Outcomes of LSTA-Funded Projects to Commonwealth

Libraries of Pennsylvania

2003-2007

Table of Contents

5-YEAR EVALUATION REPORT FOR COMMONWEALTH LIBRARIES

I.   Introductory Statement

One respondent to a recent statewide survey of Pennsylvania adults (conducted for this evaluation) said, "Has the internet made the public library obsolete? Will it be in the near future?" The results of that survey and other evidence gathered for this report, indicate that the answer has to be no, not in Pennsylvania where over 72.8 percent report that they, or someone in their household, has a library card for their local public library, a significant increase from the 60 percent of households holding cards in 2002. Over half of library cardholders (53.1 percent) reported using the library in the past month. Federal funding has clearly contributed significantly to these and other important developments in library services to Commonwealth residents over the past 4-5 years.

The Office of Commonwealth Libraries, within the Pennsylvania Department of Education, operates a major research library and leads the development of the state's public, school, academic, and special libraries to meet the information, education, and enrichment needs of its residents. This translates into oversight of more than 7000 libraries with LSTA grants reaching a possible 467 state-aided public libraries, 219 academic libraries, 627 special libraries, and 6,469 private and public school libraries through direct sub grants.

During the first four years of this grant, the Office of Commonwealth Libraries distributed approximately $24,000,000 in grants to close to 400 libraries. The greatest portion of that money went to fund projects in pubic libraries ($9,000,000 +), followed by school libraries (nearly $3,000,000), academic libraries ($1,382,000), and special, consortium, multi-system, organization and association libraries. The State Library Administrative Agency used $9,490,183, for a significant number of state directed activities such as the POWER Library's technological infrastructure, One Book: Every Young Child and outcome based evaluation of their programs, as well as for administration.

A 37 percent reduction in the public library subsidy from $75,289,000.00 to $47,789,000 in 2002-2003 gravely affected Pennsylvania libraries' ability to provide services, enhance technology, build meaningful collections, and/or create innovative programs. In 2006 the subsidy was restored to the 2002-2003 level with a proposed increased of .03 percent in 2007-2008. During this period of greatly reduced state funding, LSTA grants are playing a critical role in helping libraries meet the needs of their communities, and, if the proposed minimal Pennsylvania library subsidy is adopted, LSTA will continue to play an essential role in Pennsylvania libraries.

The Commonwealth has used Federal LSTA funding from the 2003 fiscal year to date to accomplish four major goals: (1) Pennsylvanians of all ages have increased access to information, services for learning and educational resources in a variety of formats, from all types of libraries; (2) Library services will provide all users access to information via electronic networks and provide electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries; (3) All Pennsylvanians, regardless of geographic, cultural, socioeconomic background, disability or limited functional skills will have equal opportunities and equitable access to library information and collections; and (4) State-level leadership and services will strengthen and improve library services. Section II of this report provides detailed evidence of the extent to which each has been accomplished.

LSTA funding has been critical to accomplishing these goals, ones consistent with the goals of IMLS. In particular, LSTA funding has led to greater collaboration between libraries and other agencies and individuals. Through funding for the technical infrastructure of POWER Library, virtual reference (Ask Here PA) and digitization, LSTA funding has significantly extended access to resources for even the smallest and most rural public and school libraries. Citizens of Pennsylvania are able to get the information they want and need at a time and place convenient to them. Finally, since 2002, LSTA funding has provided support to increase the uses of outcome based evaluation at both the state and local level.

The most notable accomplishment, one that will help sustain both Federal and Commonwealth investments in libraries in the future, is evidence of increased collaboration between librarians and others. POWER Library necessitates collaboration between public and school libraries. Public libraries are also partnering with community agencies as part of the Family Place initiative, including Headstart, Department of Health and the Governor's Committee on Children and Health. School librarians and teachers are working together to build information literacy skills and, in the process, understanding each other's needs more clearly. As one librarian noted,

> *Prior to acquisition of the wireless laptop lab, I would estimate that fewer than 15% of our teachers brought their classes to the library for collaborative lessons. However, once we had use of the wireless laptops, over 60% of our teachers collaborated on lessons with the library!*

Evidence of the successes of POWER library is provided in greater depth in section III of this report. Ask Here PA, a virtual reference service begun less than 6 months ago, has already had 16,000 live chat questions and over 80 libraries are contributing staff time to the services and hundreds of Pennsylvania librarians are becoming expert at virtual reference. Grants for digitization provide access and support for scholarly and personal research.

Commonwealth Libraries has also used its Federal funding to strengthen outcome based evaluation both at the state and local levels. Major studies include one on return on investment in libraries, an evaluation of summer reading, an evaluation of the statewide One Book: Every Young Child initiative and this five-year evaluation. At the same time, the Commonwealth Libraries, District Library Center staff and the consultants to the five-year evaluation have developed several different approaches to helping individual libraries incorporate outcome based evaluation into their own work, including their assessment of LSTA funding.

One librarian summarized LSTA's impact well:

> *LSTA funding expands services to a library's users. The funds also give libraries with little funds, and/or libraries with financially conservative budgets [*an opportunity*] to experiment with services that they would be more willing to fund AFTER seeing that they are successful. The funds help libraries that can fund ongoing services, but cannot afford the initial technology to build the foundation for the services. The bottom line is that LSTA has been very instrumental in the documented increase in the use of … libraries.*

II.   Results in achieving goals, objectives and desired outcomes based on 5-Year Plan.

In this section, we list each State goal, provide information about each goal and evaluate the extent to which articulated outcomes have been achieved as of the writing of this report. Where illustrative, we also include quotes from surveys and interviews. LSTA requests information on the target outputs. Because libraries have not been consistent in their data collection and in scales of measurement, there are methodological problems in aggregating these output data. For this reason, we have listed all of the outputs and known outcomes project by project and year by year in documents appended [Appendix F] to this overall evaluation.

To help determine the extent to which these outcomes are being achieved, we conducted a web-based survey to 2200 Pennsylvania librarians listed in the Pennsylvania Directory of Libraries and to Commonwealth Libraries email list of school librarians. The consultants designed the survey with input from Bureau of Library Development (BLD) staff. The consultants conducted a second survey by postal mail to a stratified (by urban, rural and suburban residence) random sample of Pennsylvania residents. Several of the questions in this survey replicate questions asked in a 2002 BLD telephone survey of Pennsylvania residents regarding POWER Library thus allowing us to measure changes over the time of this 5-year grant. We supplemented data from these surveys with information from focus groups and individual interviews with Pennsylvania librarians, urban library directors, the Director of the State Library (and her staff) and Commonwealth Libraries staff. The evaluators also distributed and analyzed questionnaires to the two libraries for the blind and physically handicapped; and reviewed all funded grant applications (2003-2006) and final reports (2003-2006) from LSTA grantees. Finally, because we originally intended to use Family Place for an in-depth evaluation, the consultants conducted email surveys with Family Place grantees and with agencies partnering with Family Place libraries, as well as surveying teachers identified by school principals regarding partnerships with the school library. A full description of the methodology of this evaluation is the subject of Section VI of this report.

Goal I: Pennsylvanians of all ages have increased access to information, services for learning and educational resources in a variety of formats, from all types of libraries.

Program: Information Literacy *[107 projects funded totaling nearly $4,000,000.]*

A total of 91 projects have been funded thus far under this strategy. The intended activities, as stated by the Commonwealth's LSTA Five-year plan, have been to install computer labs; encourage use of wireless laptop labs; train students and library users; offer workshops; and provide professional development activities (workshops, courses, conferences, seminars, etc.) Since being funded by LSTA in 2002, a host of activities have been carried out at the state and local levels. Among them are:

Information literacy education using wireless laptop labs (52 went to school libraries); collaboration; training; curriculum support and development to meet Pennsylvania academic standards; professional development and training; information literacy in curriculum workshops – for example, university students worked with 8th graders to do projects; online school references resources, collaboration, training, project development; mobile laptop labs; computer classes in public libraries; school staff development workshops/in service training; electronic resources to support K-12 standards based curriculum; POWER library training.

The anticipated outcomes for the information literacy program were as follows:

- Increased knowledge by teachers of how the school library can enhance their instructional efforts
- Increased collaborative efforts between school librarians and teachers
- Increased ability by librarians to teach information literacy skills
- Increased information literacy skills

All [100 percent of] school library sub-grantees responding to our survey note some "Increased knowledge by teachers of how the school library can enhance their instructional efforts"[1] Fifty-three percent reported the grant led to "some" increased knowledge and 47 percent reported it led "a great deal" to teachers having increased knowledge of the school library's role. Over ninety percent [90.5 percent] report that information literacy grants have increased collaborative efforts between school librarians and teachers. Collaboration increased "a great deal" according to 52.4 percent of the librarians. It increased "some" for an additional 38.1 percent.

LSTA funding for training and education contributed to this success. Over half of the school librarians (57 percent) said grant activities have led "a great deal" to increased ability of librarians to teach information literacy skills with the remaining 43 percent saying these educational opportunities have increased their abilities "some." The greatest impact has been on the librarians. When asked "to what extent has grant funding from Commonwealth Libraries helped increase information literacy skills of teachers and library staff, 22 percent said it had helped *teachers* "a great deal" while 62 percent said it had helped *librarians* a great deal.

Unfortunately, many school grantees want to measure outcomes in terms of students increasing their PSSA scores. The BLD did award a sub-grant of $90,000 to 7 school districts for Pre-K to 12 Collection Development, to help meet the needs of PSSA. In a focus group with school librarians, the evaluation consultants talked to participants about the problems in using outcome measures related to standardized test scores: the number of mitigating factors in determining PSSA scores, the challenge of any kind of controlled study, the long lead time in trying to change student scores. It is discouraging because the librarians report that changes in standardized tests are the one measure their principals or others look to in evaluating performance. For this reason we were heartened by another kind of evidence of change offered by one of our respondents.

> *The most significant outcome* [of the information literacy grant] *is the number of students who successfully complete research assignments and subsequently pass classes. Several teachers have personally told me that last year was the first year that they had a 100% turn-in rate for research projects. Some are in the form of traditional papers; others are posters, power points or displays. This is due to the availability of computers for each student, plus the LCD projector used for teaching information literacy and research skills. I can personally say that last year and this year so far were the BEST years of my teaching career because I have had the technical tools in the library necessary to*

---

[1] In this and all subsequent reports of results from the librarians' survey, we have excluded those for whom a particular grant did not apply.

promote increased support and collaboration with other teachers. Thank you for this valuable program and support.

Examples from survey respondents also demonstrate the ways in which these grants have been useful for collaborative efforts between other types of libraries and schools with limited school media services. As one librarian in our survey noted:

Bradford County Library set up a program to visit the two surrounding school districts to inform about library service, and demo POWER Library Access from the BCL webpage. We also have classes from the local junior colleges come in for the same information. Since we are out in the middle of nowhere, it has increased student usage.

Program: Preserving Access
(18 projects funded for $2,247,925)

As part of the initiative to increase Commonwealth citizens' access to materials, Commonwealth Libraries funded eighteen digitization projects. These expand access to special collections, materials and online resources for all through the Access PA database, and provide training for their use. The development of virtual reference has also expanded access. The BLD's intention has been to increase the number of items and collections digitized; to increase the number of visits to digitized collections; inquiries to a statewide virtual reference service; and to improve virtual reference service response time.

The funded projects are diverse and include: digitization of: local history, local newspapers (Bethlehem Daily Times 1867-1890, Williamsport Grit, Lock Haven Express 1899-1925, the 19th century Columbia Spy), unique collections (collections of the Meadowcroft Museum of rural life, Wes Fisher musical scores, CCC camps in Fulton County, unpublished documents of noted gerontologist M. Powel Laughton, Creative Therapy in Arts theses, James Buchanan writings, industrial history of the Lehigh Valley, Allegheny Watershed history), primary source material from American Revolution era, Civil War, etc. Some of this has been in collaboration with historical societies. A review of the project demonstrates that unique primary source material is being preserved through digitization.

BLD anticipated the following outcomes by preserving access:

- PA residents will meet personal, educational and/or enrichment needs
- Increased user satisfaction with the time it takes to gain access to desired information
- Preserve primary source material

Those librarians who have received digitization grants feel strongly that their effort has opened their collection to a wider Pennsylvania audience, with 63.2 percent saying it has opened it "a great deal and 26.3 percent saying is has opened it "some." One library's evaluation study notes an increased usage of 50 percent from 5 years before the grant was given. Anecdotal evidence shows that Pennsylvania history and local collections from Pennsylvania libraries are now better known and more fully used. As one librarian noted:

Because of the materials that we have been able to develop on our Bethlehem Digital History Project website, the participating libraries (Bethlehem Area Public, Reeves Library of Moravian College and the Moravian Archives) have achieved a high profile among scholars in the US who are researching Bethlehem's history. We have received reference questions from such organizations as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the AFL-CIO, and the University of Chicago. Our own patrons are delighted with all the rare local history materials that were previously totally unavailable to them.

When asked about the difference made by these digitized collections, 63 percent of librarians say grants for this purpose enhance users' educational needs "a great deal." About one-third (37 percent) of the librarians say their grant for enhanced access has helped users meet personal needs "a great deal" and 44 percent say it enriches users lives "a great deal." One librarian stated, *"Many people have commented about learning about local history through the postcards, photos, and documents accessed directly through our webpage."* Another commented*, "Patrons have been very eager to see local history digitized so that it can be accessed. They want to see some of their family history which was fortunate enough to be included in the historic local paper…"*

The survey for librarians did not ask directly about user satisfaction with the time to gain access to desired information because it seems an unreliable measure.

Goal II: Library services will provide all users access to information via electronic networks and provide electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries.

Program: Building Library Technological Capacity
[102 projects funded for $4,368,398]

Within the overall program to build technological capacity, the output targets for grants have been to increase the number of libraries with enhanced technological capacity; the number of public libraries providing access to POWER Library; and the number of school libraries providing access to POWER Library.

