

The Texas State Library and Archives
Commission
Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)
Grants to States Implementation Evaluation
FFY 2013 – FFY 2017

Evaluators:

William Wilson

Martha Kyrillidou, Ph.D.

Ethel Himmel, Ph.D.



Date: March 12, 2017

Commissioned by The Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Mark Smith, Director and Librarian



TEXAS STATE LIBRARY
AND
ARCHIVES COMMISSION



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Evaluation Summary | 1 |
| Evaluation Report | 6 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Competitive Grant Framework | 7 |
| Retrospective Questions (Section A) | 10 |
| Goal 1 | 10 |
| Goal 2 | 14 |
| Goal 3 | 19 |
| Goal 4 | 23 |
| Goal 5 | 25 |
| Process Questions (Section B) | 27 |
| Methodology Questions (Section C) | 28 |
| Appendix A: Acronyms | A-1 |
| Appendix B: Interviewees/Focus Group Participants | B-1 |
| Appendix C: Bibliography of Documents Reviewed | C-1 |
| Appendix D: Focus Group Questions | D-1 |
| Appendix E: Web-Survey Instrument | E-1 |
| Appendix F: Measuring Success Table | F-1 |
| Appendix G: Targeted Audience Table | G-1 |
| Appendix H: Expenditure Tables | H-1 |
| Appendix I: Web-Survey Report | I-1 |

Evaluation Summary

As the second most populous state in the nation, Texas receives the second largest Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Grants to States allotment. The LSTA Grants to States program will be referred to as LSTA in this report. The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) was responsible for the expenditure of slightly more than \$30 million in LSTA funds over the three-year period (Federal Fiscal Year [FFY] 2013, FFY 2014, and FFY 2015) covered by this evaluation. However, with this large allotment comes significant challenges.

Texas is a large and diverse state. It is the home of some of the largest urban centers in the nation, sprawling suburban areas, and vast rural areas. Texas is ethnically and culturally diverse and has a rich and complicated history. Providing library and information services to nearly 28 million people spread over 268,581 square miles is a daunting task. Texas' libraries therefore serve populations ranging from huge public library systems with extensive branch operations in thriving metroplexes to tiny outposts in rural counties that are dealing with decades of economic decline. School and academic libraries exhibit extremes in terms of size and funding as well.

Texas' LSTA allotment translates into less than 36 cents per person per year. It is obvious that LSTA funds alone are inadequate to meet the library and information needs of all Texans. Meeting these needs requires, and will continue to require, partnerships that include local governments and school districts, public and private institutions of higher learning, and various governmental and non-profit agencies as well as funding and support from the State of Texas. TSLAC's challenge through the period covered by the evaluation has been to find ways to make 36 cents per person transformative in terms of library services; to leverage a relatively small amount of money to accomplish major results by strategically deploying funds and leveraging other public and private monies in support of library and information services. In the opinion of the evaluators, TSLAC has largely accomplished this overarching goal by effectively carrying out the specific goals that are contained in its five-year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017.

There are five goal statements in the ***Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five Year Plan for Texas 2013 – 2017***. They are:

GOAL 1

Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

GOAL 2

Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

GOAL 3

Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

GOAL 4

Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

GOAL 5

Texans will receive responsive library services

These goals have several notable characteristics. First and foremost, the goals focus on end users and the benefits they will receive, which invites an outcomes-based evaluation. Second, the goals are aspirational. While it is possible to assess progress and real achievements, fully attaining the goals demands ongoing attention and effort. They are the kind of goals that you may achieve today but must be “re-achieved” tomorrow.

A. Retrospective Questions

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

As part of the assessment process, the evaluators asked the TSLAC Director and LSTA Coordinator to offer their personal appraisals of progress toward each of the five goals included in TSLAC’s 2013-2017 Five-Year Plan. Because of the aforementioned aspirational nature of Texas’ goals and the fact that the state was only three years into the implementation of a five-year plan, it was unlikely that any of the goals would be completely or finally achieved. In recognition of this reality, TSLAC’s internal assessment was that while it felt that the state library agency had ACHIEVED three of its goals, the Director and LSTA Coordinator believed that they had only PARTLY ACHIEVED the other two of their five goals. While the evaluators share the viewpoint that fully achieving several of the goals will remain elusive and will require ongoing efforts, we also believe that activities carried out under one of the two goal areas TSLAC assessed as PARTLY ACHIEVED warrant a rating of ACHIEVED.

Table 1 on the following page offers a summary of both TSLAC’s internal assessments and the evaluator’s conclusions.

| Table 1 - TSLAC Self-Assessment and Evaluator's Assessment | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Goal | Grants to States Priorities Addressed | TSLAC Self-Assessment | Evaluators' Assessment |
| GOAL 1 Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs | <p>Establish or enhance electronic and other linkages and improved coordination among and between libraries and entities for the purpose of improving the quality of and access to library and information services</p> <p>Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks</p> | Achieved | Achieved |
| GOAL 2 Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully | <p>Establish or enhance electronic and other linkages and improved coordination among and between libraries and entities for the purpose of improving the quality of and access to library and information services</p> <p>Develop library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international collaborations and networks</p> | Achieved | Achieved |
| GOAL 3 Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning | <p>Target library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills</p> <p>Target library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 9902(2) of title 42) applicable to a family of the size involved</p> | Achieved | Achieved |
| GOAL 4 Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries | <p>Expand services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages in order to support such individuals' needs for education, lifelong learning, workforce development, and digital literacy skills</p> <p>Develop public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations</p> <p>Target library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills</p> | Partly Achieved | Partly Achieved |
| GOAL 5 Texans will receive responsive library services | <p>Provide training and professional development, including continuing education, to enhance the skills of the current library workforce and leadership, and advance the delivery of library and information services</p> | Partly Achieved | Achieved |

The full evaluation will show that the evaluators believe that TSLAC has been most successful in its accomplishments related to Goals 1 and 3, that it has, (and sufficient to qualify as ACHIEVED), met Goals 2 and 5, and that it has PARTLY ACHIEVED the goals set forth in its plan for Goal 4.

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 Texas has done an outstanding job of addressing the Measuring Success focal areas. In fact, in our considered opinion having worked with more than two dozen states on LSTA evaluations, Texas is among the leaders in aligning its LSTA activities with the focal areas. Many, if not most of its sub-grants address a variety of Lifelong Learning needs. Major statewide programs such as the TexShare databases and the Interlibrary Loan program address Information Access. Extensive staff development efforts keyed to specific areas such as youth services and technology, consulting services and the Edge Assessment process all address Institutional Capacity.

While some efforts have been made to address Economic & Employment Development needs (primarily through sub-grants), this is the weakest area of the Texas program in relationship to the focal areas. Many sub-grants that are deployed in areas throughout the state address a variety of Human Resource needs. The Health and Wellness area and Household Finance areas are not particularly robust; however, the focus on the family, especially through efforts related to the Family Place initiative is strong and growing in importance. Finally, TSLAC has made major inroads in supporting Community Engagement. Work with the Harwood Institute and components of the Edge Assessment process are examples of this.

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

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

While it is possible to cite individual programs and sub-grants that target ALL of target audiences, only the Library Workforce and Children (aged 0 – 5) meet the 10% of funding test imposed by IMLS. This is primarily because the two largest programs (TexShare and Interlibrary Loan reimbursement) account for almost sixty percent (59.96%) of LSTA expenditures. Texas' Talking Book program is primarily funded with state dollars (a real strength) although a little over four percent of LSTA funds have gone to this program. Roughly sixty-five percent (64.02%) of LSTA expenditures are accounted for with these three programs. Staff development and consulting efforts targeting the library workforce do meet the 10% test as do programs that target young children when Summer Reading and a variety of sub-grants are taken as a whole. Individual sub-grants target all of the other audiences; however, none approach the 10% threshold.

B. Process Questions

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

Data has primarily been used to inform decision-making on adjustments to LSTA initiatives and sub-grants.

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

No formal changes or amendments were made to the Plan.

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

SPR data has been shared directly with key staff internally and indirectly with the agency's commission, the library community, and state governmental entities.

C. Methodology Questions

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

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission's (TSLAC) implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, TSLAC issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and selected an evaluator based on a competitive process that used the IMLS criteria as a mechanism to inform their choice.

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

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

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

TSLAC staff were engaged through personal interviews

Stakeholders were engaged through focus groups, personal interviews, and a web-based survey.

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

TSLAC will share the findings of the evaluation with key advisory boards, the Commission, the state's libraries, and with the larger public. The evaluators will conduct a web presentation. The report will be publicly available on the agency website as well as on the IMLS website.

Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

As was mentioned above, sub-grants awarded during the three-year period were reported in the SPR different ways in different years due to changes in the SPR reporting system. In some years, large groupings of sub-grants were reported under a single project. For example, the project category “Impact Grants” was used to organize a large number of related grants for FFY 2013. In subsequent years, sub-grants were treated as separate, unique projects. In an effort to fairly evaluate TSLAC’s progress, the evaluators have taken some liberty in standardizing the reporting of sub-grants. The hybrid approach that was used reflects groupings of sub-grants undertaken to further each goal. Charts that appear in Appendix H (Texas LSTA Grants to States Expenditures – FFY 2013 – FFY 2015), present all the hybrid project categories used as well as expenditures in each of these categories for each of the three years. The first chart shows all expenditures for efforts undertaken in pursuit of all goals followed by a breakdown of project categories and expenditures for each of the five goals.

COMPETITIVE GRANT FRAMEWORK

TSLAC offers Texas libraries the opportunity to apply for competitive grants in five separate categories. They are:

- Impact Grants
- Library Cooperation Grants
- Special Project Grants
- Texas Reads Grants
- TexTreasures Grants

The descriptions that follow are adapted from the TSLAC Guidelines provide to potential grantees.

Impact Grants

The purpose of these grant is to encourage libraries to create or expand their programming and services in innovative ways that directly impact the lives of Texans. The grant provides seed funding for new library programming or services, or to improve existing programming and services that support best practices in the field. The programming must be new to the library's community, or improve existing services, and must be sustainable after the first year of grant funding with other or local resources. Libraries or library systems may be awarded more than one grant in a single grant cycle provided the applications are in different focus areas. Applicants will not be awarded a grant for the same, or nearly the same, project in two consecutive grant cycles.

Impact grants can fall under several different Goals. In the three-year period covered by the evaluation, a total of 80 Impact grants were awarded. Four of these grants fell under Goal 1, 25 grants fell under Goal 2, 40 fell under Goal 3, and 11 fell under Goal 4.

Library Cooperation Grants

This grant program provides funds for programs that establish or enhance cooperative services among libraries that are members of the TexShare Library Consortium or the Texas Library System, or these libraries and community organizations. Programs must emphasize improved services by the participating entities to their customers and be designed as a multi-year cooperative program.

Library Cooperation grants can fall under several different goals. In the three-year period covered by the evaluation, a total of 27 Library Cooperation grants were awarded. Three of these fell under Goal 1, 12 fell under Goal 2, nine fell under Goal 3, two fell under Goal 4, and one fell under Goal 5.

Special Project Grants

This grant program provides funds for programs that expand library services to all members of the library's community. It enables libraries to develop programs for populations with special needs. Programs involving collaboration are encouraged. Programs must emphasize improved services by the library to its customers.

Special Projects Grants can fall under several goals. In the three-year period covered by the evaluation, a total of 41 Special Projects grants were awarded. One of these fell under Goal 1, 11 fell under Goal 2, 25 fell under Goal 3, and four fell under Goal 4.

Texas Reads Grants

This grant program funds public library programs to promote reading and literacy within local communities. Programs may be targeted to the entire community or to a segment of the community. Programs involving collaboration with other community organizations are encouraged. The agency may designate specific funding priorities for each grant cycle in response to identified needs. If this occurs, staff will provide details of funding priorities and scoring implications to applicants and to the peer review panel.

Texas Reads Grants always fall under Goal 3 of the 2013 – 2017 Plan. A total of 30 Texas Reads grants were funded during the three-year period covered by the evaluation. However, grants awarded in STATE Fiscal Year 2015 (FFY 2014), were funded with revenues from library license plate sales rather than with LSTA funds.

TexTreasures Grants

TexTreasures is an annual competitive grant program designed to help libraries make their special collections more accessible to researchers across Texas and beyond. Projects may include such activities as cataloging, indexing, and digitizing materials.

