who used circulating materials from the Service Centers. Unfortunately, circulation statistics were not available for FFY 2013; circulation in FFY 2014 was 51,910 transactions and FFY 2015 was 33,513.

Objective 8: Develop and implement a program to assist libraries in developing the digital literacy skills of their patrons. See Goal 2, objective 5 and Goal 1, objective 3 above.

Objective 9: Encourage libraries to partner and collaborate locally, across towns, and/or regionally with each other and with community-based organizations and agencies.

- Established a program to incubate novel cooperative library partnerships.
- Track number of partnerships created 2013–2014.
- Annually highlight best practices and successful/model programs.

DLD has been aggressive in developing strategic partnerships in many different areas with local, state and national organizations. The goal is to make librarians aware of and provide resources and tools designed to help library users notably in economic development, health and financial literacy, and legal literacy among others. Through a combination of workshops and consultancy services, the agency is maximizing the return of its investment in the rich resources made available to libraries and communities in Connecticut.

Connecticut was also selected by the Aspen Institute to host the first state level dialogue on public libraries since they issued their ground breaking report—Rising to the Challenge: Re-Envisioning Public Libraries. The report highlights the state of continuous change of libraries as they respond to the changing needs of society and the communities they serve.
Another example of the type of work that is taking place with partnerships is captured in the pilot project, EXCITE Transformation for Libraries, held at the Middletown Library Service Center from October 2016–Spring 2017 with seven teams of librarians. In October 2016, the teams attended a three-day bootcamp where they learned the language, tools, and process for the project. This was followed by a gap where the teams started research within their communities to uncover insights, needs, and drivers with an interim coaching session by phone with the facilitator. In November 2016, the teams returned for a two-day session where they immersed themselves in sharing insights from research, fueling and transforming ideas to address community needs and turn these ideas into real initiatives for programs or services. Prototypes and storytelling completed the design cycle. Teams returned to their communities with their ideas and sought to gain stakeholder support, setup partnerships, and develop the final implementation of their projects. On January 31, 2017, the teams came back together to fine-tune the pitch of their project which they presented to a panel of judges February 1, 2017. The judges, representing libraries and businesses from within and outside the State of Connecticut, heard the libraries’ pitches and awarded them varying amounts of seed money (supplied by the Connecticut State Library and LSTA) to begin their projects. Projects will be completed by late Spring. Building upon this successful pilot will inform future projects.

The evaluation data from this pilot are indicating very high levels of success and the participants’ comments capture the excitement in response to how they are changed by the program:

“A real paradigm shift in thinking about how to find out from patrons what they want and would mean the most for them.”

“Better appreciate the importance of first looking at our community, not what it is just a great program.”

“Further convinced in the value of seeking input during all steps of the planning and development process.”

“I’m more confident in talking with groups and drawing out their thoughts.”

“More confident in interacting with community.”

Another initiative that supports this line of work is the EDGE Initiative—a statewide subscription to this tool allows libraries to self-assess and share their findings as a community.

Connecticut has also invested in a more user friendly interface for dealing with the traditional annual library statistics. They have made much information available through appealing Tableau dashboards that can serve as a basis for further exploration and growth.

Last but not least, many of the sub-grants encouraged libraries to reach out to their communities and engage with community-based organizations and agencies.
GOAL 2 CONCLUSION

In conclusion the evaluators find three compelling reasons to conclude that Goal 2 has been ACHIEVED:

1. CSL continues to consolidate and strengthen service provision; the closing of the Willimantic location allows the agency to build on its strengths during complex and challenging times. Introducing online services like Evanced Solutions Summer Reader software, for example, allowed continuing participation in the face of the closing of the Willimantic facility which was located in an impoverished area.

2. CSL is rising to the challenge – a challenge that will continue given the state’s economy; the efforts to engage the community through the ASPEN initiative, EDGE, and other assessment tools allows the agency to build on the strengths of the community of libraries it serves.

3. CSL is innovating while consolidating; the establishment of a new interface for collecting data and the deployment of Tableau indicate how during complex and challenging times the capacity to innovate is there due to the skills and attitudes staff bring to service delivery.

In summary, the evaluators found evidence that Goal 2 is ACHIEVED even in the face of adversity and re-adjustment. As a result, this goal is ACHIEVED. CSL is constantly reinventing itself especially in the area of capacity building in the face of complex and challenging circumstances.

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

Connecticut projects addressed national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and corresponding intents. It is impressive to see the breadth of reach on the Measuring Success focal areas and intents in Appendix I.

A-3. Did any of the following groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? (Yes/No) (Table in Word file) For the purposes of this question, a substantial focus would represent at least ten percent of the total amount of resources committed by the overall plan across multiple years. For those who answer Yes to any of the above groups, please discuss to what extent each group was reached.