Pennsylvania is one of the most rural of the United States. James Hollinger, Division Chief, Division of Library Improvement, Commonwealth Libraries notes "technology, digitization, automation would have never been able to happen, especially for less well off libraries, without LSTA. LSTA helps address equity." One example is Dushore Public Library. "*Our library received a grant to automate our circulation system and to put our catalog online.*" said the Dushore librarian, "*Patrons can now search our catalog from home…. Our library is located in a 100% rural county and some of our patrons live 20 miles away….*"

A total of 78 libraries have received sub-grants under this initiative and one of those entities, Health Sciences Libraries Consortium (HSLC), used the funds to automate nine institution libraries. The activities designed to improve technological capacity included: Technology upgrades, expansion and enhancement; Automation; PDAs for nursing students; Installation of wireless technology for access; Room expansion for community groups with laptop, projector and whiteboard; Authority control training; Website redesign; Computers/equipment/software; Website development (Frontpage,

Photoshop, Flashpoint), tutorial website; LANS/WANS installed; Electronic signage expanded across WAN; SEPCHE-cat virtual catalog installed; Online databases purchased (Learnatest, HeritageQuest)/expand network resources; Web linkages with district school libraries; e-books for school curriculum; PC reserve system.

The outcomes anticipated by Commonwealth Libraries were as follows:

- Residents and students have improved ability to find desired information
- Increased teacher use of library resources in curriculum
- Increased use of technology-based library services

Librarians believe these outcomes are being accomplished. Fully 91.7 percent of librarians responded "a great deal" to the question, "To what extent has the application of LSTA funds in [the area of] technology improved your users' abilities to find desired information?" And 85.5 percent said their "grant funded activities [have led to] increased use of technology-based library services. Of lesser, but still significant, impact appears to be grant activities in improving teachers' use of library materials where almost half (48 percent) said the grant funds for technology have increased teachers' uses of library resources in the curriculum "a great deal." In a certain sense this follows the idea "if we make it accessible, they will use it." We received extensive open ended comments on the librarians' surveys including the following:

> *The patrons from our economically distressed area depend on our computers and Internet access to research and apply for jobs online. Two patrons have recently been hired for jobs they would have had great difficulty researching and applying for without our resources.*

> *Our library switched from a stand-alone DOS system to our free countywide state-of-the-art circulation system, which now provides the county w/ access to our collection, which is one of the 5 largest in the county. In its first 3 years we have increased our ILL rout-outs to other libraries to approximately 6,000 items per month.*

> *Thanks to LSTA funding, we now have four libraries in our System that offer a Homework Help program. Four years ago, there were none. Additional computers and wireless access have made this improvement possible.*

Perhaps the most important accomplishment in the area of building technological capacity and providing technical support has been POWER Library. The Commonwealth has assumed full responsibility for POWER database costs. POWER's technological support, and training in the use of it, continues to be provided by LSTA funding through the BLD. Information about this initiative and its outcomes can be found in Section III of this report. As we note below, awareness of POWER Library increased from 4.0 percent of Pennsylvanians in 2002 to 9.0 percent by late 2006. In 2006 more Pennsylvanians [6 percent of those surveyed] report *using* POWER Library, than had *heard about it* in 2002.

An improved library technological infrastructure has clearly improved residents' and students' ability to find desired information. We know from the citizen survey that almost one-third (31.2 percent) of Pennsylvania citizens have, in the past six months, "used the Internet to find library resources." In 2002 only 12 percent of respondents "used online databases available

through [their] local public or school library to search for materials, get information, or conduct research.

We see in the reviews of the digitization grants and in the successes of POWER Library, that the infrastructure has led to increased *use* of technology-based library services. In the survey of librarians, 86 percent said the application of LSTA funds had improved "a great deal" their users' abilities to find desired information.

Even the sometimes hard to reach teachers were affected by grant making in this area. Only 12.5 percent of the librarians said building technological capacity had not increased teachers uses of library resources in curriculum; almost half [46 percent] said it has "some" effect; and 42 percent said that it had increased teachers' use "a great deal. A school librarian gave an example: "*A social studies teacher and I collaborated recently to find geography games about the continents. This was a very successful lesson with the students.*" Another noted, "*Teachers have come to rely more on library professionals as a source of information and for collaborative planning of curriculum.*" By making it easier for teachers to find materials through POWER Library, teachers are enriching their teaching with more library resources.

Information from the Return on Investment study that included a state-wide household telephone survey of adults 18 and over, and an in-library survey of 2,614 visitors in 19 public libraries and their branches, supports the conclusions of the librarians about the impact of the availability of remote access to library materials. Among other findings, adults accessed Pennsylvania libraries remotely an estimated 11.4 million times. In 63.7 percent of those visits, users sought to obtain information directly from a librarian or the library.

Program: Library Cooperation and Collaboration
[27 projects funded for $750,000]

This program area seeks to encourage resource sharing, cooperation and collaboration by strengthening current, and supporting the initiation of new, library systems and consortia. It has funded feasibility studies, planning grants, and projects to encourage state of the art interlibrary loan methods. The targeted output has been the number of new system/consortia services with anticipated outcomes of (1) enhanced services to library users; and (2) increased use of library resources.

The $750,000 in sub-grants resulted in important accomplishments to 27 libraries. One new consortium was established during this LSTA grant period and one project was dedicated to state-of-the-art ILL. LSTA funds supported multidistrict workshops on such areas as customer service. Other collaborative projects included: planning grants for strategic planning, community needs assessment, facilities master plan, and an action plan for library trustees.

These grants, too, are achieving their desired outcomes with 83.3 percent of librarians saying LSTA funds have helped them enhance services to users "a great deal", and 78 percent saying the funds have increased use of library resources "a great deal." Although not asked directly about this, citizens indicated—in open-ended responses—their satisfaction in this area. One respondent noted the library is "*Exceedingly collaborative in searching for materials not on hand, helpful in locating materials I can't find in the stacks - very responsive to community needs (eg children's programming, etc.)*"

Two other collaborative efforts worthy of mention due to the scope of their efforts and the development of sustainable partnerships are humanities programming with Pennsylvania Humanities Council and Ask Here PA, a collaboration between the Bureau of Library Development and 80 public and academic libraries in the Commonwealth:

The Pennsylvania Humanities Council (PHC) partnered with Commonwealth Libraries to increase humanities programming, especially in rural and underserved areas, in order to raise the capacity of libraries to develop themselves as centers for lifelong learning. A summit was convened to discuss specific needs and plan a future direction for relevant and stimulating programming. In 2005 alone, 931 adults attended 43 programs held at 39 libraries in 28 counties. One librarian exclaimed "*the most astonishing thing we learned was how desperate people are for intelligent, stimulating adult discussion! The discussions were like going back to college without the tuition payments and tests.*"

Ask Here PA is designed to provide fast answers to questions, using information found on the Internet and in proprietary databases funded by libraries. In most cases, Ask Here PA Librarians try to provide an answer online in 15 minutes or less. For questions that involve lengthy research, librarians try to get users started and/or provide a referral and/or offer to do additional research and follow-up via e-mail. The service also provides "group" support for groups and classes. Participating libraries now provide and receive this virtual service 24 hours a day, seven days a week and growth of use has been exponential.

Goal III: All Pennsylvanians regardless of geographic, cultural, socioeconomic background, disability or limited functional literacy or information skills will have equal opportunity and equitable access to library information and collections.

Program: Literacy
[110 projects funded for a total of $2,842,576]

The target outputs for grants in family, emergent and adult literacy were to increase the number of participating families, adults and children in various literacy programs; and to increase the number of training/information packets distributed. Overall, the anticipated outcomes BLD sought to achieve have been:

- Increased reading readiness
- Increased school readiness
- Increased reading skills
- Increased functional literacy skills
- Increased pleasure of reading for individuals

The types of projects funded in this area have included:

- Baby Steps to the Library program for parents of newborns (included staff training)
- Board and picture books for emerging readers with children. Staff training and training kit "Every Child Ready to Read" produced.

- Child development resources – "Learning is Essential for Children" training and "Raising Literate Children Begins at Birth" materials for families caregivers, staff
- Emergent literacy parent and teacher resources designed to strengthen family literacy. Workshops, programs, materials. Agency cooperation

Although librarians see some effects from these activities, they are much less likely to say they have seen "a great deal" of change than they are in answering questions about other grant initiatives. This may be a result of weak programming; but it is more likely that librarians alone are not able to make "a great deal" of difference in increasing literacy, particularly when the library activities are more passive, such as providing resources and materials. Increased literacy is also dependent on the efforts individuals make outside the library, reinforcement (such as languages spoken at home or with friends; or independent reading). Moreover, the outcomes of activities designed for pre-readers may only become apparent some time after a grant expires.

We found that only in answer to a question, "to what extent do you see increased pleasure in reading from activities supported by LSTA funding" did more than half (69.2 percent) of the librarians answer "a great deal." Almost 70 percent (69.2 percent) answered they had observed "some" difference both in the area of increased functional literacy and in increased reading readiness.

Commonwealth Libraries has invested significant LSTA funding in the area of family and emergent literacy for such things as ready-to-read workshops that include information on brain development and how to work with parents. In each of the three past years the Pennsylvania Library Association, with partial support from BLD LSTA funds, has published an eye-catching brochure on best practices in programs and services to support early learning.

Finally, the BLD has invested LSTA money to the development and support of summer reading programs. Researchers from Pennsylvania State University conducted an outcome based evaluation of participants in 2006 summer reading programs focusing on the questions: "Does a SRP increase literacy-supporting behaviors in participants? How can literacy-supporting behaviors be measured?[2] According to the Executive Summary:

> *…summer reading programs are an excellent tool to help students reduce summer learning loss and to maintain reading achievement levels.…. The overwhelming view among teachers was that the SRP helped students maintain reading levels, word recognition, vocabulary, comprehension and enthusiasm.…Surveys of parents and children showed that both the Summer Reading Program and the library were very popular. Overall, parents reported positive reading habits in their children. Almost 70% of families reported that they participated in 1-2 hours per week of library activities. Parents reported that their child frequently read before and after participation in the SRP. [p. 1-2, Executive Summary]*

The One Book: Every Young Child program, discussed below, has also been devoted to improving early childhood literacy.

---

[2] See Appendix C

Program: Services to Specific Groups

LSTA funding has provided support for specialized services, outreach and approaches to library service delivery. As specified in Commonwealth Libraries original plan, the targets of these grants have been to establish family centered services, special collections, programs for young adults and older adults, homework help centers and additional bookmobile stops; distribute information packets to older adults; purchase equipment for non-English speaking persons; and install kiosks and assistive devices.

Not surprisingly the projects funded in this area are extraordinarily varied and cover the following:

- Family Place,
- Urban Library Grants, Library Services to Urban Populations
- 21 struggling high school grants of $10,000 each to lowest scoring schools in the PSSA test, and for the purpose of purchasing print materials/resources to support the achievement of the PA Academic Standards
- Materials in other languages/bilingual materials/geared to special populations
- Materials for children, teens, seniors
- Materials for home-schoolers
- After school homework help
- Senior resource centers
- Assistive technology
- Health literature initiative to help low literacy adults
- Adults new readers literacy collection for those with low literacy skills and those whose native language is not English, bilingual – family literacy, ESL core collection, picture books, workforce development, pleasure reading, training for volunteers, library staff, and tutors
- Bookmobile for Amish, Mennonite, and Latino communities
- Computers in local libraries and hospital libraries with patient education, software programs at a 6th-8th grade level in English and Spanish
- Collection development to Spanish speaking patrons – teen and adult fiction/nonfiction, bilingual books, materials on careers, GED training, and working and interview skills
- Hands-on computer instruction to seniors and the homebound
- Services to Hispanic population: collection development strategy to meet needs, translator hired, web sections put in Spanish, Youth Services department working with local churches, computer classes in Spanish, parenting information, citizen workshop, staff workshops
- Migrant education: homework help centers with certified teachers hired and high school volunteers as tutors, parenting classes with specialists hired, childcare programs, basic and advanced ESL classes, and furniture, supplies, materials and incentives purchased
- Mobile laptop labs for inner city population
- E-branch information kiosk to provide information access to underserved areas
- Special collections for reluctant readers
- Community Resource and Education Center to provide equity of access
- TTYs
- Bookmobile collections to enhance access to underserved populations

- Miniature branch outlets created to expand outreach
- Books by mail to the homebound

Overall, librarians feel these programs have come close to achieving anticipated outcomes, although these outcomes were broad and relatively unspecific as stated in the 2002 BLD plan. Moreover, the citizen survey also suggests these efforts have made a difference to many citizens.

The anticipated outcomes and achievements are:

- Increased independence in accessing library services

Over half (52.4 percent) of librarians receiving grants under this goal believe their activities increased independence of their users in accessing library services, "a great deal" and the remaining 47.6 percent said independence has been increased "some."

- Increased ability to get information needed/wanted

A large proportion—74 percent of librarians—say that grant activities in this area have increased their "ability to get information users need and/or want" by "a great deal." In 2002 only 25 percent of Pennsylvanians said they had Internet access at home. In our 2006 study, 74.1 percent reported such access. Although a digital divide remains, these statistics suggest that LSTA supported efforts to make reference, database searching and digitized collections available have clearly increased the ability of users to obtain the information they need or want. And it has also increased their independence in obtaining it.

- Increased satisfaction with library services

Librarians evaluate equally well the ways their grants have been able to increase user satisfaction. Fully 76 percent say "a great deal" in answer to the question about this goal. Users asked "How well do you think your library meets the particular needs of your community?" were equally enthusiastic: 30.9 percent answered "extremely well" and an additional 55.5 percent said, "above average."

- Increased library responsiveness to specific user needs based on individual characteristics

Finally, when asked, "To what extent did grant activities increase your library's responsiveness to specific user needs based on individual characteristics?" 70 percent said, "A great deal." In answer to the question, "Do you have any physical condition(s) which make using the library or library materials difficult for you?" 5.6 percent of Pennsylvanians responded yes. We do not have baseline data to know whether these responses represent an increase or decrease over time, nor do we know if the individuals reporting a physically limiting condition have actually tried to use the library either in person or online.

Three special programs deserve particular mention because of the number of individuals they serve and the populations they serve. These are the Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, the four Pennsylvania urban libraries serving populations of over 100,000 and the Family Place Library initiative related to family literacy.

Services to Blind and Physically Handicapped *[$480,000 funding]*

The Office of Commonwealth Libraries administers state funding to Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. LSTA funding from 2003-2007 have help these libraries meet goals such as:

- Support and encourage independent and private use of libraries by Pennsylvanians with disabilities
- Begin the transition to distribution of digital talking books

LSTA funding has been used for these libraries to:

1. Develop and support a system for a voice-activated public access catalog via telephone (VO-PAC) to enable independent and private search-and-order capability 24/7 for readers who have no computer or internet access. After an August 1, 2005 rollout, 25 readers contacted the Pittsburgh LBPH, the second week saw an additional 27 readers. As of November 2006, 170 unique users have registered for a password, 886 calls have been made generating 1,294 item requests. A positive outcome is that users of the system now experience faster service with no hold time or busy signals while extending reader advisors' customer service time for other callers. Unfortunately, there is not enough funding to market the VO-PAC beyond LBPH newsletters.