Grants are offered in two separate sub categories. *TexTreasures Basic* will award grants of up to \$7,500 to small libraries (serving a population of up to 25,000) with little or no experience with digitization. Funding will support vendor contract services to increase access to collections with local or regional significance. The *TexTreasures Original* program will continue to support libraries seeking to provide access to special or unique collections of statewide interest and greater complexity. The maximum award is \$25,000 for applications from single institutions and \$35,000 for collaborative grant projects. Grants are not always offered in both categories in a given year.

TexTreasures Grants always fall under Goal 1. A total of 31 TexTreasures grants were funded during the three-year period covered by the evaluation.

Table 2 provides a summary of the breakdown of sub-grants awarded by state goal.

| Table 2 – Sub-grants awarded by State Goal area | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------|
| | FFY 2013 | FFY 2014 | FFY 2015 | TOTAL FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 |
| Goal 1 | 19 | 14 | 6 | 39 |
| Goal 2 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 48 |
| Goal 3 | 39 | 24* | 41 | 104 |
| Goal 4 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 17 |
| Goal 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL ALL GOALS | 70 | 68* | 71 | 209 |

*Includes nine Texas Reads grants not funded with LSTA dollars.

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

A. Retrospective Questions

There are five goal statements in the *Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five Year Plan for Texas 2013 – 2017*. They are:

GOAL 1 Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

GOAL 2 Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

GOAL 3 Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

GOAL 4 Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

GOAL 5 Texans will receive responsive library services

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

GOAL 1

Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs.

We have organized the hybrid project categories undertaken in support of Goal 1 into eight groups. Following are the titles of the grouping and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities in each of these areas.

Projects & Expenditures

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Digitization of Archival Materials | \$ 364,976.96 |
| Electronic Resource Access Tools | \$ 117,459.00 |
| Enhanced Access | \$ 556,759.43 |
| ILL: Promoting Interlibrary Resource Sharing | \$ 9,272,374.47 |
| TexShare Consortia and Databases | \$ 9,298,752.13 |
| Goal 1 Library Cooperation Grants | \$ 196,252.00 |
| Goal 1 Special Projects Grants | \$ 75,000.00 |
| Goal 1 TexTreasures Grants | \$ 551,757.33 |
| GOAL 1 TOTAL | \$ 20,433,331.32 |

Goal 1 expenditures represent 65.62% of Texas' total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Texas has allocated nearly two-thirds of its LSTA Grants to States funding to projects and activities in support of Goal 1. Furthermore, two projects within this goal area, the TexShare Consortia and Databases and ILL; Promoting Interlibrary Resource Sharing, account for almost sixty percent (59.96%) of total expenditures for the three-year period. Both programs directly address the goal of providing access to shared library resources to meet the learning and informational needs of Texans in different ways.

The breadth of e-resources offered through TexShare is impressive. Included are a wide array of traditional research databases from EBSCO and Gale plus several important utility products such as the EBSCO Do-It-Yourself databases, the LearningExpress Library test-preparation/career development tool, the HeritageQuest genealogy tool, and the language learning tool, Pronunciator. The databases are available to accredited public and academic libraries and their users.

Usage statistics are impressive and have been increasing in recent years. Table 3 presents statistics for State Fiscal Years 2014 – 2016, which roughly corresponds to the period covered by the LSTA evaluation.

| Measurement | State Fiscal Year 2014 | State Fiscal Year 2015 | State Fiscal Year 2016 | Percentage Increase FY 2014 - FY 2016 |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Sessions | 214,502,912 | 281,584,200 | 292,438,399 | 36.33% |
| Searches | 445,576,719 | 636,552,781 | 651,572,748 | 46.23% |
| Documents | 28,468,162 | 34,489,917 | 30,802,922 | 8.20% |

In the web survey that was conducted, librarians rated the TexShare database program as the highest impact service supported by LSTA. Table 4 compares the ratings given of a variety of LSTA –supported programs and services by 373 respondents to the web survey (See Appendix F.)

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| TexShare | 72.8% | 1.9% | 5.7% |
| Interlibrary Loan | 66.8% | 2.2% | 6.8% |
| Summer Reading | 51.6% | 1.4% | 20.5% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 43.9% | 1.4% | 14.9% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 27.6% | 3.8% | 35.0% |
| Special Projects Grants | 27.6% | 3.5% | 36.0% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 27.1% | 3.8% | 37.4% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 26.8% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| Impact Grants | 26.0% | 3.3% | 37.4% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 25.3% | 5.2% | 34.3% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 25.2% | 4.9% | 37.8% |
| Talking Book Program | 22.3% | 6.5% | 29.9% |

Academic librarians felt particularly strongly about the databases with 94.6% indicating that the program had a high impact in their libraries. While public librarians rated Interlibrary Loan support and Summer Reading program support at higher levels, the databases were nevertheless judged to be third in impact among the many programs with a rating of very high impact by almost half of the public library respondents (48.1%).

Comments from open-ended questions in the web survey and from focus groups underscore the importance of the program. Following are a few comments from librarians in the field:

“The TexShare Databases and Interlibrary Loan are crucial for our daily operations. We use these services daily to expand what we can offer to our patrons in our small, rural community.”

“TexShare programs are a model for resource sharing in that they level the playing field of information access for all our citizens. Without TexShare, many of our libraries (all types) would be unable to adequately support their programs and the information needs of our users.”

“From my perspective, financial savings through group purchasing power is the most positive statewide impact of the TexShare databases.”

One focus group participant from an academic health sciences library said,

“The TexShare databases are an unparalleled value.”

The statewide Interlibrary loan project facilitates statewide resource sharing in a number of important ways that enables even small libraries to offer their users access to materials in libraries throughout the state. The project provides subscription and access to OCLC’s Navigator ILL system, supports the growth and maintenance of a statewide union catalog for resource discovery and delivery, funds an annual lending reimbursement program to help offset out of pocket costs related to participation, and subsidizes libraries that subscribe to the statewide courier program. The end result is that many libraries that would not otherwise involve themselves in interlibrary lending participate to the great benefit of their local patrons.

The Interlibrary Loan program was singled out in the web survey as having a high impact on libraries. Representatives of both public and academic libraries indicated that the program had a high impact on their libraries and, even more importantly, on the people they serve. Two thirds (66%) of public librarians said that the program had a high impact while 59.8% of academic librarians offered the same rating.

One web survey respondent offered a ringing endorsement of the importance of the Interlibrary Loan program saying,

“Interlibrary loan services encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries, foster strategic partnerships with libraries, and serve individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services.”

Another said,

“Interlibrary loans keep our customers happy. We do not have a budget to buy books on demand. Interlibrary loan or our local system of libraries allows us to meet demand and strengthen customer satisfaction.”

During the three-year period of time covered by the evaluation, libraries participating in various aspects of the Interlibrary Loan project maintained or increased activity on several important measures.

| | FFY 2013 | FFY 2014 | FFY 2015 | Increase or Decrease FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|--|
| ILL transactions facilitated | 396,383 | 365,030 | 388,454 | -2.00% |
| Items loaned by participating libraries | 143,704 | 133,262 | 146,904 | 2.22% |
| Items transported via Texpress Courier | 287,385 | 280,783 | 302,154 | 5.14% |

Another component of activity under Goal 1 revolves around digitization. Support for preservation, digitization as well as access to historical document focus both inward (at the Texas State Library and Archives itself) and outward through the TexTreasures sub-grant program. Although both Digitization/Availability of TSLAC Collections and TexTreasures grants ranked in the lower tier in impact for public librarians (25.9% and 25.8% indicating high impact respectively), academic librarians placed these programs much higher in priority (third) on their list of the programs that make a difference to their users and ranked both programs (Digitization/Availability of TSLAC Collections and TexTreasures) a bit higher than public librarians (30.3% and 27.6% high impact respectively).

Not surprisingly, libraries that had received TexTreasures grants were far more enthusiastic. Furthermore, there was recognition that preservation and digitization are important in the big picture. Web survey and focus group participants offered the following assessments:

“LSTA funding and TSLAC funding have made it possible for libraries to save valuable historical collections and make them more widely available via digitization.”

and...

“Grants that allow wider access to information resources through digitization and discovery serve a wider purpose.”

Overall, TSLAC’s efforts related to Goal 1 have been highly consistent with the goals set forth in their 2013 – 2017 Plan and have accomplished both the higher level goal and most of the targets established for the programs. The evaluators conclude that TSLAC has ACHIEVED Goal 1.

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

Projects and activities under Goal 1 have very successfully addressed the Information Access focal area. A case can also be made that specific activities under this goal have had a positive impact in the Institutional Capacity area. Specifically, the availability of the TexShare databases and the facilitation of participation in interlibrary loan and resource sharing enable many libraries to far exceed the service levels that they would be able to achieve with local funding.

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

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

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

GOAL 2

Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

We have organized the hybrid project categories undertaken in support of Goal 2 into eight groups. Following are the titles of the grouping and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities in each of these areas.

Projects & Expenditures

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Community Engagement Initiatives | \$ 634,367.53 |
| Edge Implementation Program | \$ 851,118.38 |
| Mobile Apps | \$ 329,812.00 |
| Talking Book Program | \$ 1,256,436.65 |
| Technology Continuing Education | \$ 339,352.87 |
| Goal 2 Impact Grants | \$ 291,984.21 |
| Goal 2 Library Cooperation Grants | \$ 597,164.36 |
| Goal 2 Special Projects Grants | <u>\$ 411,680.64</u> |
| GOAL 2 TOTAL | \$ 4,711,916.64 |

Goal 2 expenditures represent 15.13% of Texas' total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 2 are varied. They range from support for the Talking Book Program to efforts to encourage civic engagement, as well as sub-grants that introduce the public to new technologies in ways that have a positive impact on their lives.

One observation from the evaluators based primarily on personal interviews and focus group input is that TSLAC has done an excellent job of integrating the “Community Engagement” models that have been promoted into nearly everything that they do. While community engagement is already an integral part of the design of the Edge Assessment process, the evaluators saw evidence that participants in Harwood Institute sessions had internalized and applied what they learned. We frequently encountered individuals who would use the phrase “turning outward” in contexts that were not directly related to the training. A review of competitive grants (not just those in Goal 2) showed evidence of building a broader community base and positioning libraries in a place that made them part of a larger community conversation.

One web survey participant highlighted the long-term benefits of community engagement in a particularly eloquent way –

“Community engagement is essential. A library’s success is based solely on its relationship with the community it serves. Yes, the resources it provides are integral to maintaining the patron’s experience and the library’s relevance in the community it serves, but ensuring that relevance and appropriate allocation of resources only happens when the library engages with its community. Community engagement is extremely cost effective.”

Another said,

“I went to a Harwood session in Arlington. I wish I could have put what I learned in a spray can to take back home to infect some at home who are unresponsive. The session gave me the confidence to wade into my community!”

Another highlighted the engagement aspect of the Edge process:

“Edge has encouraged us to reach out and foster strategic partnerships with community organizations and services. Through Edge, we identify weaknesses/areas needing improvement, and then reach out to partners to help run the new programs.”

The Houston Public Library’s Astrodome Memories project funded under Goal 2 is a fascinating project that illustrates this integration. The project represents a unique combination of history, digitization and community engagement that brought student, researchers, and the general community together in a fascinating way. While the Astrodome Memories project truly is distinctive, it serves as an example of the excellence of TSLAC’s competitive grant process. Concepts such as community engagement are built into some grant categories (Library Cooperation Grants) and a high level of authentic engagement with the community comes through in grant guidelines in other categories as well. Although Goal 2 centers on using technology to impact lives, TSLAC has taken the Measuring Success focal areas and targeted audiences into their approach to the sub-grant process. For example, the following comes from the guidelines for Impact Grants:

“2016 Focus Areas 1. Business/Workforce Development and Digital Literacy (Impact)

This focus area supports library programs designed to enhance Texas business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, and improve the technology skills of Texans so that they may use computers and online/electronic resources to enhance their economic and personal goals... Projects that include collaboration with local Workforce offices, chambers of commerce, community organizations, other libraries, or businesses will be given preference.”