CSL is also serving an impressive array of target populations identified by IMLS (see Appendix J). CSL commits LSTA resources in several areas, but concentrates funding on three: librarians, persons with disabilities and limited functional literacy as well as summer reading programs for children and youth.

Three of these target populations meet the 10% threshold of substantial contribution. They are: Library Workforce, Individuals with Disabilities and Individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills. At 30% of all LSTA funding, LBPH represents the highest investment serving both those with disabilities and limited functional literacy. Second to that, is professional development of the Connecticut library workforce at 14.6% of all LSTA funding. Funding Library Service Centers ranks at 15% of LSTA support, however, this resource services both children, youth, librarians and all users of the
Connecticut library system so we do not indicate this category has being a targeted population that achieved the threshold of 10% investment.

CONCLUSION

The changes DLD implemented since the beginning of this LSTA cycle have been remarkable and proceed in the right direction ranging from the closing of a facility, to commissioning special studies on the delivery system to improve its efficiency, to offering tools and opportunities for engagement. Every step of the way, DLD’s decisions are focused towards strengthening libraries during times of rapid change so our communities get stronger. In the foreword to the report entitled Connecticut Rising to the Challenge: A Report of the Connecticut Dialogue on Public Libraries Kendall F. Wiggin captures the strength of the DLD’s commitment as follows:


How successfully libraries will rise to the challenge will depend to a large degree on how successfully communities, policy makers and libraries engage in re-envisioning the library.

This Dialogue is an opportunity for libraries to engage policymakers, business leaders and civic partners from across the state to explore new proposals, partnerships and initiatives to leverage the great assets our state has in its State Library and its public libraries.”

DLD has charted a path forward that includes focusing on an asset-based framework that defines the essential elements of library service and established library standards, developing data and narratives around outcomes, and telling the Connecticut library story among other things.15

B. Process Questions

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

New and old SPR data is used annually by the State Librarian and other SLAA staff. Elements are included in a variety of the agency’s reports to the public, to the library community, and to state government. Data from the SPR is also used to establish benchmarks that are reviewed on a periodic basis to assess progress toward the goals stated in the LSTA 2013 – 2017 Five-Year Plan especially in the face of staff changes and budget cuts and new demands emerging especially in relation to the resource sharing and ILL functions. SPR data has also been shared with specific outside evaluators, such as QualityMetrics, LLC, for this assessment, in their roles in evaluating specific projects.


15 Ibid, 9.
B-2. Specify any changes you made to the Five-Year Plan, and why this occurred.

Connecticut’s Five-Year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017 has not been amended. While some specific activities mentioned in the Plan were discontinued and others were added, these changes were well within the intent of the plan.

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

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

C. Methodology Questions

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

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation of the SLAA implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, the agency joined COSLINE and issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on July 1, 2016 to solicit proposals to conduct a “Library Services and Technology Act Evaluation.” Proposals were due July 18, 2016.

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

QualityMetrics, Library Consultants has in depth evaluation experience and demonstrated professional competency. Dr. Martha Kyrillidou of QualityMetrics has extensive experience in deploying mixed methods research methods for library evaluation. She has participated in developing many well-known protocols for value and outcomes assessment for libraries. She has deep experience in library evaluation over her 22 years of service at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), has taught Research Methods, Assessment, and Evaluation courses at the University of Maryland and at Kent State University and has extensive practical experience in mixed methods, evaluation and outcomes assessment. Martha is a current member of the Library Statistics Working Group (LSWG), chair of the NISO Z39.7 standard, and mentoring the next generation of public library staff and evaluators. Co-principal consultant, Bill Wilson of QualityMetrics has implemented evaluation studies for three previous cycles of LSTA evaluations starting in 2002. Mr. Wilson is experienced in both quantitative and qualitative methods and has participated in 28 previous five-year LSTA Grants to States evaluations. Lesley Langa
C-2. **Describe the types of statistical and qualitative methods (including administrative records) used in conducting the Five-Year Evaluation.**

QualityMetrics, Library Consultants deployed a mixed methods protocol for data collection that is multi-faceted and rigorous. After conducting an initial telephone conference call with representatives of the Connecticut State Library, Bill Wilson and Martha Kyrillidou visited Connecticut. Kyrillidou held interviews with staff at the State Library in Hartford, CT, on September 27, 2016. The next day she joined Bill Wilson at the Middletown District Center where they interviewed the agency staff working there. In person interviews were held with the State Librarian and with key staff engaged in LSTA and specific projects carried out under the LSTA Five-Year Plan. A total of three focus groups were conducted, two in person at the Middletown facility on 11/1 and 11/2 each, and a virtual focus group held on 11/28 via a gotomeeting session. The site visits, focus groups and interviews provided qualitative evidence and context.