2. Establish a "Mobile LBPH" outreach program that will heighten the public's awareness of services in order to reach the 150,000+ additional eligible readers, and with particular focus on senior citizens in areas outside of Allegheny and Philadelphia Counties. The van visits a variety of sites including senior centers, public libraries, nursing homes, disability agencies, and a discount store.   The number of new readers registered with the Pittsburgh LBPH increased by 7.2 by the end of 2004. Additionally, the project earned the library the 2004 Marietta Y. King & Alberta Walden Still Diversity Award. An example of project success was demonstrated when, returning from an outreach visit, Pittsburgh's van was stopped at a traffic light when a passenger in the neighboring car called out, "Do you have Harry Potter? My friend's blind." The staff responded affirmatively and told him to write down the toll-free number. "I already did!" he said as the light changed and the car pulled away. In Philadelphia the van traveled 23,064 miles to 26 counties.

3. Begin transition from analog to digital talking books. This project, in its implementation stage, will circulate digital talking books, produce masters of regional-interest materials and convert the prior analog masters of the LBPHs' Pennsylvania Collections.

Additional examples of the outcomes of LSTA funding in this goal area can be found in the interviews with recipients of urban library grants and of the evaluators' assessment of Family Place Libraries.

Urban library grants *[$1,414,000 funding*]

LSTA funds were used to enhance services to urban populations at libraries located in Erie, Allentown, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia. The funds supported multi-year projects that are examples of how profoundly libraries can impact lives.

Understanding that computer skills are essential for acquiring education and competing for jobs the Carnegie Library in Pittsburg operated a PC Center at the East Liberty Branch, a library that serves a population of 36,684 predominately minority and low income groups .The PC Center provides free classes and staff assisted open work time computer sessions. By providing access, the branch supplies the neighborhood with the opportunity to use the same informational tools as those with computers at home and at work. The center, in partnership with SeniorNet, provided 20 classes a month and averaged 110 hours of open work time/mo. (from 10/03 – 8/04 185 computer classes to 1,563 students, 1,445 open work time hours with 20,237 users). As a result, library card registrations increased and new customers are coming in. Customer comments are extremely positive – they could not afford classes on their own and class evaluations indicate that over 90 percent agreed that the classes provided the type and scope of information they expected and felt they would be able to continue working on their own; 100 percent found handouts useful and instructors knowledgeable and able to answer their questions. Without LSTA funds there would be fewer classes, less expertise in instruction and limited or no access to the center.

To meet the needs of thousands of low income children, teens and adults, the Free Library of Philadelphia undertook a total web redesign to make access better and easier (hits have doubled); created online homework help (participation has doubled); purchased career resources and materials that enabled users of all ages and literacy levels to explore information on changing careers, job search techniques and emerging employment fields; and expanded children's programming outreach. For example, a specialist was hired to work with all types of elementary schools, and partnerships were established with organizations such as the Police Athletic League to recruit low income children and families. This helped cause a 67 percent increased in program attendance from 7/03-7/04. Observation by library staff and an analyses of customer surveys and feedback indicate that library use in all areas has increased. Additionally, a branch librarian reports that 2 students with poor grades used homework help and are now hooked. The kids come in daily to do homework and their grades have improved dramatically – they are now getting As and Bs, the librarian reports.

The Allentown Public Library is situated in an economically distressed area with a high poverty/illiteracy level. It has partnered with local schools and colleges to provide educational assistance to school-age children. It offered computer classes in English and Spanish at least twice weekly, conducted computer training at social services agencies, provided access to the 25 books/year that each student is required to read, provided professional help for those needing to create resumes, conduct job searches, improve reading and/or writing skills. It provided YA programs to encourage kids to read including Manga and Anime programs, and a Readers Theater program for elementary age children. As the library director points out "*it is part of the culture of the library to understand the plight of many in this environment and they are proactive in offering myriad levels of service, including personal intervention*". An analysis of surveys administered showed that many participants had developed better job skills and some had gotten jobs as a result of classes).

The Erie Public Library improved and expanded outreach services and programs geared to inner city children and families by instituting a Live Homework Help program for students grades 4-12 and partnering with the Housing Authority to create a depository rotating collection and programming opportunities at 2 centers run by the YMCA. Families living in this area have the highest percentage of people unemployed and living below the poverty level. The goals of these programs are to foster self-sufficiency, love of reading, to improve reading skills and to make children comfortable with using the library.

All involved with the urban library projects confess that the programs would not have occurred without LSTA funding. Very simply, the impact of not having funding would be devastating.

Family Place libraries

Family Place libraries provide a special example of success for Pennsylvania libraries. In this initiative, almost four dozen libraries (44) have been funded to allow libraries to join a network of children's librarians nationwide who believe that literacy begins at birth and that libraries can help build healthy communities by nourishing healthy families.

Family Place involves redesign of library space as well as programming. It affects families by offering parents and caregivers of very young children a welcoming and supportive environment that promotes healthy child development and access to community services. A specially designated area in the Children's Room serves as the locus for information and resources for parents and caregivers. Near this, is an open area, available to families, which includes picture books, puzzles, learning toys, board books, train layouts, dollhouses, Lego tables, and puppet playhouses.

The evaluators sent a brief questionnaire via email to each Family Place library funded through 2005. It asked the librarian who had received the training how helpful the training was, and requested examples of how the training was applied. We also asked, "Have you seen any changes in your library that you can attribute to the focus on the library as a family place? If yes, can you give us examples? If no, please tell us what obstacles you encountered." These data were supplemented by interviews with Family Place librarians who were attending a workshop in September, 2006.

Librarians say that training for Family Place libraries was effective and well done. A respondent to the questionnaire echoed others when she said, "The training was excellent and it helped me to understand the program well enough to explain to the 5 libraries that I was going to coordinate the program for." Librarians were consistently enthusiastic about Family Place, many stating that the initiative had made a deep and, they expect, abiding impact on their library. As one noted

> *… Young Latino parents who have not been traditional library users became comfortable in the library - are learning what services are available to them in the community - how to get help with specific parenting issues - and having good experiences with their children in the library.*

The value to the library is not just internal. Another respondent, speaking about the changes she has seen, said

> … *We have never paid any of our resource professionals yet they still continue to come back and support the program. We feel that the lines of communication with local agencies, schools and professionals have opened up for us because of the Family Place concept.*

In a follow-up survey, the evaluators asked Family Place libraries to give us the names of institutions with which they had partnered and brief surveys were sent to the directors of these agencies asking about their experiences with the partnerships. Some examples of these agencies are the YMCA, WIC nutrition program, Cooperative Extension, Department of Health and the Visiting Nurses Association.

We received ten responses to these surveys from one-fourth of the libraries funded to date. A number of librarians have been hesitant to give the evaluators contact information of their partnering agencies. Staff at the BLD expressed disappointment that these partnerships have expanded at a rate slower than they would have liked to see, particularly because of the examples of success. From the partnering community institutions we were able to survey, we found a general increase in appreciation for the library and recognition of the services the libraries can deliver. Family Place appears to have opened the eyes of partnering agencies to possibilities of working with their local libraries and indeed librarians we interviewed report some examples where partnering agencies are now asking the libraries to conduct programs at the agencies. We suspect though that the libraries will need to continue to take the lead if they wish to encourage and engage in future collaborative relationships.

Goal IV: State-level leadership and services will strengthen and improve library services.

Program: Library Development

The purpose of this goal is to manage advisory and consultative services; administer continuing education programs; collect, preserve and publish library statistics; promote and demonstrate library service; study library problems and make the findings available; administer state funds; and to facilitate a youth services task force.

To accomplish this goal, the Bureau of Library Development has held workshops and institutes, carried out and disseminated information about a series of research projects, and undertaken other activities designed to increase the effectiveness of library programs and services (both traditional and technologically provided), number of participants in summer reading programs, and to increase the number of cooperative programs. Between 2002 and 2006, Commonwealth Libraries has delivered an extraordinary range of programs to accomplish the desired outcomes discussed below. Among them are the following:

> Professional development for librarians serving youth, funds to district libraries for family literacy activities, School Librarian Toolkit updated to reflect state standards, informational material, technology consultant did survey to identify uses of technology, age of equipment, training needs, automation vendors, use of databases, etc; School Library professional development workshops; Leadership Workshops for district

consultants; Older Adults Task Force; Latino/multicultural workshops; Advisory Services to all types of libraries (4300); Continuing education for academic Librarians via College and Research Division of the PA Library Association; Early Childhood collections to enhance and support the DLC educational initiatives; Annual Institution Librarians training; Annual Bookmobile and Outreach Services Conference; Masters degree award program; Accounting Manual – distribution and training; Partnership with Pennsylvania Humanities Council to put humanities programming in public libraries where there has been little or no programming since 2000; Affiliation with early learning organizations; Best Practices Guide; Best Practice awards; Reading First elementary library grants to support reading skills in grades K-2, and to support school curriculum and PA Academic Standards; Governor's Advisory Council; and District Library Center Collection Development for non-fiction materials in subject areas of demonstrated need.

Two of the most significant programs are (1) an Annual Institute for Trustees and Friends to assist them in improving library services; and (2) the One Book: Every Young Child program.

Data from the Trustee Institute in 2006 reveals the impact of this program. Held at two different locations in the Commonwealth each for a two-day period of time, 594 (429 Trustees and 165 Friends) participated in this event. Among the sessions were "Recruiting and Retaining the Peak-Performance Board" and "Developing a Dynamic Board/Library Director Relationship." Evaluations of these workshops were strongly positive, citing the number of new ideas, the range of topics covered and the excellent and organized speakers.

The One Book: Every Young Child program is a dynamic partnership of Pennsylvania organizations that includes the Office of Commonwealth Libraries, the Departments of Public Welfare and Education, the Children's Museum of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Public Television, Boyds Mills Press, Verizon, the Pennsylvania Child Care Association and others. Its goal is to highlight the value of early literacy development in preschoolers through a multifaceted approach that helps adults engage with children in activities surrounding books and reading. One Book: Every Young Child program has many activities associated with it. These include author visits, programs in libraries and museums, and traveling trunks with puppets, games and materials that encourage activities with young children around one particular book. Among the evaluators recommendations are (1) The One Book: Every Young Child state-wide program should be continued and (2) Local libraries have great potential for use as an effective statewide delivery system for literacy programming. This kind of a delivery system might be especially useful for literacy interventions targeting low-income communities, those most in need of these services.[3]

Anticipated Outcomes from Library Development Grants :

- Increased community understanding and appreciation of libraries – 25 percent

---

3.[3] See Appendix E for Executive Summary or the report by Temple University

In 2006, 78.3 percent of Pennsylvanians, regardless of whether they used the public library, said it was "very important" for their community to have a public library." An additional 17.4 percent said it was "important." Throughout the sub-grantee annual reports we find examples of increased community understanding and appreciation, with perhaps the Family Place projects being the clearest example, and the success of those generally attributable to the workshops offered by Commonwealth Libraries. [See appended charts for details.]

- Increased ability of libraries to be responsive to their communities—10 percent

When asked, "How well do you think your library meets the particular needs of your community," 88.7 percent of Pennsylvanians surveyed answered "extremely well" or "above average." One of the activities mentioned several times by librarians has been funding for some staff to obtain the M.S. in Library and Information Science.

These findings are supported by the Return on Investment study, as evidenced in one summary statement

> *Pennsylvania public libraries are used extensively because their information and services are found to be trustworthy, the best source available to users, and convenient or easy to use. Furthermore, users rate information from library resources or services as being of high quality, trustworthy, up-to-date, and complete. As a result of using this information, users save time and money. They also indicate that they found answers to most of their questions and that the information led to favorable outcomes. (ROI, see appendix)*

- Increased rate of school/public library cooperation – 150 cooperative partners

It is clear this outcome has been achieved. First, to take advantage of POWER Library, a school library must partner with a public library. In 2003 alone, 3,673 public and school librarians participated in the POWER Library Program. One hundred and six were new to the program. Training on new databases reached 1,046 librarians. Second, an LSTA funded Pennsylvania Library Association program in collaboration with Commonwealth Libraries encourages partnerships between schools and public libraries to prepare children to be ready for school. Finally, the Youth Services Task Force of Commonwealth Libraries held a 2005 institute to raise awareness of services to teens. The requirement for attendance by a public librarian was to bring school personnel to the workshop and to return home to realize a teen partnership in collaboration with a local school and other local agencies.

- Increased ability of libraries to be adaptable to changing environments through research and special studies – 10 percent implement at least 1 new program

The expectation of an "Increased ability of libraries to be adaptable to changing environments through research and special studies – 10 percent implement at least 1 new program." Since the Summer Reading Program and ROI research were concluded in 2006, it is premature to determine the extent to which these special studies will lead to new programs, but the results of each of these studies are powerful tools for librarians to begin to use.

- Strengthen services to all library users – 10 percent of libraries report at least 2 new services

A project-by-project review of sub-grantees final reports indicates that at least 20 percent of the grants have been for new services. (We did not conduct a survey of libraries as organizational entities.) A substantial majority of grants to Pennsylvania libraries have been used to strengthen services to library users and final reports (see appended summary) point to a number of ways this has been accomplished.

Discovered need: Collections to be shared with community agencies

Sharing of collections has been an outcome of Family Place libraries and one of the achievements noted by partnering agencies. The partnerships themselves have promoted the value of library staff and programs to the goals of these outside agencies.

Not yet mentioned is Pennsylvania's unusual efforts to support school libraries, support that is not generally offered with LSTA funds by other states. This is in line with the commitment to strengthen services to all users. The most notable achievement is POWER Library in the schools (discussed below); but there are others, including providing funds to update collections, collection development grants to "struggling schools", workshops for school librarians and partnering public libraries, technology enhancements, and Reading First grants.