TSLAC’s expectations of sub-grantees for both applying for and reporting on grants is closely tied to identifying outcomes. Furthermore, the SLAA applies the same rigor and expectations internally in assessing projects undertaken by TSLAC itself. In many programs, measures of satisfaction and action are tracked. For example, a web survey is used to assess pre and post participation knowledge of technology webinars.

Over \$ 1 million dollars was allocated to the TSLAC’s Talking Book Program (TBP) over the three-year period covered by the evaluation. Although this is a significant amount of money, it

represents only a small fraction of the total TBP budget of well over \$ 6 million in the same period of time. LSTA dollars allocated to the talking book program have been targeted for purposes consistent with Goal 2, primarily the replacement of TSLAC's legacy integrated library system in an effort to broaden online access to resources. Unfortunately, an attempt to develop a new ILS system internally did not initially succeed but, efforts continue to provide a state-of-the art tool to link TBP users with resources. LSTA funding has also been used to help support the recording of Texas-oriented content that would not otherwise be available through the National Library Service (NLS) program. This is also consistent with the purpose behind Goal 2.

A rather extensive Talking Book Program patron survey is conducted every other year that tracks user satisfaction with an array of services, as well as user experience with TSLAC TBP staff. Unlike some Library for the Blind programs, the Texas TBP has been maintaining its customer base while seeing significant growth in the use of the Braille and Audio Reading Download (BARD) program. The TBP has over 17,000 registered borrowers. TBP personnel believe that download services and newer technology have been helpful in recruiting younger patrons and retaining them in the program.

As part of the patron survey, one TBP user said,

“Fabulous service. I love the DTBM (Digital Talking Book Machine), especially sleep button!”

The Talking Book Program received the lowest “impact” rating of any (see Table 4) with only 22.3% of respondents saying that the program had high impact in their community. However, almost thirty percent (29.9%) of respondents said that they didn't know enough about the program to rate it. It is also interesting to note that the TBP fared better when librarians were asked to rate it's impact STATEWIDE as opposed to its impact on THEIR LIBRARY and the people they serve. One librarian commented that,

“The Texas population is getting older and need of the talking book program is growing.”

A very successful component of activities undertaken in support of Goal 2 relates to innovation. Sub-grants offered under Goal 2 frequently supply the innovative spark that creates long-term expansion of the service offerings of the libraries involved. Librarians representing libraries receiving sub-grants frequently shared instances in which LSTA grants provided the “proof-of-concept” that they needed to move into a new technology-based service. Furthermore, these grants often involved special target audiences. Examples include introducing seniors to new technologies, enabling participation in Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED) programs for economically challenged populations, and reaching teens through a mobile digital training lab.

One librarian participating in a focus group said,

“The grants are critical for advancements in technology. In 2009 my library had 3 computers. Through the various grants, we got it up to 15 and now we have a tech class and a 3 D printer.”

Other librarians participating in focus groups also cited unexpected side benefits of the sub-grant programs. One said,

“Getting the first grant gave me the confidence to try for another grant.”

The indication was that participation in the TSLAC/LSTA competitive grant process increased confidence and skills that in turn led to success in seeking and successfully attaining grants from other sources.

The assessment from the library community on the Edge program was somewhat mixed. Although some librarians reported that the process had enabled them to take the conversation about technology in libraries within their communities to a new level, some thought that the program simply underscored what they already knew. Frustration remains high in areas of the state that have poor access to broadband or that have limited (and often very costly) access.

Overall, the evaluators conclude that TSLAC has ACHIEVED most of what it set out to accomplish under Goal 2. While efforts must be ongoing, the projects supported under Goal 2 have made a substantive difference in the lives of many Texans.

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?

Activities undertaken in support of Goal 2 have addressed several of the Measuring Success focal areas. Perhaps the most important is the area of Community Engagement. As was already reported, the community engagement message and related concepts seem to have been internalized by many in the Texas library community including key TSLAC staff. A second focal area that has been directly impacted is Institutional Capacity. Community engagement training, the Edge assessment, technology training and sub-grants offered under Goal 2 have all served this end. Support for the Talking Book Program addresses Lifelong Learning and Information Access and individual sub-grants have been effective in addressing needs related to Economic & Employment Development and Human Resource needs although not to a large extent.

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

Applying the 10% of expenditure test results in the conclusion that none of the targeted

audiences received a substantial focus under Goal 2. However, it should be noted that activities undertaken had a significant impact on two groups. They are:

- Library Workforce
- Individuals with Disabilities

The impact on the Library Workforce was primarily through community engagement training and the impact on Individuals with Disabilities comes from support for the Talking Book Program.

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

GOAL 3

Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

We have organized the hybrid project categories undertaken in support of Goal 3 into six groups. Following are the titles of the grouping and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities in each of these areas.

Projects & Expenditures

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Summer Reading | \$ 183,675.40 |
| Goal 3 Impact Grants | \$ 219,707.35 |
| Goal 3 Library Cooperation Grants | \$ 557,899.18 |
| Goal 3 Special Projects Grants | \$ 1,118,395.65 |
| Goal 3 Texas Reads Grants | \$ 56,098.00 |
| Youth Services Continuing Education | \$ 594,211.39 |
| GOAL 3 TOTAL | \$ 2,729,986.97 |

Goal 3 expenditures represent 8.77% of Texas' total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Goal 3 activities focus primarily on public libraries in Texas communities and mostly their end-users. A majority of the funding allocated under Goal 3 took the form of support for sub-grants to individual libraries, and mostly, but not exclusively, public libraries. The range of grants offered was broad, encompassing, among other things, early literacy and STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) and STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math) initiatives.

There are strong indications that the return on this investment of 8.77% of the LSTA allotment over the three-year period covered by the evaluation was very high. One focus group participant described activities undertaken in support of Goal 3 as being “where the rubber meets the road.” The evaluators believe that this is an apt description. Because Goal 3 activities are arguably closer to the place where library staff and end-users interact, they are

more likely to generate anecdotes and are somewhat better suited to outcome-based evaluation.

Public librarians felt very strongly about the importance of initiatives designed to serve children. Several programs received attention and praise far out of proportion to the LSTA expenditures allocated to them. Most notable is support for the Summer Reading Program and support for the Family Place initiative. Although Family Place was not called out as a separate program in the web-survey question on the impact of services (Family Place expenditures are included in the Continuing Education and Consulting category), it is clear that services targeting children are extremely high in priority for Texas public libraries. Table 6 shows the relative impact ranking given to LSTA supported programs by public librarians (236 respondents) completing the web survey.

Table 6 – Impact of LSTA Support Programs – Public Librarians

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Interlibrary Loan | 66.0% | 6.4% | 3.0% |
| Summer Reading | 63.6% | 1.7% | 2.1% |
| TexShare | 48.1% | 8.5% | 3.0% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 45.1% | 3.4% | 4.3% |
| Special Projects Grants | 24.5% | 12.9% | 26.2% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 23.5% | 15.0% | 24.4% |
| Impact Grants | 23.1% | 14.1% | 27.4% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 21.7% | 8.1% | 23.4% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 20.6% | 15.9% | 28.3% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 17.6% | 15.5% | 36.5% |
| Talking Book Program | 12.4% | 24.4% | 22.6% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 12.0% | 20.5% | 19.7% |

As you can see, Summer Reading ranks just below Interlibrary Loan in impact and ahead of TexShare. To place this in perspective, Interlibrary Loan support and TexShare accounted for approximately \$18.5 million in LSTA expenditures over the three-year period compared to support of less than \$150,000 for Summer Reading. We do not introduce this fact in any way to diminish the importance of Interlibrary Loan and TexShare (which was established in the discussion under Goal 1). Rather, we point to the funding disparity to illustrate the great impact that strategic expenditures can have. One web survey respondent summed it up in the following way:

“I think Summer Reading offers the greatest value to the libraries’ end users. Keeping the kids (and teens and adults for libraries like ours that offer programs for all ages) engaged in reading helps them maintain, even improve their skills while school is not in session.

We believe that the extremely high ranking of the Summer Reading Program is due, at least in part, to the fact that nearly every community with a public library is getting a benefit. Grants awarded under the competitive grant categories often have a much greater impact for the library that received the grant, but does not directly benefit every community.

The Family Place program falls closer to the competitive grants in terms of impact. Using FFY 2015 LSTA dollars, 48 library staff from 24 libraries around Texas were given the opportunity to attend Family Place training at the Middle County Public Library on Long Island in New York State. Additional training on-site in Texas libraries as well as State-funded Family Place materials grants supplemented the LSTA-funded efforts.

A web survey respondent commented on the Family Place initiative in a way that also serves to illustrate the point that the community engagement viewpoint has spread among a variety of programs.

“I have found the provision of high quality training, such as the Harwood Institute and Family Place Libraries to be invaluable in helping me foster strategic partnerships in my community and with other libraries.”

Participants in the Family Place training credit the program with providing a new approach to youth services that engages families to a greater degree. However, a few indicated that the formal program was too rigid and staff intensive to implement in a library with limited staff and space. One person urged the development of a “Family-Place Lite” designed for small libraries that would incorporate the principles of the program on a smaller scale.

The impact of sub-grants is particularly significant in the progress that TSLAC has made in achieving this goal. Almost half (104 of 209 or 49.76%) of the sub-grants awarded by TSLAC during the three-year period covered by the evaluation addressed Goal 3. Results on the local level have often been transformative. One librarian said,

“Grants funded through TSLAC have allowed us to provide meaningful STEAM based programming to our community enhancing student learning, supporting job training and giving access to digital tools our budgets cannot provide to the community. This contributes to economic development, educational capacity and mediates the divide of have vs have not.”

Others cited the benefits of the grants in fostering innovation and the expansion of library services.

“Special projects grants enable you to ‘take a risk’ by trying something innovative. LSTA is critical to innovation in Texas libraries.”

“Special Projects grants enable us to try something new. We use it as a ‘proof-of-concept’ to try to leverage ongoing local support for expanding the scope of our services to the public. Several services that we initially offered through special project and impact grants have been integrated into our standard services.”

Yet another cited the importance of grants in expanding collaboration and partnerships.

“Pairing up with another agency or organization is one way to get the best bang for your grant dollars. Sometimes it takes creativity to see a connection to reach a common goal. The more we fund unique and innovative partnerships, the more common they become.”

TSLAC’s practice of requiring libraries to identify outputs as part of both the grant application process and the grant progress reporting process is having an effect. For example, the final report on a Teen Book Club grant awarded under Goal 3 noted that an end-of-program survey revealed that 88% of participants strongly agreed or agreed that the program increased their enthusiasm for reading and 75% of the participants strongly agreed or agreed that the program helped them think more critically about the literature. The program was judged a success by the grantee because benchmarks of 75% had been set for these two questions at the project’s onset.

Librarians reported in personal interviews and in focus groups that some of the programs undertaken in support of Goal 3 have had the effect of changing the public’s perception of the library’s role in the community.

“They (the public) take us more seriously when they see us having an impact on a preschoolers readiness for school or engaging teens in a makerspace with STEM activities that are linked to job-skills.”

Taken as a whole, the evaluators judge that TSLAC has ACHIEVED (and is re-achieving daily) Goal 3. The projects and activities undertaken in support of Goal 3 have had a significant impact on building ***“a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning.”***

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 primary focus of Goal 3 is early literacy and lifelong learning: therefore, it is not surprising that this Measuring Success focal area is addressed by the projects and activities undertaken. As has been noted earlier, the evaluators also see significant signs of the integration of

community engagement efforts in other efforts. The evaluators see evidence that the capacity of libraries to serve their communities has been enhanced by TSLAC’s efforts under Goal 3.

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

As was the case under earlier goals, most efforts to impact target audiences fall well beneath the 10% threshold established by IMLS as a definition of substantial focus. That said, most of the individual sub-grants awarded under this goal targeted children, school-aged youth, and/or families. Training efforts, specifically those related to summer reading, the Family Place initiative, and general youth services continuing education and consulting activities have effectively targeted the library workforce.

Goal 4 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities make progress towards each goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over- ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

GOAL 4
Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

We have organized the hybrid project categories undertaken in support of Goal 4 into three groups. Following are the titles of the grouping and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities in each of these areas..