The State Program Reports (SPRs) were reviewed in detail and additional reports, documentation, fliers, newspaper articles, and social media feeds were consulted selectively as corroborating evidence. A web-based survey conducted December 5-23, 2016 provided additional quantitative and qualitative information. The survey was reviewed for representativeness to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additional corroborative evidence from comments collected in the survey served to triangulate the evidence gathered.

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

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

SLAA staff recommended and recruited participants for focus groups. Three focus groups took place. Librarians from public libraries were engaged through a web-based survey.

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

The Connecticut State Library will share the findings of the evaluation with a variety of partner agencies in Connecticut (governmental, other public, and non-profit) and with the larger public by alerting the libraries in Connecticut of the availability of the evaluation report. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website. The report will also inform the formulation of the five-year plan for 2018-2022.
Appendix A: List of Acronyms

ACLPD
Advisory Council for Library Planning and Development – Advisory Council for the Connecticut state Library’s Division of Library Development

ARL
Association of Research Libraries - ARL is a nonprofit organization of 126 research libraries at comprehensive, research-extensive institutions in the US and Canada that share similar research missions, aspirations, and achievements. http://www.arl.org/

C-Car
ConnectiCar the statewide delivery system; renamed deliverIT CT

CDL
Connecticut Digital Library

CLA
Connecticut Library Association - Connecticut's professional organization of over 1,000 librarians, library staff, friends, and trustees working together: to improve library service to Connecticut, to advance the interests of librarians, library staff, and librarianship, and to increase public awareness of libraries and library services. www.ctlibraryassociation.org/

CLC
Connecticut Library Consortium - The Connecticut Library Consortium is a statewide membership collaborative serving all types of Connecticut libraries by initiating and facilitating cost-effective services, creating and supporting educational and professional development, and helping libraries to strengthen their ability to serve their users. www.ctlibrarians.org/

Connecticar C-Car – The statewide delivery system; renamed deliverIT CT

Connecticard Statewide library card

iCONN
Statewide suite of databases and other specialized information resources
www.researchitct.org

ILL
Interlibrary loan
IMLS
Institute of Museum and Library Services http://www.imls.gov

LBPH

LSTA
Library Services and Technology Act - LSTA is part of the Museum and Library Services Act, which created the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and established federal programs to help libraries and museums serve the public. The LSTA sets out three overall purposes:
• Promote improvements in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States.
• Facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; and
• Encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public.
The LSTA Grants to States program is a federal-state partnership. The Program provides funds using a population-based formula, described in the LSTA, to each state and the territories through State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs).

LSTAC
Library Services and Technology Act Coordinator

NNLM
National Network of Libraries of Medicine

ReQuest
 Connecticut statewide library catalog; renamed findit CT. http://finditct.org/
Appendix B: List of people participating in focus groups and interviews

SITE VISIT INTERVIEWS

In person Interviews at the State Library Administrative Agency:

Kendall Wiggin, State Librarian
Dawn La Valle, Director, Division of Library Development

Middletown Location:
Maria Bernier, LSTA Coordinator
Linda Williams, YA/Childrens Consultant
Gordon Reddick, Director, LBPH
Gail Hurley, Consultant, Resource Sharing, Consulting, Digital Newspaper project
Steve Cauffman, MLSC Supervisor, Consultant, ILL Coordinator, Resource Sharing
Tom Newman, Data Coordination, Consultant

FOCUS GROUPS / INTERVIEWS:

11/1/16 - Middletown #1 – In person
Rebecca Scotka, East Lyme Public Library

11/2/16 - Middletown #2- In person
Elizabeth Thornton, Bentley Memorial Library

11/28/16 - Virtual – General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Library/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alice Knapp</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>The Ferguson Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Susan Phillips</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>Hall Memorial Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elizabeth Joseph</td>
<td>Coordinator, Information &amp; Adult Services</td>
<td>Ferguson Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Karen Jensen</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>James Blackstone Memorial Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brook Berry</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>Wethersfield Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Survey Instrument

Connecticut LSTA Survey

WELCOME

Hello!

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

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

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

LIBRARY DESCRIPTION
1) Please provide the name of your library.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

2) Please describe the type of Library you represent.

( ) Public library

( ) School library

( ) Academic library

( ) Special library

( ) Other (Please specify below.)

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

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

LIBRARY AND RESPONDENT DESCRIPTION

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

_________________________________________________________________

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

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

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

_________________________________________________

5) Please indicate the population served by the library you represent.
( ) Fewer than 250
( ) 250 - 499
( ) 500 - 999
( ) 1,000 - 1999
( ) 2,000 - 4999
( ) 5,000 - 9,999
( ) 10,000 - 24,999
( ) 25,000 - 49,999
( ) 50,000 - 99,999
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

---

SERVICE MODULE INTRODUCTION

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

- Summer Reading Program Support
- Continuing Education/ Staff Development
- Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped
- LSTA Sub-Grants

---

SUMMER READING PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

This portion of the survey is for libraries that offered summer reading programs in 2016.
8) Did your library offer a summer reading program in 2016?