Program: State Library of Pennsylvania

This program is intended to assure the Commonwealth has a state library to support all government entities, as well as special needs of other libraries and the residents of Pennsylvania. The key output targets for this goal were to increase the number of visitors, number of materials borrowed in house and via interlibrary loan, number of new holdings and number of preservation consultations provided. These objectives are intended to achieve three outcomes, each related to fulfilling user needs and satisfaction.

Anticipated Outcomes:

- Meet the informational and research needs of government – 80 percent of users from government agencies report satisfaction with holdings
- Meet the resource needs of all types of libraries – 80 percent of PA libraries report satisfaction with the services available
- Meet the informational and enrichment needs of residents – 70 percent of users report having their informational or enrichment needs met at least 70 percent of the time

LSTA funding has been used to strengthen the law collection and, to assist in several other statewide initiatives, including the following:

- Preservation project – construction of a state off the art vault, to preserve documents of historical value to the Commonwealth

- Preservation specialist to oversee rare books room and to assist other libraries in Pennsylvania with preservation and conservation of materials
- Augment general collections and newspapers
- Provide ILL
- Provide Licenses for databases

.

A survey of 100 users conducted in September 2005 by the State Library found almost universal satisfaction with the Library (only one individual said he or she was not satisfied). The features ranked most helpful are the collection and the staff of the State Library. Many comments praised the staff's helpfulness. The limitations of the survey limit our ability to assess whether the numerical objectives were, in fact, met by funding to the State Library. But, in late 2006, the State Library conducted a local LibQual study that indicates the State Library is unsatisfactory in many dimensions. The relatively new Director of the State Library intends to shift the focus away from the State Library acting as a public library in order to concentrate on the research services of the State Library as a collection of materials for, by and about Pennsylvanians. If so, there are obvious implications for the ways in which the State Library delivers services and the extent to which it will meet the needs outlined in the above objectives. This may also impact funding from the BLD.

Program: LSTA Program Administration

The purpose of this program is to provide consultation and information on LSTA programs and report development by monitoring compliance with LSTA law, reviewing reports, coordinating site visits, providing reports to the federal government, and managing the sub grant program.

Anticipated outcomes of this program have been to:

- Strengthen LSTA sub-grant program – 95 percent of sub-grant programs address at least one demonstrated need of their target audience.

- Enhance outcomes of LSTA programs – 60 percent of state directed programs include at least one outcome and indicator, and 60 percent of sub-grantees that report results for at least one outcome in their annual report

Within this area, Bureau of Library Development staff has have been diligent. Outcome Based Evaluation is embedded in the grant application process and BLD staff members, as well as evaluators, have provided assistance to sub-grantees. Although not achieving an overall rate of 60 percent, by this past year slightly more than half (51 percent) of libraries' final reports included outcome based measurement of evaluation, a strong improvement from the first grant year, when 18 percent of sub-grantees' final reports had conducted outcome based evaluation.

BLD has been strengthening other aspects of the sub-grant program—quite successfully according to members of focus groups of librarians. Under the direction of the State Aid Administrator, BLD has produced a new training manual and offered 5 training sessions in its use; it has completed the transition from manual collection and mainframe data analysis of state library statistics to online collection and analysis through Bibliostat Collect. This has improved administrative efficiency and assists library managers and the BLD in reporting.

To strengthen the sub-grant program, BLD has been involved in the development of an eGrant system for grant applications, and in streamlining the signature process. The evaluators discovered a number of areas in which librarians would like improvement, but they note that under the eGrant system 25 percent more grants were awarded. BLD staff noted that they feel they could be more successful with school libraries.

III.   Results of In-Depth Evaluation

POWER Library is a major initiative of Commonwealth Libraries to help achieve Goal 3: All Pennsylvanians, regardless of geographic, cultural, socioeconomic background, disability or limited functional skills will have equal opportunities and equitable access to library information and collections. It is also aligned with Goal 2, activities of which have included providing supporting technologies to libraries to enable easy access to POWER Library

POWER Library, the technical infrastructure of which is supported by LSTA funding, through Commonwealth Libraries, provides access to 41 databases to public libraries, and to K-12 school libraries in partnership with them. Users may gain access either at home using their library card, or through their local libraries. Currently, 3,924 libraries have signed the licensing agreement to use POWER Library. A tally of number of uses is impressive, with approximately 10 million uses in the first eight months of POWER in 2004 to over 12 million in its last three months of use in 2006.

In addition to access to these databases, Commonwealth Libraries has provided extensive training and technical support for POWER Library. They continued to add new databases with state funding through 2005, have professionally produced a training manual with LSTA funds, made technological changes to support new browser requirements, coordinated training for new databases and created a new user interface. In 2002, Commonwealth Libraries conducted a survey of 800 Pennsylvania citizens to identify levels of knowledge and use of POWER Library. This has provided one baseline measure for evaluation for this report.

In evaluating POWER Library, the evaluation consultants drew on data from both the citizens and librarians surveys. They also analyzed each sub-grantee project that provided POWER Library training in order to understand increased awareness and usage. This information was supplemented by interviews with Commonwealth Libraries staff.[4] When invited to add any other comments on "the impact of LSTA funding on libraries in the Commonwealth" over one-third of the comments mentioned POWER Library spontaneously. These provided useful insights to supplement the more focused collected information.

The greatest indication of success in achieving this goal comes from our survey of Pennsylvania adults. When Commonwealth Libraries conducted their survey of 800 Pennsylvania residents in 2002, only 4 percent of Pennsylvania residents had "seen, read or heard anything about a library service in Pennsylvania known as the POWER Library?" When asked the same question in late 2006, fully 9 percent said, "yes" to the same question. Of those who said in 2006 that they knew about it, almost two-thirds (65.3 percent) said they, or a member of their household, had used it.

---

[4] We should note that we had originally intended to use Family Place for an in-depth study. As the evaluation proceeded it became clear that POWER Library was having a ubiquitous impact across all goals, and across many of the public and school libraries within the Commonwealth.

With few exceptions, librarians praise POWER Library and the way in which it increases access for their users. Regardless of whether they had received a specific LSTA grant, all librarians in the survey were asked, "To what extent have the databases of POWER Library, provided through funding from the Bureau of Library Development, made a difference in reference service to your users?" In answers, 69.1 percent said "A Great Deal"; 22.9 percent said "some"; and only 8 percent said "none." As one explained it:

> *The value of POWER Library far exceeds the actual cost per user. Library customers have used data to improve their everyday lives, improve their ability to be hired, enrich their homework, and learn more about any topic of interest. We are so fortunate to have such a program in PA. Training provided by Commonwealth Libraries has been first rate and has been of benefit to library staff.*

Another librarian said,

> *The POWER Library databases have been a wonderful addition to the resources available to our patrons. Our library is small and very rural. Having access to the multitude of information in the databases puts our library on the same playing field as the much larger libraries in urban areas.*

A particularly exuberant librarian praised POWER by saying,

> *POWER Libraries is AMAZING! It has leveled the playing field for the small and rural libraries. Their patrons never leave empty handed. It is a fantastic resource for students of all ages as well as adults. The libraries in our area could not afford such access on our own. Thank you!!*

Clearly POWER increases access to library databases significantly, and has become important to rural and school libraries. Moreover, the workshops and training offered by Commonwealth Libraries strongly supports librarians. We would suggest this support is a major reason for the high level of enthusiasm for POWER. As one librarian said, "*The POWER Library resources provide an abundance of materials our school would not otherwise have. The professional development and support that goes with it helps me to do an effective job.*"

We identified two significant challenges as POWER develops: first, the need to improve publicity for POWER Library; second, the desire of librarians to improve the technical interface.

One Commonwealth Library staff member discussed the issue of publicity when they talked about the most recent (2004) public advertising campaigns held for POWER.   That person believes it happened in too short a time period and did not have sufficient planning for the campaign to be effective.   A number of librarians agree with this.

> *POWER Library continues to be the best kept secret in the Commonwealth. Too many librarians see learning to use it as something extra and optional, rather than a necessary part of their jobs. It is disheartening to speak to professionals who are unaware of what this resource can do. More training? More widespread publicity? Perhaps a partnership with PPPTN?*

Several respondents to the librarian survey also noted problems with the POWER interface. One said patrons find difficult to use; another supported that complaint when talking about the difficulty some users experienced when trying to access it.

IV.   Progress in showing results of library initiatives or services

The Bureau of Library Development has undertaken significant initiatives to use outcome based evaluation as a basic assessment tool for LSTA funded and other projects. The four statewide activities include (1) a recently completed study on the return on investment in Pennsylvania libraries; (2) an evaluation of the summer reading program; (3) the Temple University evaluation of *One Book: Every Young Child* and (4) this evaluation of the five-year LSTA funding. As noted above, we have appended to this evaluation copies of the first three reports.

As part of the third initiative, the evaluators for the five-year plan reviewed every proposal funded for the 2005 funding cycle, and will review those in the 2007 cycle. The purpose of the 2005 review was to determine the extent to which the projects had well developed outcome measures. For those that did not, the evaluation team developed possible methods for each library and, for many, provided survey instruments they could use. The team members also offered to consult with librarians on the design of their evaluation and subsequently talked to a small number (fewer than ten) of librarians. As noted above, a review of the final reports of these 2006 grants reveals that over half the applicants embedded OBE into their grant evaluation.

In planning for the overall five-year evaluation, the evaluation consultants' surveys focused on outcomes of LSTA funded activities. And how improved outcome based evaluation became a major topic of one of the focus groups, in terms of how to strengthen the grant-making process.

V.   Lessons Learned

Two lessons learned seem particularly important for future planning. From the beginning of this evaluation process we have recognized the importance of collecting baseline data—not simply for overall evaluation, but also for evaluation of programs at the library level. In working with Pennsylvania librarians we found them quite open to OBE, but there is also a need for training and consultation. Many do not appear to understand the need to define the "universe" when setting percentage targets. They struggle to develop standard measures. Few have a concept of a logic model. It sometimes seems difficult for them to imagine how to specify outcomes at a realistic level. And, as we saw in the case of schools, librarians are sometimes expected by outside parties to achieve unrealistic outcomes, like an improvement in PSAA scores. These issues have been recognized both by the evaluators and by Commonwealth Libraries staff. Emphasizing OBE more will lead to better planning and grant implementation, as has already been seen over the 3 years of this evaluation.

On a second matter we have noted the importance of several centrally funded projects such as POWER Library. There will always be a certain tension between the proportion of LSTA money allocated to state-directed programs and that to competitive grants. Most of those interviewed felt the current process works well, and no librarians in focus groups or on surveys

indicated any concern about the current formula. Certainly a significant amount of money spent on state-directed programs is having, or will have, a clear and visible impact locally. For example, the return on investment survey will provide important tools and resources that can be used locally. The fact that centrally funded initiatives may affect a larger number of libraries than if the same resources were allocated to individual libraries, has led to a slight shift toward state directed programs in funding LSTA grants.

VI.   Brief description of evaluation process

In fall 2004, the Bureau of Library Development contracted with two independent consultants, Leigh S. Estabrook, Ph.D. and Jan O'Rourke, M.L.S, to carry out this evaluation of this five-year LSTA grant. The evaluation involved surveys, interviews and focus groups with various stakeholders, including the citizens of the Commonwealth.

To determine the extent to which these outcomes were achieved, the evaluation consultants conducted a web-based survey to 2200 Pennsylvania librarians listed in the Pennsylvania Directory of Libraries and to a Commonwealth Libraries email list of school librarians. The Directory includes librarians from all types of Pennsylvania libraries, but does NOT include all librarians. The evaluation consultants designed the survey with input from Bureau of Library Development (BLD) staff. It was distributed by BLD staff member James Hollinger, using Survey Monkey software. After one mailing in October 25th, 2006, and one follow-up, 553 responses were received, a response rate of 25 percent. Of those, 12.5 percent were from academic libraries; 41 percent, from public; 38.9 percent, from school, 4.2 percent, from special and .6 percent from institution libraries. An additional 2.8 percent listed themselves as "other" or skipped the question. Of those respondents, 35.5 percent reported their library had received LSTA fund since 2002, 15.5 percent did not know (note the question was about the library, not about the librarian), and 49 percent said no.

The evaluation consultants conducted a second survey by postal mail to a stratified (by urban, rural and suburban residence) random sample of 1600 Pennsylvania residents. The first mailing was sent in early October, 2006. A final and fourth mailing—by certified mail, was sent in late November, 2006. (Each survey went out over a several day period of time.) The valid response rate for the citizen survey was 37.3 percent (N=1510). Several of the questions in this survey replicate questions asked in a 2002 BLD telephone survey of Pennsylvania residents regarding POWER Library.

The evaluation consultants supplemented the questionnaire data with information from focus groups. Two groups were conducted in 2006. The first consisted of 10 school librarians from all areas of the state, and represented school libraries of various sizes. The second group was comprised predominantly of public librarians. It also included one academic librarian and one from the Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The purpose of the groups was to examine the grant making process, the value of LSTA funded projects to their libraries and their application of outcome based evaluation to their grants. The evaluators conducted individual interviews with Pennsylvania librarians, urban library directors, the Commissioner for Libraries, the Director of the State Library and Commonwealth Libraries staff, almost all of which were done face-to-face. The evaluators also distributed and analyzed questionnaires to the two libraries for the blind and physically handicapped; and reviewed all funded grant

applications (2003-2006) and final reports (2003-2006) from LSTA grantees. Finally, because we originally intended to use Family Place for an in-depth evaluation, the consultants conducted email surveys with Family Place grantees and with agencies partnering with Family Place libraries. We also surveyed teachers identified by school principals regarding partnerships with the school library.

Finally, as the above narrative indicates, the consultants drew on two other outcome based evaluations that have been conducted by the BLD in the past year.

Appended to this report is a summary of each grant activity, copies of the librarian and citizen survey, and frequency data from each. To protect the confidences of individual respondents, we have not included interview notes, or those from the focus groups.

The cost of the evaluation (excluding the costs for the evaluation of summer reading programs and return on investment) were as follows:

Consulting - $100,870
Staff time for OBE study and planning - $ 11,340
Staff time for Conference Calls - $ 900
Staff time for Interviews & Focus Groups - $ 1,080
Survey Monkey time - $ 140

                          TOTAL   **$114,330**

APPENDIX A: Citizen Survey

On September 15, 2006 1600 surveys were sent out to a stratified random sample of 1600 Pennsylvania residents. 90 of the 1600 surveys were returned for bad addresses. The sample was stratified by urban, suburban, and rural standing. The sampling frame came from Survey Sampling, Inc. Participants received a first class envelope with a paper survey and a postage-paid pre-addressed return envelope. On October 15th, 2006 the first reminder was sent, two weeks later on October 15th a second reminder was sent, and the final reminder was sent on November 20th. We received responses from 564 Pennsylvanians for a final response rate of 37.4 percent (N=1510).