Projects & Expenditures

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Goal 4 Impact Grants | \$ 107,151.24 |
| Goal 4 Library Cooperation Grants | \$ 120,151.00 |
| Goal 4 Special Projects Grants | <u>\$ 158,205.70</u> |
| GOAL 4 TOTAL | \$ 385,507.94 |

Goal 4 expenditures represent 1.24% of Texas’ total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

It is perhaps not surprising that the goal area in which TSLAC has performed at a lower level is the one that received by far the smallest allocation of funds. Only 1.24% of Texas’ LSTA Grants to State allotment was expended in support of Goal 4 during the three-year period covered by the evaluation. The entire amount of LSTA funding for Goal 4 projects and activities was expended on 17 sub-grants. Eleven of these were Impact Grants, four were Special Projects Grants, and two were Cooperation Grants. One positive aspect to note in regard to Goal 4 efforts is that the number of grants awarded that address Goal 4 has grown over the three— year period covered by the evaluation. Three grants were awarded using FFY 2013 dollars, six were awarded using FFY 2014 funds, and eight were awarded from the FFY 2015 allotment.

A notable aspect of the projects undertaken to date has been their diversity. Grants under this goal have been awarded to libraries serving large urbanized areas (Harris County), suburban areas (Plano) and small communities (Smithville, population 3,817). Target audiences included teens, college students, inmates in a state correctional facility, potential entrepreneurs, and mid-life adults looking to advance their careers.

A major shortcoming in efforts aligned with Goal 4 to date was noted by the TSLAC staff in the self-assessment that was performed at the evaluators' request. Staff noted that a cooperative program with the Texas Workforce Commission for statewide training/cooperation was not yet implemented in these years. This alliance was prominently identified in the 2013 – 2017 LSTA Plan. There is a cooperative program in progress for SFY 2017 (FFY 2016).

The impact of specific grants has been significant on individuals participating in the grant programs. It is hard to argue that the programs have had little impact when an inmate says,

“The access to technology at Lee College inside prison has given us the edge we need, so that when we get out we are not years behind everybody else. So that when we go to job interviews and are asked about creating databases on Access or financial sheets on Excel, we can not only say we know how but that we have hands-on experience.”

While the impact of efforts under this goal is real and is in some instances measurable, it has unfortunately been limited to a small number of people. Much more work remains to be done in this area to accomplish this important goal.

The evaluators believe that TSLAC is committed to this goal and that some progress has been made. Nevertheless, we agree with TSLAC's self-assessment that this goal has been only PARTLY ACHIEVED.

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

This goal focuses on Economic & Employment Development needs. While efforts have been made to address this focal area through sub-grants, impacts have been very localized and, considered on a statewide basis, limited.

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

Although many of the targeted audiences have been involved in specific sub-grants including individuals living below the poverty line, individuals who are unemployed/underemployed, ethnic or minority populations, individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills, and older

school-aged youth, none of the projects comes anywhere near achieving the 10% threshold established by IMLS for defining a substantial focus.

Goal 5 - Retrospective Question A-1. To what extent did your Five-Year Plan activities make progress towards each goal? Where progress was not achieved as anticipated, discuss what factors (e.g., staffing, budget, over- ambitious goals, partners) contributed?

Goal 5

GOAL 5 Texans will receive responsive library services

We have organized the hybrid project categories undertaken in support of Goal 5 into four groups. Following are the titles of the grouping and the total amount of LSTA FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 funding that was expended on activities in each of these areas.

Projects & Expenditures

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Competitive Grants Management | \$ 638,556.11 |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | \$ 559,380.00 |
| General Continuing Education | \$ 721,004.61 |
| Goal 5 Library Cooperation Grants | \$ 57,533.00 |
| GOAL 5 TOTAL | \$ 1,976,473.72 |

Goal 5 expenditures represent 6.35% of Texas’ total LSTA allotment in the FFY 2013 – FFY 2015 period.

Goal 5 centers on staff development and building library capacity. While management of the competitive grants program also legitimately falls under this goal, it is secondary to funding spent on enhancing the ability of libraries and the Texas library workforce to serve the public. Librarians in the state fully comprehend the importance of the continuing education and consulting aspects of TSLAC’s implementation of the LSTA program. Web survey respondents offered:

“Continuing education for library staff is key in a changing technological environment. We must be on top of new software, new services, new social media. Library staff needs these tools to assist patrons—they do expect us to know every possible thing accessible through our public computers. This needs to be a constant, no matter which library or town.”

and,

“As far as consulting services are concerned, no one can be expected to be an expert in everything. Small libraries and those that are underfunded can benefit tremendously by knowing that they/we can pick up the phone and consult experts or have someone work on sourcing an issue for us.”

The range of staff development opportunities offered to Texas librarians is impressive ranging from hands-on, on-site workshops on technology topics to major training initiatives on community engagement. Support for sending library staff to Family Place training (although included under Goal 3) is yet another example of the diversity of TSLAC's staff development efforts.

TSLAC statistics on training events shows over 32,000 contacts with librarians in State Fiscal Year 2015 and a target of over 40,000 for 2016. Furthermore, TSLAC captures far more than workshop attendance and contacts in its evaluation of these efforts. Participants in events ranging from workshops to webinars are asked to evaluate their knowledge on the topics covered both before and after training as well as pre and post-training confidence in implemented what was learned. This information is in turn used to inform decisions on future training events.

One impressive observation made by the evaluators was that librarians know the TSLAC staff involved in training and consulting on a first name basis. This was not just an instance of hearing from librarians in the Austin area. For example, no fewer than four TSLAC staff members (including the TSLAC Director) were mentioned (positively) by first name in a focus group session held by the evaluators in Midland. TSLAC staff were characterized as knowledgeable and approachable.

Although there was a definite desire that more on-site training be offered, the general opinion expressed seemed to indicate that TSLAC consulting and training staff know and understand the challenges faced by libraries in the field. This viewpoint was expressed by representatives of urban libraries as well as by librarians from very small libraries. A significant number of people expressed the fact that they appreciated webinars and understood the need for them but made a strong case for the importance of human networking especially given the demise of the regional library system program in SFY 2012.

It should also be noted that a considerable amount of training is done in relation to the competitive grant program. Webinars are available as well as one-on-one assistance to guide librarians through the grant-writing process. One focus group attendee said,

“The state library is very good at explaining what you need to do to apply for and report on a grant.”

Another said,

“If you can read and follow directions, you can get a grant. TSLAC provides very good rubrics. Applying for a grant is an ‘open book test.’”

Although the evaluators agree with TSLAC that Goal 5 will never be fully accomplished, we believe that the projects and activities carried out in support of Goal 5 are closely aligned with the goal and that TSLAC is striving to meet challenging performance benchmarks they have

established for themselves in regard to staff development. While they haven't met all of their targets each year, we assess that they have substantially ACHIEVED their goal.

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

Goal 5 addresses the Measuring Success focal area of Institutional Capacity.

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

The library workforce is the targeted audience for almost all activities undertaken in support of Goal 5; however, neither the library workforce nor any of the other targeted audiences approach the 10% threshold established by IMLS as representing a substantial focus.

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 TSLAC Director and other SLAA staff. Elements are included in a variety of the agency's reports to the public, to the library community, and to state government. Data from the SPR is also used to establish benchmarks that are reviewed on a periodic basis to assess progress toward the goals stated in the LSTA 2013 – 2017 Five-Year Plan. SPR data has also been shared with specific outside evaluators, such as Himmel & Wilson for this assessment, in their roles in evaluating specific projects.

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

Texas' Five-Year LSTA Plan for 2013 – 2017 was not changed or amended after its submission in 2012 to the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS). While some specific activities mentioned in the Plan were discontinued and other 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 Texas State Library and Archives staff and with various advisory groups and is shared indirectly with Library Commissioners, with legislators, and with other public officials through periodic reports from TSLAC. SPR data has also been shared with outside evaluators including Himmel & Wilson, 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 Texas State Library and Archives Commission's (TSLAC) implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, TSLAC issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) on May 31, 2016 to solicit proposals to conduct a "Library Services and Technology Act Evaluation." Proposals were due August 10, 2016.

As a result of a competitive bidding process, Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants, a library consulting firm headquartered in Milton, Wisconsin, was awarded the contract to conduct the independent LSTA evaluation. Himmel & Wilson, 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.

Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants has in depth evaluation experience and demonstrated professional competency. Bill Wilson of Himmel & Wilson Library Consultants 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. Co-principal consultant Dr. Martha Kyrillidou has deep experience in library evaluation over her 22 years of service at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Dr. Martha Kyrillidou 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. Dr. Ethel Himmel of Himmel & Wilson, who was involved in the web survey design and analysis also has extensive research credentials and experience conducting LSTA evaluations.

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

Himmel & Wilson, 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 Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Himmel & Wilson completed a site-visit to the state library administrative agency (SLAA) on September 16, 2016. In person interviews were held with the TSLAC Director and with key staff engaged in LSTA and specific projects carried out under the LSTA Five-Year Plan. A total of ten on-site focus groups and four virtual focus groups were conducted. These data gathering efforts were supplemented with a series of telephone interviews with Texas librarians and other persons with knowledge of LSTA-funded initiatives. 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 October 19 – November 18, 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. Ten focus groups were held on-site in libraries throughout the state. Four virtual focus groups were also conducted. Remote participants also participated in two of the physical sessions via go-to-meeting.

Librarians and library staff were engaged through virtual focus groups.

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

Librarians and other persons of interest participated in one-on-one interviews.

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

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

Appendix A - Acronyms

Appendix A: List of Acronyms

ARIS - Archives and Information Services

A division of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC), ARIS acquires, assesses, organizes and preserves the valuable records and publications of Texas government agencies, as well as federal agency publications and other library materials. Although documents are physically accessible to the public, ARIS works to increase universal access to holdings through the Internet.

CEC - Continuing Education and Consulting

TSLAC staff provides technical assistance and consulting by request to librarians, library staff, regional system personnel, trustees, advisory councils, and others in order to support libraries in meeting the needs of patrons and communities. CEC activities also include workshops on a wide range of topics designed to meet library educational needs, which are identified through surveys, specific requests that have statewide implications, and in response to changes occurring in the profession.

ILL - Interlibrary Loan

The statewide Interlibrary Loan program facilitates resource sharing among Texas libraries, providing Texans access to library materials that may not be available locally. Funded solely by LSTA, the statewide Interlibrary Loan project consists of the following components: statewide FirstSearch subscription, Navigator discovery and delivery service as well as training and records maintenance, the statewide union catalog (Texas Group Catalog), and WorldShare ILL subscription and access fees. Additionally, TexShare libraries that participate in the statewide courier are eligible for a subsidy towards their annual courier subscription costs.

IMLS - Institute of Museum and Library Services

The Institute of Museum and Library Services is the primary source of federal support for the 123,000 libraries and 35,000 museums nationwide. The mission is to inspire libraries and museums to advance innovation, lifelong learning, and cultural and civic engagement.

LDN - Library Development and Networking

A division of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) LDN articulates and advances the value of Texas libraries as essential to Texas communities and the state. LDN provides services to Texans through statewide resource sharing programs that expand the capabilities of local public, academic, school, and special libraries. The division manages programs that support library development through training, consulting, workforce assistance and other programs that support key needs and initiatives, and grant funds statewide.

LSTA - Library Services and Technology Act

The LSTA Grants to States Program supports the delivery of library services in the United States. The Grants to States Program is the largest grant program run by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS); it provides funds to State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) using a population-based formula. SLAAs may use federal funds to support statewide initiatives and services; they also may distribute the funds through subgrant competitions or cooperative agreements to public, academic, research, school, and special libraries or consortia in their state. The program has the benefit of building the capacity of states to develop statewide plans for library services and to evaluate those services every five years (for more information, see <https://www.ims.gov/grants/grants-states>).

TBP - Talking Book Program

Administered by TSLAC, the Talking Book Program is a free library service to Texans of all ages who are unable to read standard print material due to visual, physical, or reading disabilities, whether permanent or temporary. Reading materials are available via digital download, on digital cartridge, by books printed in Braille and large print formats. Playback equipment to be used with TBP materials is also available to borrow. Materials may be downloaded from the Internet or mailed at no charge to the patron. The program offers more than 89,000 titles in fiction and nonfiction, plus about 80 national magazines for adults and children.