( ) Yes
( ) No

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - NONE

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

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

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

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Only self-help guides, reading lists, and other resources provided without staff led events or programs</th>
<th>Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or programs</th>
<th>No summer reading program offered for this group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school children</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-aged children</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Please indicate your degree of awareness with each of the following resources/initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Very unaware</th>
<th>2 - Unaware</th>
<th>3 - Neither unaware</th>
<th>4 - Aware</th>
<th>5 - Very aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nor aware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL participates in the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of CSLP manual and other resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanced Wandoo Reader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

( ) Yes

( ) No

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

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

( ) 1 - Strongly disagree

( ) 2 - Disagree

( ) 3 - Neither agree nor disagree

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

____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________

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

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

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

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

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

18) Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP) Program Manual
( ) 1 - Poor
( ) 2 - Fair
( ) 3 - Good
( ) 4 - Excellent
( ) Not aware of this resource
( ) Did not use this resource

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

19) Providing the names of summer reading resource presenters/performers/educators.
( ) 1 - Poor
( ) 2 - Fair
( ) 3 - Good
( ) 4 - Excellent
( ) Not aware of this resource
( ) Did not use this resource

20) General summer reading program advice and consultation
( ) 1 - Poor
( ) 2 - Fair
( ) 3 - Good
( ) 4 - Excellent
( ) Not aware of this resource
( ) Did not use this resource

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

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

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

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

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

_________________________________________________________________________
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CONTINUING EDUCATION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Totally unaware</th>
<th>2 - Somewhat aware</th>
<th>3 - Very aware</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's/ youth services training and education</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen/ young adult services training and education</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/ Information services training and education</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology training and education</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning training and education</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee training and education</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement training and education</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management training and education</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have personally participated</th>
<th>Other staff members from my library have participated</th>
<th>Neither I nor any of the other staff at my library have participated</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's/ youth services training and education</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>1 - Completely dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen/ young adult services training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/ Information services training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management training and education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26) Please rate each of the following continuing education opportunities offered by the Connecticut State Library:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and Education Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's/ youth services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen/ young adult services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/ Information services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27) If you have any additional feedback for the Connecticut State Library regarding its support for continuing education and staff development, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.
LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The Connecticut State Library (CSL) provides a variety of services to residents who are unable to read standard print due to a visual, physical, or organic reading disability and for institutions which serve these eligible individuals (schools, hospitals, care facilities, etc.).

The Connecticut State Library has invested LSTA dollars in a range of services and resources in services to individuals with special needs through the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. For each of the services described below, please indicate the degree to which you are aware of the services made available through the National Library Service (NLS), LSTA funds, and the Connecticut State Library.

28) NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE (NLS): That All May Read
The Connecticut State Library 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Unaware of the program</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 - Moderately aware of the program</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Very aware of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Library Service Talking Books Program</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29) **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 that are sent through the mail to eligible readers. How aware are you of this service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Unaware of this service</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 - Moderately aware of this service</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Very aware of this service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking Books Collection</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30) **BARD: Braille and Audio Reading Download**

This free service, offered by the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Unaware of this service</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 - Moderately aware of this service</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Very aware of this service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARD: Braille and Audio Reading Download service</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31) **Large Print Materials**

The Connecticut State 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?
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

32) 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.

(can mark one answer)

( ) 1 - Strongly disagree

( ) 2 - Disagree

( ) 3 - Neither agree nor disagree

( ) 4 - Agree

( ) 5 - Strongly agree

33) 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.)

(can mark one answer)

( ) 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.)

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

____________________________________________
35) If the Talking Books program provided through the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped was no longer available through the Connecticut State Library, how likely is it that your library would be able to fund the cost of its services through your library's budget?

( ) 1 - Extremely unlikely
( ) 2 - Unlikely
( ) 3 - Neutral or unsure
( ) 4 - Likely
( ) 5 - Extremely likely

36) If you have any additional feedback for the Connecticut State Library regarding its support for the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

LSTA SUB-GRANTS

The Connecticut State Library has offered competitive sub-grants to libraries when funding has been available. Sub-grants have enabled libraries to offer a variety of new and innovative services. We're interested in your input on the importance of competitive sub-grants.
37) Over the course of the last three years, the Connecticut State Library has offered sub-grants in several categories. Please check any category(ies) that represent(s) a sub-grant that the library you represent has received.

[ ] Every Child Ready to Read

[ ] Programs for Older Adults

[ ] Programs for Multilingual Populations

[ ] Programs for People with Disabilities

[ ] Community Needs Assessment

[ ] Other (Please Specify below.)