Questions and frequency of Responses.

0.   *NOT ASKED:* Location *(n=539)*
            Rural...153 (28.4)
            Suburban 283 (52.5)
            Urban..103 (19.2)
            Missing...26 (4.8)*
            Unclear Response 0*

1.   Do you, or does anyone in your household, have a library card for a local public library in the state? *(n=564)*
            Yes 409 (72.5)
            No...155 (27.5)
            Missing...0 (0)*
            Unclear Response 0*

1a) If yes, is that *(n=406)*
            You, yourself...159 (39.2)
            Someone else in your household.............................79 (19.5)
            Both...168 (41.4))
            Missing...3 (0.5)*
            Unclear Response 0*

2.   And, whether or not you have a library card, have you, or anyone in your household, used your local public library or school library to search for materials and conduct research *in the past 6 months? (n=545)*
            Yes 289 (53.0)
            No...256 (47.0
            Missing...3 (0.5)*
            Unclear Response 0*

2a) If yes, the last time you visited the library did you: (Please check all that apply) *(n=290)*

        Use the library computer terminal 161 (55.5)
        Ask librarians for assistance 185 (63.8)
        Look through the shelves for materials.................................238 (82.1)
        Missing*...10 (1.7)
        Unclear Response 16 (2.8)

3.   In the past 6 months have you done any of the following: (please check all that apply)? *(n=563)*

        Used the internet to find library resources............................176 (31.2)
        Telephoned the library to ask a question 116 (20.6)
        Asked a household member to get information
           from the library for you?..71 (12.6)
        Missing*...1 (0.2)
        Unclear Response 0

4.   And has anyone in your household attended a program or programs at a public library in the past 6 months? *(n=547)*

        Yes 89 (16.3)
        No..458 (83.7)
        Missing*...16 (2.9)
        Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

4a) If yes, the did you attend a program or programs: (Please check all that apply) *(n=88)*

        Children...51 (58.0)
        Teen..6 (6.8)
        Adults..42 (48.3)
        Missing*...28 (5.0)
        Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

5.   On average, how frequently do you or members of your household, use your public library? *(n=557)*

        More than once a week 21 (3.8)
        Weekly 49 (8.8)
        A few times a month...130 (23.3)
        A few times a year 149 (26.8)
        Rarely...104 (18.7)
        Never..104 (18.7)
        Missing*...4 (0.7)
        Unclear Response 3 (0.5)

6.   Regardless of whether you or members of your household use your public library, how important do you think it is for your community to have a public library? *(n=561)*

        Very important..427 (76.1)
        Important..96 (17.1)
        Not important...38 (6.8)
        Missing*...2 (0.4)
        Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

7.   How well do you think your library meets the particular needs of your community? *(n=512)*

Extremely well..158 (30.9)
Above average 284 (55.5)
Average..8 (1.6)
Below average..42 (8.2)
Poorly...20 (3.9)
Missing*..51 (9.0)
Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

8.   Besides the library closest to your home, have you used any other public libraries within Pennsylvania in the past 6 months? *(n=558)*

Yes 173 (31.2)
No...385 (68.8)
Missing*..4 (0.7)
Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

9.   Have you seen, read or heard anything about a library service in Pennsylvania known as the POWER Library? *(n=556)*

Yes 50 (9.0)
No...506 (91.0)
Missing*..8 (1.4)
Unclear Response 0

9a) If yes, have you or anyone in your household used the POWER Library? *(n=49)*

Yes 32 (65.3)
No...17 (34.7)
Missing*..11 (2.0)
Unclear Response 1 (0.2)

10.   Do you have access to the Internet from your: (Please check all that apply)? *(n=562)*

Home..418 (74.1)
Place of work 253 (45.0)
Home of friend or family 137 (24.4)
Missing*..2 (0.4)
Unclear Response 0

11.   What year were you born? *(n=514)*

Average..54.7
Minimum..19
25th percentile...43
Median 55
75th percentile...66
Maximum..93
Missing*..50 (8.9)
Unclear Response 0

30 or under 26 (4.6)
31-44 ....124 (22.0)
45-64 ....220 (39.0)
65 and over 194 (34.4)

12.   What was the last grade you completed in school? *(n=558)*
Grade 1-8 ....10 (1.8)
Attended high school 24 (4.3)
Graduated from high school 129 (23.1)
Completed technical or vocational school 55 (9.9)
Attended college, but did not graduate 77 (13.8)
Graduated from college 137 (24.6)
Attend graduate professional school 126 (22.6)
Missing ....*5 (0.9))*
Unclear Response ....*1 (0.2)*

13.   What is your racial or ethnic heritage? *(n=556)*

Caucasian/white 514 (91.1)
African-American/black 27 (4.9)
Hispanic/Latina/Latino 2 (0.4)
Asian 9 (1.6)
Native American 3 (0.5)
Other 1 (0.2)
Missing ....*7 (1.2))*
Unclear Response ....*1 (0.2)*

14.   What is your gender *(n=555)*
Female 290 (52.3)
Male 265 (47.7)
Missing ....*8 (1.4)*
Unclear Response ....*1 (0.2)*

15.   Are you employed: *(n=502)*
Outside the home 316 (61.2)
Currently seeking employment 11 (2.1)
Retired 173 (33.5)
Other 16 (3.1)
Missing ....*39 (6.9)*
Unclear Response ....*9 (1.6)*

16.   Do you have any physical condition(s) which make using the library or library materials difficult for you? *(n=550)*
Yes 31 (5.6)
No 519 (94.4)
Missing ....*13 (2.3)*
Unclear Response ....*1 (0.2)*

17.   Do you have anything else you would like to tell us about your experience with the libraries in your community *(n=564)*

> Reponded 110 (19.5)
> Did not repond 453 (80.5)
> *Missing*..0*
> *Unclear Response ....1 (0.2)*

* Missing is not included in percentages of valid responses. Percent missing is of the whole.

Appendix B: Survey of Librarians in the Commonwealth—frequencies

1. Are you currently employed in a library in Pennsylvania? If no please skip to end.
   (n=554)
   > Yes 98.9%
   > No..1.1%

2. What is the type of library in which you work? (n=543)
   > Academic 12.7%
   > Public 40.9%
   > School 38.9%
   > Special...4.2%
   > Institution 0.6%
   > Other 2.8%

3. Has your library received any LSTA grant funding since 2002?
   > Yes 35.7%
   > No..48.9%
   > I don't know..15.4%

4. Has your library received an Information Literacy grant? (If no please skip to
   Q10) (n=199)
   > Yes 12.1%
   > No..87.9%

5. To what extent have grant funded activities led to teachers having increased
   knowledge of how the school library enhances their instructional efforts? (n=26)
   > Not at all..0.0%
   > Some 34.6%
   > A great deal..30.8%
   > Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................34.6%

6. To what extent have grant funded activities led to increased collaborative efforts
   between school library media specialists and teachers? (n=26)
   > Not at all..7.7%
   > Some 30.8%
   > A great deal..42.3%
   > Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................19.2%

7. To what extent have grant funded activities led to increased ability of librarians to
   teach information literacy skills? (n=24)
   > Not at all..0.0%
   > Some 41.7%
   > A great deal..54.2%
   > Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................4.2%

8. To what extent has grant funding from Commonwealth Libraries helped increase
   information literacy skills of the following groups?

Teachers (n=23)
       Not at all...4.0%
       Some 57.0%
       A great deal..22.0%
       Does not apply to focus of our grant...........17.0%

Library Staff (n=24)
       Not at all...0.0%
       Some 33.3%
       A great deal..54.0%
       Does not apply to focus of our grant...........12.0%

Other (n=13)
       Not at all...0.0%
       Some 46.0%
       A great deal..54.0%
       Does not apply to focus of our grant...........0.0%

9. Please provide a specific example of one of the outcomes of your Information Literacy grant—tell us a story of some thing(s) that happened in your library that demonstrate increased information literacy among your users (n=14)
   (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

10. Has your library received a digitization and preservation grant? (If no please skip to Q16) (n=197)
           Yes 10.7%
           No...89.3%

11. To what extent has your effort opened your collection to a wider Pennsylvania audience? (n=19)
           Not at all...5.3%
           Some 26.3%
           A great deal..63.2%
           Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................5.3%

12. To what extent have you been able to preserve primary source material? (n=19)
           Not at all...0.0%
           Some 15.8%
           A great deal..52.6%
           Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................31.6%

13. In your opinion to what extent has your digitization and preservation grant enhanced access to users? (n=19)

    Not at all...0.0%
    Some 31.6%
    A great deal...52.6%
    Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................15.8%

14. To what extent has this enhanced access helped use

    Meet personal needs (n=19)

      Not at all..5.0%
      Some 32.0%
      A great deal...37.0%
      Does not apply to focus of our grant...........26.0%

    Meet educational needs (n=19)

      Not at all..5.0%
      Some 26.0%
      A great deal...63.0%
      Does not apply to focus of our grant...........5.0%

    Enrich their lives (n=18)

      Not at all..6.0%
      Some 39.0%
      A great deal...44.0%
      Does not apply to focus of our grant...........11.0%

    Increase user satisfaction with the time it takes to gain access to desired information (n=19)

      Not at all..5.0%
      Some 16.0%
      A great deal...74.0%
      Does not apply to focus of our grant...........5.0%

15. If you have had a digitization grant, please provide ONE example of a successful outcome within your library—tell us a story about the changes you've seen. (n=14)

    (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

16. Have you received a grant under the LSTA program to build technological capacity? (If no please skip to Q21) (n=192)

    Yes 38.0%
    No..62.0%

17. To what extent has the application of LSTA funds in this area: Improved your users abilities ability to find desired information? (N=72)

          Not at all...0.0%
          Some 6.9%
          A great deal..91.7%
          Does not apply to focus of our grant..........................1.4%

18. To what extent have grant funded activities to build technological capacity led to increased teachers' use of library resources in the curriculum? (n=70)

          Not at all...8.6%
          Some 31.4%
          A great deal..28.6%
          Does not apply to focus of our grant..........................31.4%

19. To what extent have grant funded activities led to increased use of technology-based library services? (n=71)

          Not at all...0.0%
          Some 14.1%
          A great deal..83.1%
          Does not apply to focus of our grant..........................2.8%

20. If you can, please provide ONE example of a successful outcome within your library—tell us a story about the changes you've seen from your having built technological capacity. (n=57)

         (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

21. Have you received a grant(s) under the Library Cooperation and Collaboration (for planning and development) initiative? [these include grants for wireless laptop labs; grants for school /public library cooperation; and grants for teacher/school librarian cooperation] (if no please skip to Q25) (n=186)

          Yes 23.7%
          No...76.3%

22. To what extent have LSTA funds helped you enhance services to library users? (n=43)

          Not at all...0.0%
          Some 16.3%
          A great deal..81.4%
          Does not apply to focus of our grant..........................2.3%

23. To what extent have LSTA funds for library cooperation and collaboration helped increase the use of library resources? (n=43)

          Not at all...0.0%
          Some 20.9%
          A great deal..74.4%
          Does not apply to focus of our grant..........................4.7%

24. If you can, please provide ONE example of increased cooperation and collaboration that you have experienced. (n=28)
   (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

25. Have you received a grant under the literacy area –to develop and support family, emergent and adult literacy training and services? (If no please skip to Q32) (n=186)

   Yes 7.0%
   No..93.0%

26. To what extent have you observed increased reading readiness? (n=13)

   Not at all..0.0%
   Some 69.2%
   A great deal..23.1%
   Does not apply to focus of our grant...........................7.7%

27. To what extent do you see increased school readiness? (n=13)

   Not at all..7.7%
   Some 38.5%
   A great deal..46.2%
   Does not apply to focus of our grant...........................7.7%

28. To what extent have you observed increased reading skills? (n=13)

   Not at all..0.0%
   Some 53.8%
   A great deal..38.5%
   Does not apply to focus of our grant...........................7.7%

29. To what extent have you observed increased functional literacy skills? (n=13)

   Not at all..0.0%
   Some 69.2%
   A great deal..15.4%
   Does not apply to focus of our grant...........................15.4%

30. To what extent do you see increased pleasure in reading from activities supported by LSTA funding? (n=13)

   Not at all..0.0%
   Some 30.8%
   A great deal..69.2%
   Does not apply to focus of our grant...........................0.0%

31. Can you give an example of something that happened in your library as a result of training in the area of emergent, family or adult literacy? (n=7)
   (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

32. Have you received an LSTA grant to serve better the needs of un-
    served/underserved users? [examples of such grants are homework help centers,
    activities to help with job seeking skills or educational improvement; services to
    the blind and the physically handicapped; and Family Place libraries] (If no please
    skip to Q39) (n=184)

    Yes 23.4%
    No..76.6%

33. To what extent did grant activities increase independence in accessing library
    services? (n=42)

    Not at all..0.0%
    Some 38.1%
    A great deal..52.4%
    Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................9.5%

34. To what extent did it increase ability to get information users need and/or want?
    (n=43)

    Not at all..0.0%
    Some 25.6%
    A great deal..72.1%
    Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................2.3%

35. To what extent did it increase satisfaction with library services? (n=43)

    Not at all..0.0%
    Some 23.3%
    A great deal..74.4%
    Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................2.3%

36. To what extent did grant activities increase your library's responsiveness to
    specific user needs based on individual characteristics? (n=42)

    Not at all..0.0%
    Some 28.6%
    A great deal..66.7%
    Does not apply to focus of our grant.........................4.8%

37. If you can, please provide an example or story of how your library has reached
    out to un-served or under-served users. (n=31)
    (Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

38. Have you seen any changes in libraries attributable to the funding of Family
    Place? (n=40)

    Yes 32.5%
    No..17.5%
    Don't have any knowledge about 'Family Place'......50.0%

39. As a result of support provided by the Bureau of Library Development to what extent to you think your library's users have increased their understanding and appreciation of libraries? (n=496)

>   Not at all...9.9%
>   Some 54.0%
>   A great deal...36.1%

40. As a result of support provided by the Bureau of Library Development to what extent do you feel your library is more able to respond to community needs than you were 4 years ago? (N=493)

>   Not at all...9.3%
>   Some 46.7%
>   A great deal...44.0%

41. As a result of support provided by the Bureau of Library Development to what extent do you see increased school/public library cooperation in the Commonwealth? (n=

>   Not at all...14.7%
>   Some 59.3%
>   A great deal...26.0%

42. As a result of training opportunities provided by the Bureau of Library Development, to what extent have you been able to enhance your ability as a librarian? (n=493)

>   Not at all...11.4%
>   Some 43.2%
>   A great deal...45.4%

43. To what extent do the databases of POWER Library provided through funding from the Bureau of Library Development made a difference in reference service to your users? (n=498)

>   Not at all...8.0%
>   Some 22.9%
>   A great deal...69.1%

44. Please feel free to add any other comments about the impact of LSTA funding on libraries in the Commonwealth. (n=173)

(Available by request to leighe@uiuc.edu)

Appendix C: Evaluation of Summer Reading Program (Executive Summary)

Like other public-sector institutions facing today's conservative fiscal climate, tax-supported public libraries are increasingly subjected to fiscal scrutiny, and they must now prove their worth. One way in which public libraries have traditionally made a difference is their mission of fostering literacy skills for all children. As Celano and Neuman pointed out, "children in Pennsylvania benefit from a wide array of summer reading programs designed to enhance their reading skills" (p. 47). However, public libraries now require empirical evidence to demonstrate that their literacy programs "make a significant difference" to the communities they serve (Holt, Elliot, & Moore, 1999, p. 1).