TSLAC - Texas State Library and Archives Commission

An agency of the Texas state government, the mission of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission is to preserve the record of government for public scrutiny, to secure and make accessible historically significant records and other valuable resources, to meet the reading needs of Texans with disabilities, to build and sustain statewide partnerships to improve library programs and services, and to enhance the capacity for achievement of individuals and institutions served by TSLAC.

Appendix B – Interviewees and Focus Groups

Appendix B: Texas List of Individuals Interviewed

Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC)

Mark Smith, TSLAC Director and Librarian
Deborah Littrell, TSLAC Library Development & Networking Division Director
Stacey Malek, TSLAC LSTA Coordinator
Erica McCormick, TSLAC Grants Administrator
Jennifer Peters, TSLAC Community Engagement Administrator
Jelain Chubb, TSLAC Archives & Information Services Division Director
Sara Hayes, TSLAC Interlibrary Loan Program Coordinator
Russlene Waukechon, TSLAC TexShare E-Resources Coordinator
Katherine Adelberg, TSLAC Continuing Education and Consulting Manager
Ava Smith, TSLAC Talking Book Program Division Director

Representatives of the Texas Library Community

Chris Accardo, Director of Library Services, Weatherford Public Library
Drenna Belden, Assistant Dean for External Relations, University of North Texas
Judith Bergeron, Director, Smithville Public Library
David Carlson, Dean of Libraries, Texas A&M University Libraries
Michelle Cervantes, Director, Round Rock Public Library
Janet Cox, Library Technical Services Manager, Plano Public Library System
Lorraine Haricombe, Director University of Texas – Austin Library
Fred Heath, Retired Director University of Texas – Austin Library
Judith Hiott, Chief, Houston Area Library Automated Network
Kate Horan, Director, McAllen Memorial Library
Pattie Mayfield, Director, Bertha Voyer Memorial Library
Christine Peterson, eShelf Service Manager, AMIGOS Library Services
Gretchen Pruet, Director, New Braunfels Public Library
Alexia Thompson-Young, University of Texas System Licensing Coordinator
John Trischitti III, Director, Midland County Library
Monica Wong, Head Librarian, El Paso Community College Library

Appendix C – Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

Appendix C – Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

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

Institute of Museum and Library Services
Purposes and Priorities of LSTA

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

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

Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Five Year Plan for Texas 2013 – 2017

Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Texas State Library and Archives Commission Website
<https://www.tsl.texas.gov/>

Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Texas State Library and Archives Commission Website
Community Engagement and Libraries
<https://www.tsl.texas.gov/ld/engagement>

Holland, Shari M.P.Aff. Morningside Research and Consulting, Inc.
Evaluation of Library Services and Technology Act Five-Year Plan for Texas, 2008-2012

In addition, the evaluators reviewed many internal documents including:

- Library Development and Networking Reports
- TexShare Statistics
- Statewide 19-Year Statistical Report
- Talking Book Program Statistics

Appendix D – Focus Group Questions

Appendix D – Focus Group Questions

Focus Group Protocol

Please introduce yourselves and indicate who you are, which library you represent, what job you hold or role you fulfill and, finally, tell us how long you have been involved in (state) libraries.

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

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

NOTE: These questions were modified a bit depending on the make-up of the groups involved.

Appendix E – Web Survey Instrument

Appendix E: Web Survey Instrument Texas LSTA

Welcome



**TEXAS STATE LIBRARY
AND
ARCHIVES COMMISSION**

TEXAS STATE LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES COMMISSION (TSLAC)

Every five years the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) conducts an evaluation of its implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) "Grants to States" program in fulfillment of the requirements of the Museums and Libraries Act. The LSTA Grants to States Program is a federal program that provides funding to each state on a population-driven formula. Federal funding for the program in Texas is approximately \$10 million per year. Decisions regarding how available funds are spent are made at the state level; however, expenditures must be consistent with the purposes and priorities that are established nationally.

The following survey is an effort to gather information regarding the impact that LSTA has had on individuals and libraries in Texas. Please take a few minutes to assist us with this important evaluation. Thanks!

Background

TSLAC uses its LSTA funds to support a number of different activities, including those in support of libraries. Most of the funding is used to support major statewide initiatives such as the TexShare program, the Talking Book Program, Interlibrary Loan and Resource Sharing activities, digitization activities and consulting and continuing education services.

Funds are also used to support grants awarded to individual libraries for innovation and enhanced access to resources. This includes Library Cooperation grants, Texas Reads grants, TexTreasures grants, Impact grants, and Special Projects grants. We would appreciate your input on the impact of these services from both a statewide perspective and from the perspective of your library.

Local Impact

1) On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "No/Very Low Impact" and 5 representing "Very High Impact," please rate the degree to which each of the following programs has a positive impact on library services **in YOUR library**. (Please select "0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate" if you are unaware of the program or lack the information needed to rate the service.)

| | 0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate | 1 - No/Very Low Impact | 2 | 3 - Moderate Impact | 4 | 5 - Very High Impact |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------------------|
| TexShare (includes statewide database licensing, card program, and courier) | | | | | | |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | | | | | | |
| Talking Book Program | | | | | | |
| Interlibrary Loan | | | | | | |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | | | | | | |
| Library Cooperation grants | | | | | | |
| Impact Grants | | | | | | |
| Special Projects grants | | | | | | |
| Texas Reads grants | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Community Engagement/ Edge | | | | | | |
| Summer Reading | | | | | | |
| TexTreasures grants | | | | | | |

2) Briefly tell us about the impact that your highest ranked service or services has had in YOUR library.

Statewide Impact

3) On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "No/Very Low Impact" and 5 representing "Very High Impact," please rate the degree to which each of the following programs has a positive impact on library services **on a STATEWIDE BASIS**. (Please select "0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate" if you are unaware of the program or lack the information needed to rate the service.)

| | 0 - Don't Know/Can't Rate | 1 - No/Very Low Impact | 2 | 3 - Moderate Impact | 4 | 5 - Very High Impact |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------------------|
| TexShare (includes statewide database licensing, card program, and courier) | | | | | | |
| Digitization/ availability of TSLAC collections | | | | | | |
| Talking Book Program | | | | | | |
| Interlibrary Loan | | | | | | |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Library Cooperation grants | | | | | | |
| Impact Grants | | | | | | |
| Special Projects grants | | | | | | |
| Texas Reads grants | | | | | | |
| Community Engagement/ Edge | | | | | | |
| Summer Reading | | | | | | |
| TexTreasures grants | | | | | | |

4) Briefly tell us about the impact that you think your highest ranked service or services has had on a STATEWIDE basis.

Program/Initiative Potential

Here are some of the programs/initiatives that have been supported with LSTA funds in recent years:

- Community Engagement**
- Consulting Services**
- Continuing Education**
- Digitization/ availability of TSLAC collections**
- Summer Reading**
- Talking Book Program**
- TexShare**
- Impact grants**
- Library Cooperation grants**
- Special Projects grants**
- Texas Reads grants**
- TexTreasures grants**

5) In your opinion, which of the above listed services or initiatives offers the greatest VALUE to customers/ end users of libraries? Why?

6) In your opinion, which of the services or initiatives listed above has the greatest potential for improving library services in Texas?

7) Please share any examples of TSLAC services or initiatives that support the LSTA priorities encouraging resource sharing, fostering strategic partnerships, and/or serving individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services.

8) If you could improve the LSTA program in Texas in any way, what would that change be? What program or programs would you prioritize? Are there any new programs/initiatives that are needed?

Respondent Demographics

9) *The category that most closely describes your role/responsibilities in the library community is:*

Library Director

Children's/Youth Services Librarian

Reference/Information Librarian

Interlibrary Loan or Technical Services Librarian

Library Technology Specialist

Other Library Staff

Library Friend or Library Trustee

Other (Please specify.)

If you selected "other," please specify here.

10) *Please complete the following sentence. I work in or am most closely associated with:*

a public library

an academic library

a school library

a special library

something other than those in the list (Please specify.)

If you selected "other," please specify here.

11) *Please indicate the size of the community or the student body of the library in which you work.*

Fewer than 250

250 - 499

500 - 2,499

2,500 - 9,999

10,000 - 49,999

50,000 - 99,999

100,000 - 499,999

500,000 or more

DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

12) Please estimate the overall annual operating budget of the library in which you work or with which you are associated.

Less than \$10,000

\$10,000 - \$49,999

\$50,000 - \$99,999

\$100,000 - \$249,999

\$250,000 - \$499,999

\$500,000 - \$999,999

\$1 million or more

DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us. Please refer any questions about this survey to Bill Wilson, Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants.

wilson@libraryconsultant.com

Appendix F – Measuring Success Table

Appendix F - Measuring Success Focal Area Table

| | Goal 1 Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs. | Goal 2 Texans and Texas communities will have access to internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully | Goal 3 Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning. | Goal 4 Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries. | Goal 5 Texans will receive responsive library services |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Lifelong Learning | | | | | |
| Improve users' formal education | | | | | |
| Improve users' general knowledge and skills | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Information Access | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to discover information resources | Yes | | Yes | | |
| Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| Institutional Capacity | | | | | |
| Improve the library workforce | Yes | Yes | | | Yes |
| Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Improve library operations | Yes | Yes | | | Yes |
| Economic & Employment Development | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support | | | | Yes | |
| Improve users' ability to use and apply business resources | | | | Yes | |
| Human Resources | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal, family or household finances | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their personal or family health & wellness | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills | | | | | |
| Civic Engagement | | | | | |
| Improve users' ability to participate in their community | | Yes | | | |
| Improve users' ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern | | | | | |

Appendix G – Targeted Audience Table

Appendix G - Targeted Audience Table

| PROGRAM/INITIATIVE | Library Workforce (current and future) | Individuals Living Below the Poverty Line | Individuals Who are Unemployed/Underemployed | Ethnic or Minority Populations | Immigrants/Refugees | Individuals with Disabilities | Families | Individuals with Limited Functional Literacy or Information Skills | Children (aged 0-5) | School-aged Youth (aged 6-17) | General |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Goal 1 Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs. | | | | | | | | | | | Yes |
| Goal 2 Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully. | Yes | | | | | Yes | | | | | Yes |
| Goal 3 Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning. | Yes | | | | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Goal 4 Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries. | | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | | | Yes | |
| Goal 5 Texans will receive responsive library services . | Yes | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix H – Expenditure Tables

| TEXAS LSTA SUMMARY | State Goal | FFY 2013 Expenditure | % of FFY 2013 Expenditures | FFY 2014 Expenditure | % of FFY 2014 Expenditures | FFY 2015 Expenditure | % of FFY 2015 Expenditures | FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure TOTALS | % of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure |
|--|------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Digitization of Archival Materials | Goal 1 | \$ 55,142.00 | 0.79% | \$ 165,115.74 | 2.73% | \$ 144,719.22 | 1.96% | \$ 364,976.96 | 1.79% |
| Electronic Resource Access Tools | Goal 1 | \$ 117,459.00 | 1.68% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 117,459.00 | 0.57% |
| Enhanced Access | Goal 1 | \$ 174,973.00 | 2.50% | \$ 175,381.52 | 2.90% | \$ 206,404.91 | 2.80% | \$ 556,759.43 | 2.72% |
| ILL: Promoting interlibrary resource sharing | Goal 1 | \$ 3,179,366.00 | 45.35% | \$ 2,909,294.43 | 48.04% | \$ 3,183,714.04 | 43.22% | \$ 9,272,374.47 | 45.38% |
| TexShare Consortia and Databases | Goal 1 | \$ 3,115,289.00 | 44.44% | \$ 2,510,379.43 | 41.46% | \$ 3,673,083.70 | 49.86% | \$ 9,298,752.13 | 45.51% |
| Goal 1 Library Cooperation Grants | Goal 1 | \$ 121,252.00 | 1.73% | \$ 75,000.00 | 1.24% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 196,252.00 | 0.96% |
| Goal 1 Special Projects Grants | Goal 1 | \$ 75,000.00 | 1.07% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 75,000.00 | 0.37% |
| Goal 1 TexTreasures Grants | Goal 1 | \$ 172,372.00 | 2.46% | \$ 220,185.33 | 3.64% | \$ 159,200.00 | 2.16% | \$ 551,757.33 | 2.70% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Expended | | \$ 7,010,853.00 | 100.00% | \$ 6,055,356.45 | 100.00% | \$ 7,367,121.87 | 100.00% | \$ 20,433,331.32 | 100.00% |
| Total LSTA Allotment | | \$ 9,964,148.00 | | \$ 10,510,319.00 | | \$ 10,665,018.00 | | \$ 31,139,485.00 | |