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

________________________________________________________________________

39) Please indicate the importance of each of the following grant categories to your library regardless of whether or not you have received a grant in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Very unimportant</th>
<th>2 - Unimportant</th>
<th>3 - Neither unimportant nor important</th>
<th>4 - Important</th>
<th>5 - Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Older Adults</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Multilingual Populations</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40) Competitive sub-grants enable libraries to try new and innovative programs. In most instances, sub-grants are awarded with the hope that demonstrating new and innovative services will ultimately result in the continuation of the program using local funding sources. Please indicate your opinion of how likely it would be that a highly successful demonstration grant to your library would result in ongoing local funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential that a highly successful demonstration grant to your library would result in ongoing local funding.</th>
<th>1 - Highly unlikely</th>
<th>2 - Unlikely</th>
<th>3 - Uncertain</th>
<th>4 - Likely</th>
<th>5 - Highly likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41) Applying for, implementing, and reporting the results of competitive grants takes time and effort. In your opinion, how large a grant award is necessary to justify the time and effort required to apply for, implement, and report on a typical grant?

( ) less than $2,000

( ) $2,000 - $2,499
( ) $2,500 - $2,999
( ) $3,000 - $4,999
( ) $5,000 - $7,499
( ) $7,500 - $9,999
( ) $10,000 - $14,999
( ) $15,000 - $24,999
( ) $25,000 or more

42) If you have any additional feedback for the Connecticut State Library regarding competitive subgrants, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below. Please feel free to suggest areas in which you believe grant assistance would have the greatest impact. Note that LSTA funds cannot not be used for construction.

____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________

THANK YOU!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.
Appendix E: Focus Group and Interview Protocol

**General questions**

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

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

**Focus Group: Public Librarians**

1. Which LSTA programs have been most impactful for your library?
2. Are reporting expectations reasonable?
3. How important have LSTA sub-grants been in providing opportunities for innovation?
4. A major focus of IMLS has been on assessing outcomes. Have you been able to document outcomes from your LSTA projects?
5. What impact have LSTA-funded projects had for the residents of your library district?
6. Is it your experience that the State Library has made great efforts to help LSTA grant applicants and libraries be successful?
7. 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?
8. Finally, what would you like to say about LSTA?
Appendix F: Summary of Survey Results

Connecticut LSTA Web Survey Report

Seventy-five individuals responded to the LSTA evaluation web survey. They represented sixty-four different libraries. Sixty-seven (representing 91.8 percent of the total responses) were in public libraries. Two individuals were in academic libraries. Three “other” libraries were association libraries and a fourth was described as a private library, which was considered public. All eight Connecticut counties were represented.

Seventy-four (74.0) percent of the respondents identified themselves as library directors. Another nine (9.6) percent were managers/department heads and another eight (8.2) percent were reference/information services librarians.

The largest group, thirty (30.6) percent, were in communities of 10,000 to 24,999 population. Nine (9.7) percent served communities of 100,000 to 249,999. Thirteen (13.9) percent served communities of less than 5,000 population.

The largest group, twenty-eight (28.6) percent, had an annual operating budget of $1,000,000 to $1,999,999. One reported a budget of $10,000,000 or more and one reported a budget of $10,000 to $49,999.

The largest group, thirty-one (31.9) percent, had five to nine full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. One reported an FTE of 100 to 249; seven (representing 9.7 percent of the total respondents) had less than two FTE staff.

**Summer Reading Program**

Almost all, ninety-seven (97.3) percent offered a summer reading program in 2016. Of the two that did not offer the program, one said their population decreased in the summer and the other was an academic library near a public library that did offer the program.
Ninety-two (92.9) percent reported providing school-aged children summer reading programs with staff or other presenters leading events or programs. Ninety (90.0) percent provided this level of programming for pre-school children; seventy-three (73.9) percent provided this level for teens; and fifty (50.7) percent provided this level of programming for adults. Twenty-nine (29.9) percent provided no summer reading program for adults.

Eighty-seven (87.1) percent of the respondents were either aware or very aware that the Connecticut State Library (CSL) participates in the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP). Eighty-seven (87.2) percent were either aware or very aware of the availability of the CSLP manual and other resources. Sixty-five (65.7) percent were aware or very aware of the Evanced Wandoo Reader. Eighty-one (81.4) percent reported having used the CSLP materials provided by the CSL.