The Pennsylvania Department of Library services has conducted evaluations of summer reading programs using the *Summer Reading Statistical Report and Evaluation Form.* While this instrument provided important information about numbers of students involved in the program and numbers of books read, it did not provide student reading achievement outcomes; therefore, to meet the demands fiscal mandates, and other mitigating factors such as budget cuts, low salaries, and staff turnover, public libraries have turned to researchers to evaluate the effectiveness of programs. The purpose of this project was to conduct a comprehensive, outcome-based evaluation of the Summer Reading Program 2005-2006 by addressing the following essential questions: Does a SRP increase literacy-supporting behaviors in participants? How can literacy-supporting behaviors be measured?

The over-all results indicate that children enrolled in 2006 summer reading programs across the Commonwealth benefited from many literacy-enhancing activities such as story hour, arts and crafts, and other special events coordinated throughout the state. In addition, the present findings suggest that summer reading programs are an excellent tool to help students reduce summer learning loss and to maintain reading achievement levels.

Students' Literacy Achievement

The methodology for the study included surveying the primary stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, and public librarians) about the effectiveness and popularity of summer reading programs. Based on survey results, parents and teachers felt that students maintained reading skills while participating in the SRP. According to teachers, reading levels did not change between spring 2006 and fall 2006 (2.41 ± 0.73 vs. 2.44 ± 0.73). Teachers reported that the majority of children (88%; n=113) maintained reading levels during the summer, whereas 5% decreased (n=6), and 7% improved (n=9) their reading levels. The overwhelming view among teachers was that the SRP helped students maintain reading levels, word recognition, vocabulary, comprehension and enthusiasm. Since research clearly shows the damaging results of summer learning loss, the role that Summer Reading Programs plays in helping students maintain their reading skills is critically important to parents and teachers and their students.

Positive Attitudes about Public Libraries and Summer Reading Programs

Surveys of parents and children showed that both the Summer Reading Program and the library were very popular. Overall, parents reported positive reading habits in their children. Almost 70% of families reported that they participated in 1-2 hours per week of library activities.

Parents reported that their child frequently read before and after participation in the SRP. Only 2% of parents reported that their child spent no time reading after the SRP. The percentage of children reading 3-4 hours per week remained stable. In contrast, there was a 17% increase in the number of children reading 5 or more hours per week.

Also, the overwhelming majority of parents (86%-98%) agreed or strongly agreed with each of the following statements about their perceptions of the SRP including: enjoyment of reading improved, enthusiasm about his/her participation in the SRP, enjoyment of the library programs, the use of incentives to encourage children to read, and continuation of reading with their child in the future
Overall, the responses of the 437 children ages 5-12 who completed the survey were positive. The children reported that they liked the Summer Reading Program and going to the library. Almost 90% of student respondents reported that the SRP helped them learn and to read better in school than the previous year. Seventy-two percent reported that liked to read with other people. Interestingly, less than half of the children reported that someone helps them read.

Sixty-five children responded to the survey designed for 13-18 year-olds. Most of the respondents (77%) were 7th and 9th grade. Overall, the respondents classified themselves as good readers who were willing to tell people they liked to read. The thought that reading helped them learn other subjects and improve their vocabulary. They also liked to broaden their interests through reading.

Recommendations
The results of this study concur with an examination of recent literature that supports the positive role that Pennsylvania libraries continue to play in developing children's literacy. In order for public libraries to capitalize on the proven success of summer reading programs, the following recommendations are offered.

1.   Establishing partnerships with public schools. Public libraries should
   routinely connect with schools in their areas.

2.   Supporting existing summer reading programs and encouraging all public libraries to implement similar programs. Money must be made available to continue support for existing programs. Recent budget cuts strain successful programs.

3.   Attracting diverse groups of parents and students for summer reading programs. In order to meet the literacy needs of all students, those hard to reach children must have equal access to libraries.

Appendix D: Return on Investment Study (Executive Summary)

TAXPAYER RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)
IN PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC LIBRARIES

INTRODUCTION

Pennsylvania Public Libraries are used extensively by citizens, tourists and organizations such as schools, universities and colleges, businesses, hospitals and other non-profit institutions. While an important use of public libraries is for recreation or entertainment through use of library collections and programs, a majority of citizen use involves:

- addressing personal or family information needs such as dealing with issues of

  health; solving problems; learning about culture, religion or genealogy; and

  keeping up with current events.

- formal educational use by students and teachers at all levels;

- lifelong learning by pre-school children and adults such as retirees and others

  interested in their continued learning; and

- supporting work or job-related information needs such as research and legal,

  finance, and marketing activities, etc.

Organization libraries cooperate fully with public libraries and benefit substantially through such cooperation.

To serve the essential information needs of citizens and organizations, Pennsylvania public libraries and their branches provide a complete range of materials, services, and facilities, all of which are extensively used. The public libraries have enhanced their capabilities through Internet access to the World Wide Web from internal user workstations and remote visitor access through PA POWER Library and other remote access services. These new capabilities are extensively used and highly valued by public library users for the many purposes mentioned above.

Pennsylvania public libraries are used extensively because their information and services are found to be trustworthy, the best source available to users, and convenient or easy to use. Furthermore, users rate information from library resources or services as being of high quality, trustworthy, up-to-date, and complete. As a result of using this information, users save time and money. They also indicate that they found answers to most of their questions and that the information led to favorable outcomes. Pennsylvania public libraries clearly serve their citizens and other libraries well.

All Pennsylvania citizens and taxpayers, users or not, benefit from public libraries through their valuable contribution to education, the economy, tourism, quality of life, and so on. Users pay for public libraries through their taxes, but even more so through the time and money expended in going to the library and using the services. They would not expend these resources if the information obtained is not valuable to them. However, if there were no public libraries, citizens and organization users would require a much higher cost in their time and money to obtain needed information from alternative sources. Not only is there an economic return-on-investment to citizens and organization users, the surrounding communities receive an economic return in a ripple effect from salaries and wages paid to staff, library purchases made, and a halo effect of spending made by visitors during their trips to the public libraries.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In August 2005, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of Commonwealth Libraries issued a Request for Application entitled "Taxpayer Return on Investment in Pennsylvania Public Libraries". The Request for Applications specified that: "The study will determine the economic benefit of public libraries for Pennsylvanians and to what extent citizens feel the public library contributes to their overall economic wellbeing." A contract was awarded in December 2005 to the School of Information and Library Science (SILS), University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. The findings of this study highlight both economic and other benefits achieved through use of public libraries.

The project involves four integrated surveys and a state-wide economic input-output model (REMI). Annual Pennsylvania Library Statistics provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of Commonwealth Libraries are also used. The four surveys[5] are as follows:

- a state-wide household telephone survey of adults 18 and over. The Random Digit Dial survey resulted in 1,128 complete or partial interviews,

- in-library survey of 2,614 visitors in 19 public libraries and their branches,

- a survey of 226 school, university and college, business and non-profit organization librarians, and

- a follow-up survey of 112 public libraries.

The first two surveys were designed to obtain information concerning public library use, reasons for use, outcomes of use and data used to determine the value of public library services. The third survey established the extent to which other types of libraries used public library services and also provided data contributing to the value of public libraries. The fourth survey of public libraries obtained information not provided elsewhere that is

---

[5] The four surveys were processed by University of Pittsburgh, University Center for Social and Urban Research in cooperation with UNC, SILS.

used in the REMI economic input-output model. These surveys were all conducted in the Spring 2006.

This report provides overall study results concerning extent of in-library and remote use through the Internet, characteristics of those who use Pennsylvania public libraries, what services are used, factors that affect use, and the purposes for which the public libraries are used. Estimates are also provided for what public library users currently pay to use the public libraries in their time and money (e.g., for travel and parking). Of particular importance are the consequences of not having public libraries on users and the local communities. This economic contingent valuation is also presented. The REMI economic results are also discussed.

SUMMARY

What Users Pay for Public Library Information and Services

Visitors pay to use public libraries in their time to go to and from libraries and the time spent in them. They get to libraries in many ways such as walking or biking, driving, or taking public transportation or taxis. Some of these modes of transportation are costly to visitors including driving and parking fees. Placing an economic value on visitors' time and adding the other costs incurred suggests that visitors pay about $574 million for the library information and services. They also pay an additional $109 million in using remote Internet access to library information and services. They would not expend this time and money if they did not consider library information and services to be worth at least $683 million to them.

Contingent Valuation of Pennsylvania Public Libraries

One economic method for estimating return on public library investment is contingent valuation. Contingent valuation is a common tool used to evaluate non-priced goods and services by examining the implications of not having the goods or services. This study focuses on the added cost to use alternative sources of information and services currently provided by public libraries (should users choose to use them) and the economic loss to communities if there were no public libraries.

If there were no public libraries in Pennsylvania, current users would be affected in various ways. In order to determine how they would be affected, we asked in-person and remote access visitors what they would do to obtain the information they got from their last use. Some said they would not bother to do anything. Some said they needed the information, but did not know where else to go to obtain it. Others said they would use another source such as a store, another person, or academic libraries, etc. We then asked the latter users what sources they would use to get the information and about how much of their time and money they think it would take to use this source. The estimated cost to use alternative sources is found to be $1,647 million. The compares with $683 million public library users currently spend in their time and money using public libraries.

- Thus, it would cost public library users *$964 million* more to obtain needed or desired information if there were no public libraries (i.e., net benefit).

Some information obtained from public libraries saves users time and money such as in performing work, making household repairs, or purchasing a product at a lower price. When such information is needed, but users do not know where else to go, they would lose the savings provided by such information.

- Library users would lose *$84 million* by not knowing where to go to obtain needed information.

In addition to extensive additional costs to user, the local economy would lose as well since the library staff wages and salaries are lost to the economy and in-state library purchases of publications and other goods and services are lost as well.

- Library wages and salaries lost to the economy is *$180 million.*

- Library in-state purchases lost to the economy amount to *$68 million*.

The public libraries host gift shops, vending machines, copying machines, and other services that are operated by non-library vendors and others. The revenue of these services would also be lost to the local communities.

- The extent of this loss to the economy is *$1 million*.

Library visitors often use local shops, restaurants, and other services before or after their trip to the library. Some revenue to these services (i.e., a "halo" effect) would be lost if there were no public libraries. Based on a study in the UK, about 23 percent of the total revenue is likely to be lost to the local communities.

- The lost "halo" effect is estimated to be *$80 million*.

If there were no public libraries in Pennsylvania, the total economic loss to users and the local economy is estimated to be $1,377 million. Pennsylvania taxpayers contribute $249 million to public libraries through local, state and federal taxes.

- Thus, the Pennsylvania taxpayer return on investment (ROI) in public library is 5.5 to 1 ($1,377÷$249 million). [6]

REMI Estimate of Return on Investment
[To come]

---

[6] The cost to users is based on a $ value of their time. The literature in this value varies a great deal. Some say that the basis could be the median income of users. Using this approach the ROI would be 5.8 to 1. We chose to refine the value of time of persons having different purposes of use: personal, work-related, teaching, student use, and so on which yielded 5.5 to 1 ROI.

Use of Pennsylvania Public Libraries

A total of 474 public libraries serve a population of nearly 12 million Pennsylvanians in 2006. Of 9.1 million adults, 4.7 million (51.6%) are found to have visited a public library in the previous 12 months and 1.2 million (13.2%) adults indicated they connected to the library remotely.

All told there are estimated to be 40.8 million in-library visits by the following types of visitors:

- Pennsylvania adults (18 and over)   48.2% of visits

- Pennsylvania school age children   39.0%

- Pennsylvania adults who brought children
  to use the library   8.4%

- Tourists   4.4%

Adults are estimated to connect to public libraries through the Internet about 11.4 million times, or 22 percent of all visits (i.e., in-person and remote).

Pennsylvania adults visit public libraries in-person about 23.0 million times to use the following top ten used services.

- check out a book or books   56.0% of visits

- use a library computer to access the Internet   38.7%

- read a book, newspaper or magazine in the library   35.4%

- ask a librarian to help in finding information   34.2%

- use a library catalog   30.8%

- check out a video, DVD, CD or audiotape   27.7%

- use reference materials in the library   25.7%

- use a library computer other than to access the Internet 22.9%

- ask a reference librarian to actually conduct
  a reference search   12.9%

- attend a lecture or some other sort of program   11.0%

Adult access to the Internet from a library computer (8.9 million times) were done for the following top five purposes:

- use e-mail   20.0% of visits

- use a search engine such as Google or Yahoo   19.6%

- search the library online catalog   17.9%

- look for information about a service or product   15.1%

- get news online or visit a blog   10.2%

Adult remote access to public library (11.4 million times) were to:

- obtain information directly from a librarian
  or the library   63.7% of remote visits

- use a search engine such as Google or Yahoo   38.2%

- view or download articles   31.4%

- look at another website   29.4%

- use e-mail   22.5%

- view or download e-books   11.8%

- use chat mail or instant messenger (IM)   9.8%

- view a blog website   8.8%

The public libraries are visited by adults for many purposes such as recreation or entertainment, to deal with personal or family issues, educational reasons, work-related activities, or life-long learning. The proportion (%) of all purposes of visits are as follows:

- Recreational or entertainment   23.7% of all purposes

- Personal or family issues   16.4%

- Educational reasons:
  - as teachers   5.5%
  - as students   13.1%

- Work-related activities   16.9%

- Life-long learning
  - as pre-school children   11.7%
  - as retires or others   12.7%

Recreation or entertainment is achieved through reading, viewing or listening using library materials or programs. This leads to encouraging further reading, viewing, listening; learning something new; broadening one's perspective on life; among other favorable outcomes.