Goal 1. Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

Goal 2. Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

Goal 3. Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

Goal 4. Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

Goal 5. Texans will receive responsive library services

| TEXAS LSTA SUMMARY | State Goal | FFY 2013 Expenditure | % of FFY 2013 Expenditures | FFY 2014 Expenditure | % of FFY 2014 Expenditures | FFY 2015 Expenditure | % of FFY 2015 Expenditures | FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure TOTALS | % of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Community Engagement Initiatives | Goal 2 | \$ 38,608.00 | 3.81% | \$ 471,372.54 | 18.18% | \$ 124,386.99 | 11.24% | \$ 634,367.53 | 13.46% |
| Edge Implementation Program | Goal 2 | \$ 238,209.00 | 23.53% | \$ 612,909.38 | 23.64% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 851,118.38 | 18.06% |
| Mobile Apps | Goal 2 | \$ 329,812.00 | 32.57% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 329,812.00 | 7.00% |
| Talking Book Program | Goal 2 | \$ 199,118.00 | 19.67% | \$ 687,927.72 | 26.53% | \$ 369,390.93 | 33.37% | \$ 1,256,436.65 | 26.67% |
| Technology Continuing Education | Goal 2 | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 159,989.19 | 6.17% | \$ 179,363.68 | 16.21% | \$ 339,352.87 | 7.20% |
| Goal 2 Impact Grants | Goal 2 | \$ 127,424.00 | 12.59% | \$ 76,690.21 | 2.96% | \$ 87,870.00 | 7.94% | \$ 291,984.21 | 6.20% |
| Goal 2 Library Cooperation Grants | Goal 2 | \$ 48,602.00 | 4.80% | \$ 277,762.36 | 10.71% | \$ 270,800.00 | 24.47% | \$ 597,164.36 | 12.67% |
| Goal 2 Special Projects Grants | Goal 2 | \$ 30,700.00 | 3.03% | \$ 305,980.64 | 11.80% | \$ 75,000.00 | 6.78% | \$ 411,680.64 | 8.74% |
| Expended | | \$ 1,012,473.00 | 100.00% | \$ 2,592,632.04 | 100.00% | \$ 1,106,811.60 | 100.00% | \$ 4,711,916.64 | 100.00% |
| Total LSTA Allotment | | \$ 9,964,148.00 | | \$ 10,510,319.00 | | \$ 10,665,018.00 | | \$ 31,139,485.00 | |

Goal 1. Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

Goal 2. Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

Goal 3. Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

Goal 4. Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

Goal 5. Texans will receive responsive library services

| TEXAS LSTA SUMMARY | State Goal | FFY 2013 Expenditure | % of FFY 2013 Expenditures | FFY 2014 Expenditure | % of FFY 2014 Expenditures | FFY 2015 Expenditure | % of FFY 2015 Expenditures | FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure TOTALS | % of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Summer Reading | Goal 3 | \$ 40,547.00 | 5.46% | \$ 75,976.11 | 11.64% | \$ 67,152.29 | 5.03% | \$ 183,675.40 | 6.73% |
| Goal 3 Impact Grants | Goal 3 | \$ 49,017.00 | 6.61% | \$ 68,950.35 | 10.56% | \$ 101,740.00 | 7.62% | \$ 219,707.35 | 8.05% |
| Goal 3 Library Cooperation Grants | Goal 3 | \$ 246,502.00 | 33.22% | \$ 113,397.18 | 17.38% | \$ 198,000.00 | 14.83% | \$ 557,899.18 | 20.44% |
| Goal 3 Special Projects Grants | Goal 3 | \$ 379,121.00 | 51.10% | \$ 201,484.65 | 30.87% | \$ 537,790.00 | 40.27% | \$ 1,118,395.65 | 40.97% |
| Goal 3 Texas Reads Grants | Goal 3 | \$ 26,778.00 | 3.61% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 29,320.00 | 2.20% | \$ 56,098.00 | 2.05% |
| Youth Services Continuing Education | Goal 3 | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 192,835.32 | 29.55% | \$ 401,376.07 | 30.06% | \$ 594,211.39 | 21.77% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Expended | | \$ 741,965.00 | 100.00% | \$ 652,643.61 | 100.00% | \$ 1,335,378.36 | 100.00% | \$ 2,729,986.97 | 100.00% |
| Total LSTA Allotment | | \$ 9,964,148.00 | | \$ 10,510,319.00 | | \$ 10,665,018.00 | | \$ 31,139,485.00 | |

Goal 1. Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

Goal 2. Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

Goal 3. Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

Goal 4. Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

Goal 5. Texans will receive responsive library services

| TEXAS LSTA SUMMARY | State Goal | FFY 2013 Expenditure | % of FFY 2013 Expenditures | FFY 2014 Expenditure | % of FFY 2014 Expenditures | FFY 2015 Expenditure | % of FFY 2015 Expenditures | FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure TOTALS | % of FFY 2013 FFY 2015 Expenditure |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Goal 4 Impact Grants | Goal 4 | \$ 30,907.00 | 16.61% | \$ 24,641.24 | 16.67% | \$ 51,603.00 | 100.00% | \$ 107,151.24 | 27.79% |
| Goal 4 Library Cooperation Grants | Goal 4 | \$ 70,151.00 | 37.70% | \$ 50,000.00 | 33.82% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 120,151.00 | 31.17% |
| Goal 4 Special Projects Grants | Goal 4 | \$ 85,000.00 | 45.68% | \$ 73,205.70 | 49.51% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 158,205.70 | 41.04% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Expended | | \$ 186,058.00 | 100.00% | \$ 147,846.94 | 100.00% | \$ 51,603.00 | 100.00% | \$ 385,507.94 | 100.00% |
| Total LSTA Allotment | | \$ 9,964,148.00 | | \$ 10,510,319.00 | | \$ 10,665,018.00 | | \$ 31,139,485.00 | |

Goal 1. Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

Goal 2. Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

Goal 3. Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

Goal 4. Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

Goal 5. Texans will receive responsive library services

| TEXAS LSTA SUMMARY | State Goal | FFY 2013 Expenditure | % of FFY 2013 Expenditures | FFY 2014 Expenditure | % of FFY 2014 Expenditures | FFY 2015 Expenditure | % of FFY 2015 Expenditures | FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure TOTALS | % of FFY 2013 - FFY 2015 Expenditure |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Competitive Grants Management | Goal 5 | \$ 134,503.00 | 17.90% | \$ 327,586.65 | 48.42% | \$ 176,466.46 | 32.17% | \$ 638,556.11 | 32.31% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | Goal 5 | \$ 559,380.00 | 74.44% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 559,380.00 | 28.30% |
| General Continuing Education | Goal 5 | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 348,993.64 | 51.58% | \$ 372,010.97 | 67.83% | \$ 721,004.61 | 36.48% |
| Goal 5 Library Cooperation Grants | Goal 5 | \$ 57,533.00 | 7.66% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ - | 0.00% | \$ 57,533.00 | 2.91% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Expended | | \$ 751,416.00 | 100.00% | \$ 676,580.29 | 100.00% | \$ 548,477.43 | 100.00% | \$ 1,976,473.72 | 100.00% |
| Total LSTA Allotment | | \$ 9,964,148.00 | | \$10,510,319.00 | | \$ 10,665,018.00 | | \$ 31,139,485.00 | |

Goal 1. Texans will have access to shared library resources to meet their learning and informational needs

Goal 2. Texans and Texas communities will have access to Internet connected resources and services through Texas libraries to meet community and personal goals and the support they need to use them successfully

Goal 3. Texans will have access to library services to build a strong foundation for early learning, success in school, and lifelong learning

Goal 4. Texans will enhance their business and workforce development, including entrepreneurial endeavors, through use of materials and services at their libraries

Goal 5. Texans will receive responsive library services

Appendix I – Web Survey Report

Appendix I: Web-Survey Report

Three hundred and seventy-three individuals responded to the Texas State Library web survey regarding the LSTA Evaluation. Of these two hundred thirty-six identified themselves as being most closely associated with public libraries (representing 63.2 percent of the respondents), one hundred and eleven with academic libraries (29.8 percent) and twenty-five (6.7 percent) as “other.” The other libraries included twelve respondents in school libraries, four in combination libraries (high school/community, academic/public, public/school), and seven in special libraries, such as medical.

Seventy-one (71.5) percent described their library responsibilities as those of a director, another seven (7.7) percent were reference/information librarians and another five (5.3) percent were interlibrary loan or technical services librarians. Twenty-two (22.0) percent had an overall annual operating budget of \$ 1 million or more; however, twelve (12.9) percent had an operating budget of under \$50,000.

The table below lists the twelve programs being evaluated by descending order of the percent of the total respondents rating that program as having a Very High Impact in **THEIR** library.

Overall Responses of Very High Impact on Respondent’s Library

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don’t Know/Can’t Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| TexShare | 63.2% | 6.1% | 1.9% |
| Interlibrary Loan | 61.2% | 7.5% | 4.6% |
| Summer Reading | 43.3% | 10.2% | 18.8% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 34.7% | 7.0% | 6.7% |
| Special Projects Grants | 20.7% | 14.7% | 30.8% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 19.7% | 16.2% | 28.6% |
| Impact Grants | 18.6% | 16.2% | 32.9% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 16.8% | 16.3% | 38.0% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 15.4% | 19.2% | 20.3% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 14.9% | 19.5% | 34.9% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 14.8% | 15.1% | 31.5% |
| Talking Book Program | 8.9% | 29.4% | 28.3% |

TexShare and Interlibrary Loan have a very high impact across the responding libraries and both are well-known.

Because sixty-three percent of the respondents represented public libraries, the analysis divides the report by type of library (public, academic, other) under each of the questions.

Impact Rating by Public Libraries

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Interlibrary Loan | 66.0% | 6.4% | 3.0% |
| Summer Reading | 63.6% | 1.7% | 2.1% |
| TexShare | 48.1% | 8.5% | 3.0% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 45.1% | 3.4% | 4.3% |
| Special Projects Grants | 24.5% | 12.9% | 26.2% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 23.5% | 15.0% | 24.4% |
| Impact Grants | 23.1% | 14.1% | 27.4% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 21.7% | 8.1% | 23.4% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 20.6% | 15.9% | 28.3% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 17.6% | 15.5% | 36.5% |
| Talking Book Program | 12.4% | 24.4% | 22.6% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 12.0% | 20.5% | 19.7% |

Public library respondents rated the impact of interlibrary loan and summer reading as highest with TexShare rating third. Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections was rated last (twelfth) of the programs.

Impact Rating by Academic Libraries

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| TexShare | 94.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Interlibrary Loan | 59.8% | 7.5% | 3.7% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 24.3% | 15.9% | 18.7% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 17.6% | 17.6% | 37.0% |
| Special Projects Grants | 16.2% | 17.1% | 33.3% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 15.7% | 11.1% | 11.1% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 14.8% | 19.4% | 30.6% |
| Impact Grants | 11.1% | 19.4% | 38.9% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 3.7% | 27.8% | 45.4% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 2.8% | 29.9% | 44.9% |
| Summer Reading | 1.9% | 27.1% | 52.3% |
| Talking Book Program | 0.9% | 39.8% | 38.9% |

Academic library respondents rated the impact of the TexShare program highest, followed by interlibrary loan and the digitization/availability of TSLAC collections. They rated the impact of the Talking Book program last of the twelve programs.

Impact Rating by the “Other” Types of Libraries

The twenty-five respondents who identified their library as other than public or academic said TexShare had the greatest impact. Seventy-two (72.0) percent gave TexShare a very high impact rating, followed by twenty-four (24.0) percent very high impact rating for interlibrary loan. Twenty-four (24.0) percent also gave the very high impact rating to the summer reading program. (Note: The other libraries included twelve respondents in school libraries, four in combination libraries (high school/community, academic/public, public/school), and seven in special libraries, such as medical.) This group gave high percents of don’t know ratings to the various grants programs. Sixty-eight (68.0) percent said they didn’t know about special project grants. Sixty-five (65.2) percent didn’t know about TexTreasures grants; sixty-four (64.0) percent didn’t know about library cooperation grants or impact grants. Fifty-six (56.0) percent didn’t know about Texas Reads grants or Community Engagement/EDGE grants.