Eighty-five (85.7) percent of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that their staff have the skills and training they need to plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. (Forty-eight percent strongly agreed!) Eleven (11.5) percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

The next question asked what types of skills or training would help your staff plan and conduct an effective summer reading program. Of the thirty people who responded to this question, five said their staff did not need any additional skills or training. Three mentioned needing Wandoo Reader training and five cited program planning. “I feel like we struggle like most libraries with the time it takes to plan out the program effectively. We always seem to be planning till the last second, which is something we need to work on.” “effective programming and planning skills, computer skills for the online summer reading program.” (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)

Sixty-seven (67.2) percent either strongly agreed or agreed that their library receives all the support it needs from the CSL to carry out an effective summer reading program. Five (5.7) percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

When asked to describe the types of additional support they felt would help their library plan and conduct an effective summer reading program, twenty-eight commented. Five said they did not need anything. Three mentioned the delivery system: “lack of effective delivery system was crippling to our program by preventing the sharing of resources.” “We need the C-CAR. We need to be able to borrow
multiple copies of reading list books from other libraries. The kids want to read, and we must provide them the books they are anxious to read.” Four wanted funding support. “Funding/discounts for performers and activity supplies." (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)

Seventy-eight (78.2) percent said the CSLP Program Manual was either good or excellent. Of the nine respondents who said they did not use the Manual, four indicated they did their own programming and topics. “We have run successful summer reading programs for decades and have our own resources.”

Fifty-six (56.5) percent thought the service of providing names of summer reading resource presenters/performers/educators was good or excellent. Sixty-four (64.7) percent thought the general summer reading program advice and consultation was good or excellent. Twenty-two (22.1) percent said they did not use the program advice and consultation resource.

The survey listed six training opportunities and asked which would make the most difference in terms of improving the respondent’s summer reading program. (Respondents were encouraged to check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>% checking this training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training on public engagement</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on outreach</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with program evaluation</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with program planning/curriculum design</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/resource management training</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/cultural competency training</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training on public engagement received the highest percent of checks. Nine people checked the “other” category and offered suggestions. Three did not need help. The others offered a variety of ideas. (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)

Seven respondents shared additional feedback on the CSL support for summer reading. Three said they were “grateful.” “We are so grateful for the Collaborative Summer Reading Program. It makes it so
much easier for all of us. Please keep it!” (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)

Continuing Education Offerings supported by the CSL

The survey asked respondents how aware they are of eight continuing education offerings. The table below lists the offerings in descending order of very aware responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering</th>
<th>% Very Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology training and education</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Information services training and education</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen/young adult services training and education</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning training and education</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management training and education</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s/youth services training and education</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee training and education</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement training and education</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey participants were most aware of the technology training and education and least aware of the community engagement training and education. Trustee training and education received the highest percent of responses indicating people were totally unaware of it.

The next question asked respondents to indicate in which of the eight offerings they had personally participated, in which other staff members from their library had participated, and in which neither they nor any of their other staff had participated. The respondents (remember 74 percent of them were library directors) had personally participated in technology training and education (40.3 percent had participated), library management training and education (39.1 percent), community engagement training and education (34.3 percent), adult/information services training and education (25.7 percent), strategic planning training and education (23.9 percent) and trustee training and education (21.4 percent). They said other of their staff members had participated in children’s/youth services training and education (64.8 percent), teen/young adult services training and education (52.9 percent), technology training and education (44.4 percent) and adult/information services training and education (44.3 percent). The training opportunities with the highest percents of respondents who said neither they nor their staff had participated in were strategic planning training and education (55.2 percent), trustee training and education (45.7 percent), library management training and education (43.5 percent) and community engagement training and education (41.4 percent).
The survey then asked respondents to rate the eight continuing education opportunities in terms of their satisfaction with those opportunities. The table below lists the opportunities in descending order of the percents of respondents giving a rating of four or five where five indicates completely satisfied. The table also lists the percents of respondents who said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, the “neutral” rating. Only two of the opportunities received one each completely dissatisfied rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE opportunity</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology training and education</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s/youth services training and education</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen/young adult services training and education</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement training and education</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult/Information services training and education</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library management training and education</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning training and education</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee training and education</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirteen respondents added feedback for the CSL regarding its support for continuing education and staff development. Four of the comments pertained to location for the offerings. “Individual programs and workshops vary in quality and effectiveness, but overall the CSL provides a wide range of choices in training, usually at convenient times and locations and for very affordable costs (either free or nominal fees).” “It would be nice if the locations for training was more varied.” (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)

Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped

Fifty-six (56.9) 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 twenty-nine (29.2) percent were moderately aware of the program.

Their awareness was about the same for the Talking Books Collection. Fifty-seven (57.7) percent were aware (rated a four or a five) and another twenty-nine (29.6) percent were moderately aware.
Their awareness diminished when they were asked about BARD: Braille and Audio Reading Download. Only twenty-seven (27.8) percent rated their awareness as a four or a five. Thirty-eight (38.9) percent were unaware of this service.

The program respondents were most aware of was the large print materials collection of the CSL. Sixty-four (64.7) percent rated their awareness a four or a five. Nine (9.9) percent were unaware of this service.