The five top **personal or family needs** addressed in public library visits are (in order of number of visit): to help with a health or wellness problem, to keep up with the news or current events, to help with a hobby or how to fix something, for information on culture or religion, and to learn more about personal finances. Use of library information for personal or family purposes result in favorable outcomes, answering all questions and leading to other useful sources.

Teachers used the libraries largely for continued learning, to keep up with the literature, to prepare for a class or lecture, and to prepare a paper. Some used the public library for home schooling. Most **students** were in universities or colleges. They and other students used the public libraries to keep up with the literature, as a place to study, and to get information for a specific assignment. A few students were involved in virtual or distance education programs.

Work-place needs (other than teaching) addressed in public library visits largely include (in order of number of visits): research, information about a person or organization, marketing or sales, finance or tax issues, and legal issues. This use is said to improve work, increase productivity, and speed up work, among other favorable outcomes.

Public libraries are also used for **life-long learning** by pre-school children, retirees, and others. Pre-school children are brought to public libraries to read, check out books, attend a children's program, and other activities. Retirees and others also indicate they continue learning through public library services or through virtual or distance education.

Generally, adult visitors choose public library resources or services to obtain needed information because they are convenient to use, they do not cost much in time or money, they are considered the best source of information, and their information can be trusted. Visitors highly rate trustworthiness, timeliness or up-to-date information, quality of information, and completeness of information provided by public libraries.

In summary, the taxpayers in Pennsylvania contribute $249 million to public libraries. In return Pennsylvania residents visit public libraries nearly 39 million times (and extend the courtesy to 1.8 million tourists) and they use public libraries 11.3 million times through remote Internet access. The libraries are used extensively for educational, personal and family, and work-related needs in addition to traditional recreational and entertainment purposes. The quality of life benefits of public library information and services are extensively documented by this study and users are found to believe that public libraries are particularly trustworthy and provide high quality and timely information to satisfy their widely varied information needs. Not only do users benefit through excellent

services, they gain economically by not having to use more time consuming and expensive sources of information. Pennsylvania communities also benefit through the economic contribution of library salaries and wages, purchases made in-state, and the 'halo' effect of spending by visitors on other goods and services during their visits.

Pennsylvania taxpayers can be confident that their direct and indirect return on their investment in public libraries is about 5.5 to 1.

Appendix E: GETTING A JUMPSTART ON LITERACY (**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**)

GETTING A JUMPSTART ON LITERACY:
A PILOT EVALUATION OF THE
ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD PROGRAM

A report prepared for the
Office of Commonwealth Libraries
by the
Family and Children's Policy Collaborative

Michelle Harmon
Marsha Weinraub, Ph.D.

December 2006

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the pilot evaluation of the first year of the One Book, Every Young Child program which the Family and Children's Policy Collaborative at Temple University conducted at the request of the Pennsylvania Office of Commonwealth Libraries.

In April 2006, the Office of Commonwealth Libraries launched the One Book, Every Young Child program in an effort to improve the literacy skills of preschool aged children by modeling interactive activities centered on story book reading. In this pilot evaluation we evaluated three components of the program: the author visits, book mailers, and the website. In addition, we explored the parent recognition of *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM)* by Lindsay Barrett George (2004), and the literacy activities of a sample of low income families.

To promote the One Book program, Lindsay Barrett George, author of *IMOM*, toured the Commonwealth, reading from her book and modeling interactive play activities with adults and children. To document the attendance and the participation rates at the author's visits, we asked one representative at each site of Lindsay Barrett George's One Book promotional tour to complete and Author Visit Form. All sites reported an excellent turnout for Ms. George's visit. Over 8,000 adults and 6,000 children were reported to be in attendance at all sites combined. At 92% of her site visits, reading from the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book took place and 84% of the time an orchestrated a hands-on activity was available for the children in attendance. One teacher mentioned using the techniques they learned about with the children in their care.

The Commonwealth mailed over 9,000 free copies of Lindsay Barrett George's Book, *IMOM* to licensed child care centers and registered family day care homes and group day care homes in Pennsylvania. We designed a Book Mailer Questionnaire that

was mailed out following the book mailing. The questionnaires yielded a relatively low response rate (17%); with 1,553 questionnaires completed and returned. The responses were favorable of the One Book program. Most early childhood educators who received the book said they read it and took part in some interactive activity regarding the book with children in their care. For the most part, early childhood educators reported reading to children, many as a daily experience. Most of the educators also reported structuring activities for the children that centered on a story book.

The Commonwealth also created a website, paonebook.org, as an additional online resource where parents and early childhood education professionals could learn more about the One Book program, access Ms. George's visit itinerary, and download materials that could be used to provide and interactive experience based on the *IMOM* book. The site seemed to get off to somewhat of a slow start. Many of the web pages were not fully functional at the start of the program and a lot of the material intended for downloading was not readily available when visitors logged onto the site early in April. As more files became available, satisfaction with the site increased. However the momentum of visitors touring the site, as evidenced by the reduction of hits and downloaded materials, waned in the months immediately following the first month of the program. Due to the low response rate, the feedback survey we designed did not yield any significant data. This response rate was possibly due to its placement within the larger, more prominent feedback page or by the very fact that two feedback options were available to the visitor.

Recognition of the selected book and literacy activities was assessed for a sample of low-income families in our Laboratory on Temple University's main campus. To assess parents' recognition of *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*, we displayed it along with two other books (*Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!* by Candace Flemming and *Three Billy Goats Gruff* by Paul Galdone) that were colorful and roughly the same size as the *IMOM* book. Parents were directed to view the books on display. Very few parents recognized the selected book for the program, *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse.* When given the opportunity to identify three books on display in the room, most instantly recognized *Three Billy Goats Gruff.* It is not clear, however, whether the parents recognized this particular book by Paul Galdone or if they recognized the classic story title. The vast majority of parents reported reading to their child on a daily basis and more that two-thirds indicated their child had a high interest in books. Many had children story books in the home. Fewer parents reported owned reading material for adults in the household. While most said they had a library card, few actually used it.

In light of these findings we offer the following recommendations for the program and future evaluations:

Program Recommendations

1. The One Book, Every Young Child state-wide program should be continued.

2. Consideration should be made to delay the start of the intervention (and promotion of the intervention) in some districts of the Commonwealth in order for the evaluation to assess the impact of the intervention.

3. Local libraries have great potential for use as an effective statewide delivery system for literacy programming. This kind of a delivery system might be especially useful for literacy interventions targeting low-income communities, those most in need of these services.

4. Prepare the website to be ready to accept visitors at the start of the program. Have all the materials readily available and confirm the links go to the intended files prior to the introduction of the website address.

5. Prepare district libraries for accessing children's story book circulation statistics by implementing a system that will help to account for the One Book program's impact on the local libraries.

Evaluation Recommendations

1. Future evaluations of the One Book Program can be more effective if a Logic Model is introduced prior to the evaluation. What are the goals of the program, how are they to be accomplished, and how will anyone know if these goals are attained? Once this model is clear, then choices concerning evaluation will also be clear.

2. Future evaluations of the One Book program can be more effective when control groups or communities are included as part of the intervention design. To ensure that all libraries and communities receive the program benefits, control group participants can receive the program/intervention after, rather than before, the outcome measurements are complete.

3. Measures of program benefits might also include measurement of the effects of the program in the selected communities on the libraries, parent reports of children's literacy skills, child care teacher reports of children's literacy skills, and reports of child care teacher literacy activities in the classroom.

4. Future evaluations of the One Book promotional author tours that involve modeling interactive activities with children could include a short survey to be completed by audience members immediately following the presentation. Such an evaluation can provide a fount of information regarding the information found most and least useful and the likelihood of conducting similar activities with children in their care.

5. Measures of effects on library involvement could include circulation statistics for children's story books and usage of library resources (e.g., web site and One Book program partners) provided by the One Book program.

6. Book recognition by parents can be an effective measure of the effectiveness of the program. However, the program book needs to be compared with other books similar in shape, size and color, as well as title novelty. Classic childhood stories

(such as Three Billy Goats Gruff) can lead to artificial responses of book recognition.

7. Changes in children's literacy interest, motivation and skills could be effectively and efficiently assessed using parent reports.

8. Future evaluations of the One Book program could delve deeper into the *type* of activities early childhood educators are conducting with the children in their care. While most teachers said they already conducted activities related to story books, the type of activities and the extent of the interaction between the children and adults were unknown.

9. Future evaluations of the website should re-consider the placement of the visitor profile survey. An alternative could be for the site to require visitors to sign in with an email address so a follow-up email survey can be sent to them after they complete the website visit.

10. Confirm mailing addresses of actively operated child care facilities in the Commonwealth prior to a mass mailing. The number of returned unopened Book Mailer Questionnaires (n = 444) cost the Commonwealth about $700 in unnecessary postage stamps. The initial cost of postage for mailing the books and activity posters plus the expense of printing additional questionnaires could be avoided in the future. It is recommended that a bar coded return mailing label be used for future mail surveys. The bar code allows the post office to bill the client only for the postage actually used.

Appendix F: Summary of LSTA grants 2002-2005 (by project, including outcomes)

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	1A	Albert Gallatin Area School District	Wireless laptop lab established for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Lab with 25 laptops made available for 2 day projects. Subject matter infused with technology and information literacy concepts. Lesson followed by research activity.	32 teachers and 500 students affected by the instruction.	Pre-test indicated deficiencies in the area of information seeking strategies, location and access, and evaluation. Post-test indicated improvement in all areas.		
2005	1A	Bucks County Free Library	Staff development education and training.	Targeting workshop topics using a survey and through discussion. Procured outside trainers and prepared training calendar.	8 workshops averaging 3 hours each attended by 304.	Surveys showed improved customer centered skills, communication with the organization, and staff morale. Enhanced understanding of how to perform job and competence and confidence.	71% felt increased confidence in competence. 66% felt an enhanced understanding of how to do one's job in a better way.	
2005	1A	Bucks County Tech High School	Wireless laptop lab established for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Librarian collaborated with teachers to incorporate a variety of learning experiences to prepare students to meet state learning standards.	Librarian worked with 10 teachers and approximately 300 students from grades 9-12. Most of 23 students completed senior project.			
2005	1A	Burrell High School Library	Wireless laptop lab established for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Lab setup with 30 laptops. Students and teachers trained.	Collaboration with 50 high school teachers in almost all subject areas. Most of the student body, approximately 750 students come to library on a regular basis.	Students have become more comfortable handling and using laptops, many of whom cannot afford one at home. Teachers can now try out new teaching styles and methods. No evidence.		
2005	1A	Canton Jr/Sr High School Library	Collection development to support the achievements of the PA Academic Standards.	Accelerated Reader, biography, and professional development sections enhanced.	332 books purchased and have circulated 608 times in 8 months.	Library now has a more current look that encourages more students to browse. No evidence.		
2005	1A	Central PA District Library	Provide a mobile wireless laptop lab for training of staff and public.	Lab made operational. Staff trained. Training commenced.	POWER Library workshop - 10 attendees. Access PA workshop - 5 attendees. Grant Station workshop - 4 attendees. Library from Home workshop - 10 attendees. Basic Internet Techniques - 10 attendees. E-mail Basics - 8 attendees.	OBE survey based on suggestions from Consultants. Staff confidence in ability to teach POWER increased and staff knowledge increased. Also, staff appreciated having training brought to their site. Concept of the district center as a technology leader for district members was reinforced.		
2005	1A	Chichester School District	Wireless laptop lab established for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Wireless laptop lab for 5th and 6th grade students created.	Collaboration with teachers. Instruction. Mutual planning.	Increased level of interested among students regarding use of library resources. Increased number of non-participating teachers inquiring about the new initiative. Teachers gained new insight into the power of collaboration. Teachers developed a working understanding of the PA Information Literacy Standards. No evidence.		Some of our students still do not have access to a computer in their home and some feel separated from their peers as a result of this situation. Our librarian and teachers noted that they observed an increase in classroom participation when some students who do not, under ordinary circumstances, participate. They reported that having equal access to the technology made all the difference for some students.

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	1A	Dauphin County Library System	Purchase print and electronic resources to provide information essential for the well-being of the community.	Materials purchased.	6 databases purchased. Usage statistics for Gale Biography and Gale Lit Resource Centers indicate 166 searches in 1 month. 57 reference sets/items purchased and 15 large print titles.			
2005	1A	Downingtown Area School District	Support chapter, divisions, and groups within PA that wanted to offer a workshop for academic librarians. Professional development.	Sponsored 11 workshops.	499 attendees.			
2005	1A	Ephrata Area School District/ Highland Elementary School Library	Wireless laptop labs created for 5th grade students particularly in the area of science.	Training workshop. Collaborative team formed. Laptops installed for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.				
2005	1A	Harrisburg School District	Collection development					
2005	1A	James V. Brown Library	Instruct and involve local education community in understanding and using POWER library.	15 POWER Library tutorials developed. Audio tutorials recorded and coded in Flash. Tutorials tested with middle school students and select instructional technology professionals. Website set up for POWER info and linked to library website. School partnerships developed. Training for teachers. Library cards distributed. Promotion at schools and classroom packets. Book covers for POWER Library distributed. Document prepared with examples of POWER to meet Academic Standards for History.	15 tutorials. 17 teacher trainings with 28 teachers. 3 school visits with 888 students seen. Total fines forgiven was $3000. Library cards made for 469. 800 book covers provided. 5000 Known-zone teen cards provided.	Since tutorials not completed until mid-May, have not had opportunity yet to see full outcomes that are expected.	60% increase in Learnatest. 50% increase in Ebsco databases.	
2005	1A	James V. Brown Library	Increase continuing education opportunities to district member staff via web casts.	Consultant hired. Vendor selected to record live trainings. District consultant trained to use Webex	8 web cast workshops with total of 55 attendees and 26 who used recorded material.	Pre/post surveys: 100% increase in skills, 100% increased knowledge of a particular topic, 100% change in behavior or method of performing related responsibility, 75% change method of delivering library service. 50% increase in staff participation in training.		
2005	1A	Jersey Area School District	Wireless laptop lab and collaboration for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.		775 students used lab.	Increased student familiarity with use of lab. .		