Question 2 asked respondents to briefly tell us about the impact that your highest ranked service or services has had in **YOUR** library. Three hundred and twenty-one respondents answered this question. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)*

Public Library Responses on Highest Impact on YOUR Library

Two hundred and two public library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Interlibrary loan | 91 |
| Summer reading | 63 |
| Databases | 44 |
| TexShare | 24 |
| Courier | 11 |
| TexShare Cards | 15 |
| Continuing education | 36 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 20 |
| EDGE | 12 |
| Talking Books | 9 |
| Impact grants | 8 |
| Special projects grants | 7 |
| TexTreasures grants | 4 |
| Texas Reads grants | 4 |
| Library cooperation grants | 4 |

Example responses include the following:

“Some of the services, such as the TexShare Databases and Interlibrary Loan are crucial for our daily operations. We use these services daily to expand what we can offer to our patrons in our small, rural community. Summer Reading Program manuals and materials are also very important to us and allow us to offer quality children’s programming each summer.”

“Resources available through ILL or TexShare enable our patrons to have access to materials we could never afford alone. Students needing citations for papers, engineers needing high level topic-specific materials, people doing family genealogical research—the needs met are countless! We had one ESL patron who, when told about Pronunciator, said with a beaming smile, that now he could improve his command of English enough to hopefully get a better job for his family.”

“Grants funded through TSLAC have allowed us to provide meaningful STEAM based programming to our community enhancing student learning, supporting job training and giving access to digital tools our budgets cannot provide to the community. This contributes to economic development, educational capacity and mediates the divide of have vs have not.”

“Being a very rural library, we depend on Interlibrary Loan to provide resources that we do not have available. We depend on the Continuing Education to stay current and up-to-date with trends, and best practices. Summer Reading is a big hit with the K-3rd graders in our area. Teachers can quickly identify those students that participated in our Summer Reading Program. We use the Manual for ideas for the programs and the free promotional materials.”

“The courier service allows us to be part of the North Texas Library Consortium which has been wonderful for our patrons. It has also helped with Interlibrary Loans—we don’t have to mail as many items.”

Academic Library Responses on Highest Impact on THEIR Library

Ninety-six academic library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Databases | 66 |
| TexShare | 24 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 20 |
| TexShare Card | 17 |
| Courier | 11 |
| TexTreasures grants | 9 |
| Continuing education | 2 |
| Impact grants | 2 |
| Special projects grants | 1 |

Example responses include the following:

“4 out of our top 10 most heavily used electronic resources are from TexShare. The program provides a tremendous savings on electronic resources used by our undergraduates, graduates, and faculty.”

“Both the TexShare Card program and the Interlibrary Loan Services program have had positive influences on the research output of our constituents (undergraduate, graduate, and professors). The ability of our users to access materials we do not own, either through in person visits or by receiving materials to use at our location, has improved the depth and quality of research output. Our librarians and ILL staff are often mentioned in the “Acknowledgements” sections of theses and published monographs for the help they have provided in identifying and providing access to necessary research materials.”

“ILL and the courier service between TexShare libraries is one of the best services our library has in this program. The free exchange of resources within the state has been highly beneficial to our patrons.”

“TexShare programs are a model for resource sharing in that they level the playing field of information access for all our citizens. Without TexShare, many of our libraries (all types) would be unable to adequately support their programs and the information needs of our users. Grant programs are good but on a scale have less of an impact in that they support very targeted purposes. Grants that allow wider access to information resources through digitization and discovery serve a wider purpose.”

“Other” Library Responses on Highest Impact on THEIR Library

Twenty-three participants responded to this question of the impact in THEIR library. Examples of their responses include:

“Access to TexShare databases has allowed our employees access to multiple resources to support continuing education programs and more diverse resources generally not available to Libraries of Clinical Medicine.”

“I receive a great deal of professional development that is broader and very beneficial to my role as a school librarian.”

“TexTreasures grant has allowed us to digitize some important historical collections.”

Question 3 asked respondents to rate the impact of each of the twelve programs on a STATEWIDE basis.

Overall Responses of Very High Impact STATEWIDE

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| TexShare | 72.8% | 1.9% | 5.7% |
| Interlibrary Loan | 66.8% | 2.2% | 6.8% |
| Summer Reading | 51.6% | 1.4% | 20.5% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 43.9% | 1.4% | 14.9% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 27.6% | 3.8% | 35.0% |
| Special Projects Grants | 27.6% | 3.5% | 36.0% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 27.1% | 3.8% | 37.4% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 26.8% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| Impact Grants | 26.0% | 3.3% | 37.4% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 25.3% | 5.2% | 34.3% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 25.2% | 4.9% | 37.8% |
| Talking Book Program | 22.3% | 6.5% | 29.9% |

The top four programs in terms of very high impact STATEWIDE are the same four programs as for the individual respondent's library. The Talking Book Program remains in last place. Even though the impact of these programs was high in the respondents' own libraries, they rated the impact even higher statewide, i.e., TexShare was rated as having a very high impact on their own library by 63.2 percent of the respondents, but it was rated as having a very high impact statewide by 72.8 percent of the respondents. This was true for the responses from all types of libraries.

STATEWIDE Impact Rating by Public Libraries

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Interlibrary Loan | 70.8% | 1.7% | 5.2% |
| Summer Reading | 66.4% | 0.0% | 8.6% |
| TexShare | 62.2% | 2.6% | 8.2% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 54.7% | 0.0% | 10.3% |
| Special Projects Grants | 31.9% | 3.4% | 30.6% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 31.9% | 3.9% | 31.0% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 31.6% | 5.6% | 26.4% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 30.2% | 3.9% | 32.8% |
| Impact Grants | 30.0% | 3.4% | 33.5% |
| Talking Book Program | 26.8% | 7.8% | 23.4% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 25.9% | 5.6% | 36.6% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 25.8% | 6.4% | 28.3% |

Public library respondents gave the same five programs their top ratings for having STATEWIDE impact as for having a very high impact in their own libraries.

STATEWIDE Impact Rating by Academic Libraries

| Program | Very High Impact | No/Very Low Impact | Don't Know/Can't Rate |
|--|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| TexShare | 93.6% | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| Interlibrary Loan | 62.4% | 2.8% | 6.4% |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 30.3% | 4.6% | 25.7% |
| TexTreasures Grants | 27.6% | 2.9% | 35.2% |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 24.8% | 2.8% | 35.8% |
| Special Projects Grants | 22.0% | 2.8% | 42.2% |
| Continuing Education and Consulting | 22.0% | 3.7% | 22.0% |
| Impact Grants | 21.3%% | 1.9% | 41.7% |
| Summer Reading | 20.6% | 4.7% | 43.9% |
| Texas Reads Grants | 18.3% | 3.7% | 46.8% |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 13.9% | 4.6% | 46.3% |
| Talking Book Program | 13.8% | 5.5% | 42.2% |

Academic library respondents gave the same four programs their top ratings for having STATEWIDE impact as they did for having a very high impact in their own libraries.

Statewide Impact Rating by the “Other” Types of Libraries

The twenty-five respondents who identified their library as other than public or academic said TexShare had the greatest statewide impact. Eighty-seven (87.5) percent gave TexShare a very high impact rating, followed by fifty (50.0) percent very high impact rating for interlibrary loan. Thirty-nine (39.1) percent also gave the very high impact rating to the summer reading program.

Question 4 asked respondents to briefly tell us about the impact that your highest ranked service or services has had on a STATEWIDE basis. Two hundred and twenty-nine respondents answered this question. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)*

Public Library Responses on Highest Statewide Impact

One hundred and forty-five public library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|--|-------------------------|
| Interlibrary loan | 41 |
| Summer reading | 38 |
| TexShare | 29 |
| Databases | 21 |
| Courier | 3 |
| Continuing education | 20 |
| Consulting | 4 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 12 |
| Community Engagement Grants/EDGE | 5 |
| Digitization/availability of TSLAC collections | 4 |
| Talking Books Program | 4 |
| Special projects Grants | 3 |
| Impact Grants | 1 |

Eight respondents said “all” the programs had the highest statewide impact. “All of the above impact Texas residents who need access to information and access to classes that will help them improve their living standard.” Another eight said they could not rate the statewide impact or did not know the answer. “I have no idea on a statewide level how any of these should rank.”

Example responses include the following:

“TexShare is a wonderful program that allows libraries to partner together and provide greater service to our communities. We are surrounded by several other TexShare libraries and this allows our patrons and theirs to utilize many of our programs and resources.”

“The Digital Library of Texas has a significant impact on many of the smaller libraries and communities in the state. The state library grants have helped by providing expertise and financial resources at an affordable or subsidized rate. Many things are now available online that might have disappeared without state library support.”

“The TexShare program allows all sorts of public and academic libraries, no matter their size or location, to have access to excellent resources for a very low cost. It provides equity of access across the state.”

“Children need the opportunity to explore reading and summer reading helps even parents. Population is getting older and need of the talking book program is growing. Interlibrary loan expands the collection.”

“Interlibrary loans keep our customers happy. We do not have a budget to buy books on demand. Interlibrary loan or our local system of libraries allows us to meet demand and strengthen customer satisfaction.”

“Continuing education for library staff is key in a changing technological environment. We must be on top of new software, new services, new social media. Library staff needs these tools to assist patrons—they do expect us to know every possible thing accessible through our public computers. This needs to be a constant, no matter which library or town, all library professionals need to provide the same high level of service. Partnerships and cooperation is also key in a community with low income. Pairing up with another agency or organization is one way to get the best bang for your grant dollars. Sometimes it takes creativity to see a connection to reach a common goal. The more we fund unique and innovative partnerships, the more common they become. We also need to better share some of these great partnerships and their projects so that others might be so inspired.”

Academic Library Responses on Highest Impact Statewide

Seventy academic library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Databases | 23 |
| TexShare | 17 |
| Card | 5 |
| Courier | 3 |
| Interlibrary loan | 12 |
| Summer Reading | 3 |
| Grants (general) | 3 |
| TexTreasures grants | 2 |
| Continuing education | 2 |
| Talking Books Program | 2 |

Five respondents said “all” of the programs had statewide impact. Three said they did not know or could not answer the question.

Example responses include the following:

“All of these programs provide enormous opportunities to maximize resources and services to all Texas residents.”

“Both TexShare Card program and Interlibrary loan have had a positive impact statewide, due to the broad sharing of resources among Texas libraries. Patrons have borrowing and checkout privileges at participating libraries throughout the state of Texas. The courier service is reliable and efficient.”

“Even though we are a regional community college we are a net ‘loaner’ library meaning we loan more titles than we borrow from other libraries. We support researchers and students all over the state and our ability to borrow from other libraries adds to the support we can provide our students, faculty, and community.”

“From my perspective, financial savings through group purchasing power is the most positive statewide impact of the TexShare databases.”

“TexShare databases are absolutely vital to quality library services around the state.”

Other Library Responses on Highest Impact Statewide

Fourteen of the respondents in the other library group responded to the question about the statewide impact. Examples include:

“Database licensing for TexShare has brought resources to a wider population for the State through participating Library programs, better for Texas and all state citizens.”

“Patrons can have access to the TexShare resources even when they move locations and that has a huge impact.”

Question 5 asked which of the above listed services or initiatives offers the greatest VALUE to customers/end users of libraries? Why? Two hundred and thirty-six answered the question. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)*

Public Library Responses on Greatest VALUE

Two hundred and eleven public library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| TexShare | 91 |
| Databases | 20 |
| Courier | 2 |
| Summer Reading | 88 |
| Continuing Education | 39 |
| Consulting | 11 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 29 |
| Talking Books Program | 16 |
| Community Engagement Grants | 15 |
| Digitization Grants | 12 |
| Special Projects Grants | 9 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 7 |
| Impact Grants | 7 |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 6 |
| All of the Above | 5 |
| Don't Know/NA | 4 |
| Texas Reads | 2 |

Examples of responses include:

“All of them are important but it depends on the needs of your community.”