Thirty-nine (39.4) 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. An almost equal percent (35.3 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. However, sixty-four (64.3) percent said the availability of the program broadened the range of services/resources their patrons can access. Of the six respondents who checked other for this question, one said “has no effect on my staff.” Another said “this program is offered and advertised periodically. Few have shown interest.” However, still another added, “We are not doing enough in this area. Staff needs to be made more aware of services.”

When asked how likely it is that your library would be able to fund the costs of the Talking Books program if it were no longer available through the CSL, fifty-four (54.1) percent said it was unlikely or extremely unlikely that their library would do so. Only nine (9.7) percent said it was likely or extremely likely their library would fund the cost.

Eight respondents provided additional feedback on the CSL support for the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. (Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.) One said, “we already offer library materials in our collection for persons with vision acuity difficulties. This service could be eliminated via the CT State Library.” Another said, “The library offers many Books on Tape and Playaway books, which are heavily used. Titles are constantly being added to the collection. We are unaware if any are used by blind or physically handicapped patrons.” “It seems to me that this is a core CSL service. If it were to go away I don’t know how we could provide comparable service.” “This is a much needed and valuable service. One of the most needed and widely applicable services the state provides. Recent relocations of collections has made this harder to use. It would be better to invest in this, making the collections more accessible, not take them away.”

**Sub-Grants**

66
Survey respondents were asked to indicate any category(ies) of sub-grants that their library had received in the last three years. Twenty-six of the respondents had received a sub-grant in the past three years. Seven (representing 24.1 percent of those answering the question) said they had received an Every Child Ready to Read grant. Five had received a grant for Programs for Older Adults and five had received a grant for Programs for Multilingual Populations. Four had received a grant for a community needs assessment. Over half (fifteen respondents or 51.7 percent) checked the “other” box and shared information on their grant. Six had not received a grant; two had received grants for the Programs for Teens; two said Programs for Young Adults. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to this question.)*

Survey participants were asked to indicate the importance of each of five grant categories regardless of whether their library had received a grant in the past. The table below lists the grant categories in descending order of the percents of respondents who said the category was either important or very important. *(The % Neutral reflects the percent who said the grant category was neither unimportant nor important.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Important</th>
<th>% Neutral</th>
<th>% Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Older Adults</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Needs Assessment</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Multilingual Populations</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programs for older adults category was rated the most important and the programs for multilingual populations received the highest percent of very unimportant and unimportant checks.

The next question in the survey asked participants to indicate their opinion of how likely it would be that a highly successful demonstration grant to your library would result in ongoing local funding. Less than half of the sixty-nine participants answering this question (47.8 percent) said it was either likely or highly likely that a highly successful demonstration grant to their library would result in ongoing local funding. Forty-two (42.0) percent were uncertain and ten (10.1) percent said it was highly unlikely or unlikely the result would be ongoing local funding.

Respondents were asked how large a grant award is necessary to justify the time and effort required to apply for, implement, and report on a typical grant? Thirty (30.0) percent said the award would need to
be in the $5,000 to $7,499 range. Eighteen (18.5) percent said it would need to be $2,500 or less. Ten (10.0) percent said it would need to be $15,000 or more.

The final question asked respondents to share any additional feedback concerning the competitive sub-grants and to suggest areas in which grant assistance would have the greatest impact. Four respondents offered suggestions. Two were discouraged and two offered suggestions. “The fact that we haven’t applied for any of the grants does not mean that we are not interested or that we don’t think they are important. The Community needs assessment for example is a very valuable tool.” “We appreciate grant opportunities to help with delivery of social services to urban disenfranchised and underserved populations. We would welcome programs to attract and retain a diverse professional library staff.”
### Appendix G: LSTA Funding Allotments 2013-2015 Mapped to Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSTA Administrative Costs</td>
<td>78,992</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>81,375</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218,867</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Delivery System (deliverIT CT)</td>
<td>294,099</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>307,578</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>400,808</td>
<td>19.92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,002,485</td>
<td>16.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting and DLD Administration</td>
<td>177,708</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>209,089</td>
<td>10.28%</td>
<td>399,576</td>
<td>19.86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>786,373</td>
<td>13.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCONN/reQuest</td>
<td>342,153</td>
<td>17.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>342,153</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>605,796</td>
<td>30.68%</td>
<td>644,206</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
<td>570,547</td>
<td>28.35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,820,549</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sharing of Supplementary Library Collections</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>348,500</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
<td>207,049</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>555,549</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Service Centers</td>
<td>349,106</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>349,106</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>45,566</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>57,455</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>48,994</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152,015</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Reading</td>
<td>24,458</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>26,408</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>26,624</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77,490</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Child to Read</td>
<td>11,925</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,912</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Citizenship and Beyond - Ferguson</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Programming - Bethel Public Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7,409</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>7,409</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Makers Project - East Lyme Public Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Labs - James Blackstone Memorial Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom Beyond Years - Beacon Falls Public Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Moments - Darien</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forever Young</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Story Writers - Ferguson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Elington Oral History Project - Hall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Happenings</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life After 55</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype-a-Docent: Museum Tours</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Lifelong Learners</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacy for Older Adults - Rockville</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing an Appreciation for the Library - Douglas Library</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration @ Your Library - Seymour Public Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPads for OLLIs</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoirs and Educational Programs for Seniors</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Magic</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Boomers and Late Bloomers: iPad</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,974,810</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,034,387</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,012,231</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,021,428</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>813,960</td>
<td>41.22%</td>
<td>855,456</td>
<td>42.05%</td>
<td>1,054,426</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>2,723,842</td>
<td>45.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>1,081,858</td>
<td>54.78%</td>
<td>1,097,556</td>
<td>53.95%</td>
<td>899,305</td>
<td>44.69%</td>
<td>3,078,719</td>
<td>51.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSTA Funds Expended</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Grant Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFY13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Peck OA</td>
<td>$ 2,904.00</td>
<td>$ 1,732.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin-Peck ECRR</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 767.50</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Library</td>
<td>$ 4,466.00</td>
<td>$ 1,677.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Public Library</td>
<td>$ 2,925.11</td>
<td>$ 1,190.00</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Public Library</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,122.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Public Library</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 776.42</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Public Library</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,791.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Memorial</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,250.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Library</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,280.00</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosser Public Library</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,300.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville Public Library</td>
<td>$ 4,968.53</td>
<td>$ 1,268.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Library Association</td>
<td>$ 4,998.44</td>
<td>$ 9,560.44</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut Waterbury Campus Library</td>
<td>$ 4,670.00</td>
<td>$ 2,081.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartford Public Library</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,392.23</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 56,932.08</td>
<td>$ 31,187.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFY14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Public Library</td>
<td>$ 2,999.49</td>
<td>$ 774.00</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien Library</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hartford Public Library</td>
<td>$ 2,987.01</td>
<td>$ 950.00</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Library</td>
<td>$ 4,999.61</td>
<td>$ 1,800.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Memorial Library</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,399.00</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 20,986.11</td>
<td>$ 9,923.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFY15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Falls Public Library, Town of Beacon Falls</td>
<td>$ 5,241.00</td>
<td>$ 3,005.06</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Public Library, Town of Bethel</td>
<td>$ 7,409.00</td>
<td>$ 7,455.98</td>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Library, Town of Hebron</td>
<td>$ 4,941.00</td>
<td>$ 4,117.85</td>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lyme Public Library</td>
<td>$ 6,632.00</td>
<td>$ 7,325.10</td>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson Library</td>
<td>$ 7,474.51</td>
<td>$ 8,350.00</td>
<td>Multilingual Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blackstone Memorial Library</td>
<td>$ 6,458.00</td>
<td>$ 2,457.00</td>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library of New London</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,239.11</td>
<td>Every Child Ready to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour Public Library, Town of Seymour</td>
<td>$ 4,935.00</td>
<td>$ 2,370.75</td>
<td>Older Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 46,090.51</td>
<td>$ 38,320.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I: Measuring Success Focal Areas for Connecticut

### Lifelong Learning
- Improve users’ formal education: Y, Y, Y
- Improve users’ general knowledge and skills: Y

### Information Access
- Improve users’ ability to discover information resources: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y
- Improve users’ ability to obtain and/or use information resources: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y

### Institutional Capacity
- Improve the library’s staff: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y
- Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Improve library operations: Y, Y, Y, Y

### Economic & Employment Development
- Improve users’ ability to use resources and apply information for employment support: Y, Y
- Improve users’ ability to use and apply business resources: Y, Y

### Human Resources
- Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family or household finances: Y, Y, Y, Y, Y
- Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health & wellness: Y, Y, Y, Y

### Civic Engagement
- Improve users’ ability to participate in their community: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Improve users’ ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern: Y, Y, Y, Y
Appendix J: Target Populations Served for Connecticut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM/INITIATIVE</th>
<th>STATE GOAL</th>
<th>Library Workforce (current and future)</th>
<th>Individuals living below poverty line</th>
<th>Individuals who are unemployed/underemployed</th>
<th>Ethnic or Minority Populations</th>
<th>Individuals with Disabilities</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Children (age 0-5)</th>
<th>School-aged Youths (age 6-27)</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Statewide databases (researchIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Statewide Delivery System (deliveryIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Individualized Consulting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Integrated Library System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Continuing Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Individualized Consultancies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Summer Reading Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Programs for Underserved Groups in literacy, education, digital literacy, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Programs for Underserved Groups in rural or urban communities with supplemental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Workforce Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Digital Literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Partnerships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>