“I believe TexShare provides the best value because it is shared uniformly across the state. The grant funds are not evenly distributed and often depend on the skill of the grant writer – which varies widely from library to library both in time to write, skill to write, and creativity to imaging a program and translate it into a successful grant program when basic operational support is what is really needed.”

“I think Summer Reading offers the greatest value to the libraries’ end users. Keeping the kids (and teens and adults for libraries like ours that offer programs for all ages) engaged in reading helps them maintain, even improve their skills while school is not in session. They get opportunities to meet kids from other schools, become more integrated in their communities, and discover the job of reading and learning outside of the formal school environment.”

“Community Engagement. A library’s success is based solely on its relationship with the community it serves. Yes, the resources it provides are integral to maintaining the patron’s experience and the library’s relevance in the community it serves, but ensuring that relevance and appropriate allocation of resources only happens when the library engages with its community. Community engagement is extremely cost effective.”

Academic Library Responses on Greatest VALUE

One hundred and five academic library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| TexShare | 71 |
| Card | 4 |
| Courier | 1 |
| Databases | 21 |
| Summer Reading | 9 |
| Digitization | 7 |
| TexTreasures | 6 |
| Talking Books Program | 5 |
| Continuing Education | 4 |
| Consulting | 3 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 3 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 3 |
| Special Projects Grants | 2 |
| Texas Reads Grants | 1 |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 1 |

Examples of responses include:

“Consulting Services: No one can be expected to be an expert in everything. Small libraries and those that are underfunded can benefit tremendously by knowing that they/we can pick up the phone and consult experts or have someone work on sourcing an issue for us.”

“I am not familiar with many of these programs but in my view, I would say that digitization and the availability of TSLAC collection is essential for all patrons.”

“TexShare – because it subsidizes the purchase of essential e-resources without which faculty and students alike would be deprived of cutting edge information. TexTreasures grants – allows us to share rare and fragile resources that no one would know we had otherwise. We have not attracted the attention of Google and have been invited to share our Texas artists collection in their new Cultural Institute. This would not have happened without the TexTreasures grants in the first place.”

“TexShare – just because of the huge number of resources and the relatively low cost.”

Other Library Responses on the Greatest VALUE

Twenty of the respondents in the other library group responded to the question about the greatest value. Thirteen of them included TexShare in their answer.

Examples include:

“TexShare provides information for our patrons that they would not have access to otherwise.”

“It is hard to pick one when they are all needed to impact and improve patrons becoming life long learners.”

Question 6 asked which of the services or initiatives listed above has the greatest POTENTIAL for improving library services in Texas? Two hundred and eighty-six responded to the question. (Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)

Public Library Responses on Greatest POTENTIAL for Improving Library Services

One hundred and seventy-nine public library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Continuing Education | 55 |
| Consulting | 21 |
| TexShare | 29 |
| Databases | 2 |
| All/any of the grants | 29 |
| Community Engagement Grants | 20 |
| Summer Reading | 15 |
| Special Projects Grants | 13 |
| All/any of the above | 9 |
| Don't know/NA | 9 |
| Texas Reads Grants | 8 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 8 |
| Digitization | 7 |
| TexTreasures Grants | 5 |
| Talking Books Program | 5 |

Examples of responses include:

“Continuing Education helps the librarians stay current on trends in libraries and how to improve or expand services at the local level. It also helps with networking and learning from what others are doing.”

“Summer Reading – because it impacts our youngest customers. But it does appear that the Summer Reading initiatives are not as well supported as they used to be.”

“TexShare will only become more and more dynamic as additional databases are added, and the possibilities are endless for the future.”

“I think the funds distributed through the grant programs have the greatest potential to improve library service, but not as they are presently structured. I think they would better serve the people of Texas if they were distributed on a formula, so all libraries got something each year they could count on, without having to compose 'special' grant projects.”

“That is a tough one! I tried to couch it in terms of which one would hurt most if it was gone and I think it would have to be TexShare – especially including ILL.”

Academic Library Responses on Greatest POTENTIAL for Improving Library Services

Eight-nine academic library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| TexShare | 37 |
| Continuing Education | 16 |
| Consulting | 4 |
| All/Any Grants | 11 |
| Don't Know/NA | 11 |
| Digitization | 9 |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 7 |
| Special Projects Grants | 6 |
| Community Engagement Grants | 3 |
| Impact Grants | 2 |
| TexTreasures Grants | 2 |
| Summer Reading | 2 |
| Talking Books Program | 2 |
| All the above | 2 |

Examples of the responses include:

“All of the programs have a great deal of potential, although I would rate continuing education, digitization, TexShare, and grants to individual libraries highest.”

“Any of the grant opportunities have great potential in improving library services as it provides libraries the chance to evaluate the needs of their users in order to plan, create, and implement specific projects to enhance services.”

“I’m just not familiar enough with all these programs to properly answer this question.”

Other Library Responses on the Greatest POTENTIAL

Eighteen of the respondents in the other library group responded to the question of greatest potential. Five of them included TexShare in their answer. Five included grants in their answer. Example responses include:

“Grants are very important for developing new services by motivated libraries.”

“TexShare and grants have a great potential for improving library services in Texas.”

Question 7 asked respondents to share examples of TSLAC services or initiatives that support the LSTA priorities encouraging resource sharing, fostering strategic partnerships, and/or serving individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services. One hundred and sixty-one participants provided an answer. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)*

Public Library Responses on Services or Initiatives that Support the LSTA Priorities

One hundred public library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Talking Book Program | 25 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 20 |
| TexShare | 12 |
| Databases | 7 |
| Courier | 2 |
| TexShare Card | 1 |
| N/A or Don't Know | 9 |
| Community Engagement/EDGE | 7 |
| Summer Reading | 4 |
| Special Projects Grants | 4 |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 3 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 3 |
| Digitization | 2 |
| Impact Grants | 2 |
| Continuing Education | 1 |
| Consulting | 1 |

The Talking Book Program was cited the highest number of times, perhaps because it has traditionally been a service for individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services and more people are aware of it.

Examples of responses include:

“Cooperation grants with Workforce –partnerships with job hunters”

“Many dyslectic children in our area are helped by the Talking Book Program.”

“TexShare databases are the best example of LSTA priorities.”

“I have found the provision of high quality training, such as the Harwood Institute and Family Place Libraries to be invaluable in helping me foster strategic partnerships in my community and with other libraries.”

“We have several patrons that use TexShare to study for the GED—some in English and some in Spanish. This is helpful to them because they are unable to leave their homes due to a variety of reasons and these programs are always current and easy to use.”

“LSTA funding and TSLAC funding have made it possible for libraries to save valuable historical collections and make them more widely available via digitization. They have encouraged vision in creating new services and collections aimed at special audiences, such as autistic children, military families and others. We have one phobic patron who never comes into the library, but utilizes our online resources all the time, and will occasionally call us for more information. He expressed gratitude once that we had all that, saying with his issues, he’d never be able to find the authoritative type of information the library provided elsewhere.”

“The impact grant helped us to partner with other organizations to provide services in the library.”

“Arlington partnered with Mansfield for a joint catalog. MY library, Wylie, offers an on-site library at the Senior Center and goes to the Senior Center and leads a book club. Several libraries in the DFW area used TSLAC to create MakerSpaces.”

“Dallas Public Library’s Homeless Engagement Initiative was recently awarded a third year of TSLAC grant funding. This project entails the streamlining of services at a specific help desk to serve the Central Library’s homeless population. This program has been instrumental in assisting hundreds with securing the information necessary to locate housing, work, family, and forms of support.”

“Edge has encouraged us to reach out and foster strategic partnerships with community organizations and services. Through Edge, we identify weaknesses/areas needing improvement, and then reach out to partners to help run the new programs.”

Academic Library Responses on Services or Initiatives that Support the LSTA Priorities

Fifty-five academic library respondents answered the question. Content analysis of the responses gave the following numbers of times each of the words appeared:

| Program | # of times cited |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Don't Know/NA | 13 |
| TexShare | 11 |
| Databases | 7 |
| Courier | 3 |
| Card | 3 |
| Interlibrary Loan | 9 |
| Talking Books Program | 9 |
| Grants (unspecified) | 3 |
| TexTreasures Grants | 3 |
| Special Projects Grants | 3 |
| Digitization | 1 |
| Library Cooperation Grants | 1 |
| Continuing Education | 1 |
| Consulting | 1 |

Examples of responses include:

“At the beginning of every semester, students come to the library looking for textbooks. Either their book is sold out at the bookstore, has not arrived yet, or their funds have not arrived. Teaching the student how to locate books and use the TexShare Card is a life saver and students truly appreciate it. Library service ratings always reflect high marks in this area.”

“For years, I believe the Texas State Library has been assisting visually impaired citizens through the Talking Book Program even before TexShare. This is a very worthwhile program.”

“Interlibrary loan services encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries, foster strategic partnerships with libraries, and serve individuals who find it difficult to use traditional library services.”

Other Library Responses on Services or Initiatives that Support the LSTA Priorities

Six of the respondents in the other library group provided answers.

For example, “TexShare and Community Engagement and Library Cooperation Grants provide services to a greater more diverse group of Texans.”

“Our friends group is making it possible in fostering strategic partnerships in our community.”

Question 8 asked respondents how the LSTA program in Texas could be improved. It also asked what program or programs should be prioritized and whether any new programs/initiatives were needed.

One hundred and ninety-two participants shared an answer. *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete responses to this question.)*

Public Library Responses on Improvements, Priorities, and New Initiatives

One hundred and twenty public library participants shared answers to this question. Some examples of their suggestions follow.

Improvements:

“More efficient guidelines for ILL should be studied and implemented.”

“I would distribute the funds on a formula basis and require they be spent on technology related equipment and programming. A simple report to state what the funds were spent on could provide the necessary feedback to justify the spending to the State and Federal government. Results would be more widespread and impact, especially in smaller libraries would be more impactful.”

“Expand the funding opportunities for the same project beyond 3 years. We have partners who see the need but are encouraging us to search for additional funding. I would rank the needs: computer classes, GED, ESL and E-books/e-content sharing equally.”

Priorities:

“I would keep the emphasis on training; keep ILL and TexShare programs. Expand TexShare database/digital offerings. Offer assistance (discounts for consultants/extensive training/survey advice/etc.) for long range planning.”

“Priority programs would be TexShare, ILL, digitization, and special programs.”

“Keep on doing what you’re doing. It makes a big difference for all Texans.”

“I think I would provide more emphasis on face to face training for rural librarians....Webinars are great alternatives but I find that I rarely am able to put aside the time needed to attend them. In a face to face setting you have no alternative but to be present and have very little means of distraction.”

New Initiatives:

“Programs for reaching the Hispanic community that work.”

“Statewide eBook collection through Overdrive or a similar vendor.”

“I would like more continuing education or programming related to working with adults. There are lots of resources for librarians who work with children....We could also use more information on working with senior citizens.”

Academic Library Responses on Improvements, Priorities, and New Initiatives

Sixty-six academic library participants shared answers to this question. Some examples of their suggestions follow.

Improvements:

“I wish I’d had more than a year to accomplish my grant. I’d have liked to be able to report THIS year for the services installed last year, but being used by my students now.”

“You are doing a great job and the service to our patrons is much appreciated.”

“I would rethink some of the programs. Are the reading programs providing a service that local libraries don’t provide anyway? Are there programs with costs that outweigh benefits? Streamlining and cutting some programs would allow better funding of quality programs.”

“Expand continuing education.”

Priorities:

“Continue TexShare databases and increase the number offered.”

“I think Cont Ed should be top priority. Perhaps showing librarians how to implement new programs and how to apply for the mentioned grants.”

“The TexShare card and databases are of the highest priority.”

New Initiatives:

“I know some of our classes are moving toward 3D applications which are not widely available because of design and cost.”

“Overdrive or some popular ebook/audiobook option.”

“Something aimed at early childhood development would be beneficial for the state as a whole. More Spanish resources would also be good.”

Other Library Responses on Improvements, Priorities, and New Initiatives

Six other library responses were shared. An example follows.

“I would improve the financial report: I would make it easier to complete. I think it is totally confusing. Every year I have problems completing it. The most important programs are summer reading, TexShare, and grants. There need to be more grants for small rural libraries.”