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	1A	Karns City Area School District Jr/Sr High School Library	Wireless laptop lab and collaboration for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	20 laptops added.		Staff survey indicate that 98% were very satisfied with library procedures, materials, and access to technology.	Hits to server increased 27% over 2005. Number of teachers bringing students to the library for research has increased to encompass almost 91% of the 7-12 grade staff.	
2005	1A	Kutztown Senior High Library	Wireless laptop lab and collaboration for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.		54 projects/workshops conducted. 45 faculty received training utilizing the equipment.	Greater student familiarity with online databases and greater faculty/librarian collaboration in project design. Outcome information was gathered through planning sessions with faculty.		
2005	1A	Lackawanna Trail School District	Wireless laptop lab established for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers (2nd).	During 2005 and 2006 a total of 326 classes used lab.			13% increase in student participation. 100% collaboration between librarian and teachers. 62% of teachers used lab for internet research versus 33% last year. Projects completed increased 23%. Of the 1,521 students participating 96.5 received a passing grade.	
2005	1A	Lancaster Lebanon I.U.	Provide curriculum support and tools for school staff, particularly librarians, to increase necessary skills and strategies for student use of Internet.	Professional development program for administrators and media specialists. Team of media specialists, facilitated by the consultant, developed and wrote curriculum framework and sequence document of Internet-based skills for 1-12 students that can be used as a model in the information literacy program.	107 area educators attended workshop.			
2005	1A	Lycoming County Library System	Health literacy project	Focus groups held with lower level readers/learners, seniors and nurse practitioners. Website/kiosk developed. Worked with Medical Library Director and Learning Center Director. Public awareness health literacy presentations. AMA train the trainer session. 100 websites added to www.firstfind.info site.		New Health Literacy Committee formed. James V. Brown website now listed on the National Library of Medicine website. Library won a NNLM Express Exhibit for traveling health display. Enhanced working relations between health system, rural health system, LCHIC, AHEC, and James V. Brown Library.		
2005	1A	Mahoney Area School District	Collection Development	Collection development to help meet PA Academic Standards.	Selections determined by survey. Books ordered. Bibliography created.			
2005	1A	Marywood University	Provide students, faculty, and library users library instruction workshops. "Learning Library Initiative"	Laptops purchased.	73 workshops reaching 1340 students in fall semester.	Initiative has brought increased awareness of the importance of information literacy.		

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	1A	North East Middle School	Wireless laptop lab established in middle school library for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Training session related to student research needs for students.	Laptops used for 82 days of school year.			
2005	1A	Penncrest School District/ Maplewood Jr/Sr Library	Mobile laptop labs purchased for information literacy program in collaboration with classroom teachers.	Purchased 2 mobile laptop carts with projectors. Staff trained. Collaborative information literacy units planned and executed.	817 students participated. All staff attended in-service instruction.	Students able to demonstrate competencies in the state standards. More teachers bringing students to library with increased collaboration.		
2005	1A	Southwest Middle School - Reading	Collection development	Weaknesses in collection identified. Books ordered. Book display set up.	255 books purchased.		78% of books have been signed out at least once.	
2005	1A	Susquehanna Community School District	Collection develop with an emphasis on emergent literacy.	Teachers and librarian collaborated in selection of materials.	300 new items purchased.			
2005	1A	Tyrone Area School District	Collection development.	Books selected that exemplified one or more of the elements of writing.	Books arrived too late to conduct writing workshops but traveling kits will be ready for next school year.			
2005	2A	Adams County Library System	Automation upgrade.	Upgraded 6 routers.	20% increase in network speed. Reaction times in most libraries increased by more than 20%		Pre/post survey showed that was a 15% increases in the respondents who felt the internet was running faster and a 20% increase in those who felt OPAC reaction was faster.	
2005	1B	Lancaster County Historical Society	Digitization of Columbia Spy.	Material digitized. Teaching tool prepared. Staff trained.	Demonstration/reception had 75 attended. 60 years totaled 4464 pages digitized.	Staff and patrons filled out evaluation forms. On average the webpage is accessed 54 times a day.	100% had a successful search. 65% found it easy to use.100% would recommend database to others.	
2005	1B	Lehigh University	Digitization and creation of website "Beyond Steel: An Archive of Lehigh Valley Industry and Culture."	Partnerships developed for provision of materials with Bethlehem Area Public Library, Hagley Library and Museum, Historic Bethlehem Partnership, Lehigh County Historical Society, Moravian Archives, National Canal Museum, and Steel Workers Archives.				
2005	1B	Warren Library Association	Digitization of Allegheny Chronicles.	Adult new readers collection literacy materials implemented. Project cataloged and harvested to WorldCat. Added to online catalog. Primary materials archived. Staff training.	363 items digitized. Website visited by over 2000 unique users between 3/6/06 and 6/11/06 averaging between 60-100 1st time visitors a week.			Library approached by the Lumber Heritage Region of NW PA to utilize a number of materials in the collection to enhance their kiosks promoting their trails.
2005	2A	Allegheny College, Pelletier Library	Implementation and participation in PA Academic Library Consortium's EZ Borrow system.	Installation and training. Publicity used to promote.	The new direct borrow system has become the primary source of books. Lending to other PALCI libraries has increased. Borrowing activities of students and teachers has increased. Statistics in report.	Staff encouraging students to use system and they are.	In March 2006 35% of loans went to faculty, 59% to students, 6% to staff.	

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	2A	Berks County Public Library - Exeter Community Library	Improve and expand technology network for new library. Built on a wireless infrastructure.	Equipment selected and purchased but no further activity on grant as library building project pushed back many times.				
2005	2A	Dauphin County Library System	Automation upgrade.	"Info-Link Project" with features that will allow users the ability to find information easily, access more information, and link to local government and community services. Vendor selected. System purchased and installed. Migration to new system. Tabs were added to patron catalog interface that provide access to additional library resources. Training provided.		Patrons have improved accuracy of searching as well as increased ease of use. Staff spends less time training users.		
2005	2A	Delaware County Community College Library	PDA's purchased for the nursing program.	Integration of PDAs to provide access to library materials and resources related to patient care, medications, and process. Training. Faculty developed exercises for specific courses.	During fall 2005 semester 35 nursing students and 5 faculty participated. During spring 2006 39 students and faculty participated.	In surveys both students and faculty noted they were able to show patients information on the PDA to assist them in understanding their condition and medications. Pre/post surveys indicated that PDAs did make a significant difference the teaching and learning process.	26% now use PDAs.	
2005	2A	FLP	Developed a Computer Assisted Weeding Tool (CAW) to assist staff in the project of weeding 100,000 volumes form the Central Library.	Database developed. Staff instructed.	511 books evaluated. 77,000 volumes weeded and expect to reach 100,000 by 2007.			
2005	2A	Franklin County Library System	Updated staff computers and improving connectivity between computers.	Purchased and installed 6 servers, 14 desktop computers, and 6 managed switches.	No tangible outputs for we did not want to change appearances on the user end, but instead make system rum smoother and be easier to handle for tech staff.	Staff surveys conducted.	78% were satisfied	
2005	2A	Hamlin Memorial Library	Automation upgrade.	Vendor selected. System installed.	24,000 items mounted on web. Usage increased from 1,000 hits per month to 1,200.	Increase in patron satisfaction. No evidence.		
2005	2A	Huntingdon County Library	Replace obsolete voice system and increase data transmission speed between main library and 2 branches. Place catalog on website.	Installation of system.	Speedier transactions.			

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	2A	Johnsonburg Public Library	Automation upgrade.	Equipment purchased. Layout of library was adjusted to allow for separate age specific areas.	9 computers and monitors, new server, software, wireless access points installed.	Survey saw increased patron satisfaction.		A man lost his job due to downsizing. He came in every day to create and submit resumes both online and paper. We helped him create an email account to keep track of his proposals. We assisted him in the creation of his resume through various software programs. Staff helped him locate online job sites. Today, he is making $17 per hour.
2005	2A	Lackawanna County Library System	Software purchased to improve patron interaction with computer use and to free staff to provide more public service.	PC Reservation and LPTOOne software installed. Staff training.	During May 2006 more than 10,000 used PC Reservation.	Post implementation survey.	In 2 weeks, 71% decrease in requests for equipment assistance. 27% increase in reference questions asked. 25% of respondents had not previously used a computer at a library, indicating that the "self-service" model of computer reservation is attractive to more users.	
2005	2A	Lower Merion Library System	Wireless access made available to Ludington Library as a pilot project.	Discovered that filtering requirement would be very difficult to install and it took several months to solve problem. Installed. Detailed instructions to users prepared.	System tracked logins .	Filtering the internet in keeping with CIPA requirements is very difficult.		
2005	2A	Marysville Rye Library	Automation upgrade.	Collection of 13,235 items converted. System installed. Staff trained.		Survey showed patrons find new system easier to use. Staff finds it is a big time saver for it produces report.		
2005	2A	Towanda Public Library	Enhanced automated catalog by replacing brief MARC records, adding authority control, custom clean-up and adding a new computer and software for T.S.	Clean-up. Authority control. Instruction on library resources and POWER Library.	192 students in 8 groups trained in how to use the improved catalog. Individual trainings.	Library tracked usage of materials and conducted surveys of patrons.	5% increase in circulation.	
2005	2A	York County Library System	Automation upgrade.	Implementation and training.				
2005	2B	Butler County Community College Library	Conduct a user needs assessment and then develop a library revitalization plan that integrates technology, services, resources, and design with current and future needs.	Consultant hired.	LibQUAL survey completed by 394. Hed 7 focus group sessions with 71 participants. Web alumni survey completed by 16. Campus community survey via touch screen computer completed by 144, facility assessment, and 3 peer comparison via data collection and interviews. Final report submitted.	Increased understanding and knowledge of the community's needs in terms of library resources, technology and services. Assessment brought to light areas in need of improvement and community concerns and the plan presents suggestions for a course of action.		

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	2B	Cambria County Library System	Strategic planning process that would result in a long range plan for county-wide services.	Consultant hired.	Each of 3 planning meeting were attended by at least 1 representative of each of the 14 libraries. 14 focus groups had 122 participants. Mail surveys completed by 211 households and 586 individuals responded to the web survey. Final report submitted.	By participating, committee members gained knowledge of community needs.		
2005	2B	Cheltenham Township Library System	Gauge community awareness of library services and to update the strategic plan.	Consultant hired. Telephone survey prepared and administered.	Telephone survey to 500 residents. 34 interviews with staff, Board and Friends, community leadings. Strategic plan updated.	Survey revealed that many residents are unaware of the services being provided and underscored the need for an aggressive marketing plan.		
2005	2B	Chester County Library	To produce a template to manage library's relationship with the public, guide staff development, and frame the development of a community needs strategy. Intent is to increase customer satisfaction, library visibility, and staff awareness.	Consultant hired to develop plan. Adoption and implementation of plan. Assessment and evaluation.	20 individuals interviewed. 8000 randomly selected telephone numbers purchased. 400 individuals contacted.	Results of interviews were used for the design of the new CCLS logo, branding and tag line.		
2005	2B	Lancaster-Lebanon Intermediate Unit 13	Lebanon County Library District/System	To provide delivery services between libraries.	Van delivery provided by contract with I.U. for 5 days a week. Increase of 2 days.			
2005	2B	Montgomery County Library and Information Network Consortium	Strategic planning conducted.	Consultant hired. Data gathering.	Focus group of 3 staff and 15 member library staff conducted. SWOT exercise conducted with Board of 16. Interviewed 4. Held 3 focus groups with 10 participants. Web survey of 250.	3 important issues clarified.		
2005	2B	Palmyra Public Library/Lebanon County	Conduct research to determine support for potential relocation/expansion.	Consultant hired. Board surveyed. Interviews with staff and leadership conducted. Telephone survey. Online survey of students grades 9-12. Building consultant did feasibility study. Results of research and facility evaluation were integrated into the long range plan.	9 completed board surveys. 23 leadership interviews. 360 random telephone calls completed. 182 online surveys completed. Long range plan and building assessment report.		22.8% increase in circulation.	
2005	2B	SE PA Consortium for Higher Education (SEPCHE)	Strengthen impact of SEPCHE libraries on 8 campuses and strengthen student academic achievement, increase faculty awareness and librarian/faculty interaction.	Surveys, focus groups. Consultant hired. Strategic plan based on survey results.		Surveys showed most students are unhappy with aesthetics of libraries and want more electronic resources with larger media collections.		

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	3A	Allegheny College, Crawford Library	Initiate a community based emergent literacy project to improve quality of early childhood literacy instruction and to improve level of literacy development in children ages 0-8.	Collection development with books, story time kits, puppets, music CDs. Raising Reader Clubs conducted and met for 8 weeks. Raising Reader Parent Clubs held. Read Together Program offered to each literacy center which pairs children with reading mentors. Training for volunteers. Storytelling sessions held.	Establishment of 6 community literacy centers at off campus sites. 827 items added. Raising Readers Parent Clubs attended by 74 adults and 104 kids. Read Together attended by 47 children. Storytelling attended by 461 children and 140 adults. 11 storytellers, 7 site coordinators, 17 Read Together volunteers 403 books read at child/mentor sessions.	Outcomes measured by Read Together Report Cards, interviews with parents and caregivers, and community comments. Some responses demonstrated a new or renewed value placed on the importance of reading to children. Parents felt quality of their of their family reading improved.	98% of families report reading more frequently to their children.	From a volunteer: "I know Elizabeth is progressing with her reading and alphabet skills. Every week she is more and more enthused and we read more and more each week. This program is benefiting both of us enormously."
2005	3A	Delaware County Library System	Family Place	Separately analyzed.				
2005	3A	Lebanon County Library System	Reading Packs, including bilingual packs, for young children were developed and distributed among 6 county libraries. Packs are used as educational tool for teachers, daycare providers and home schoolers.	Committee determined needed subject areas and appropriate materials. Themes developed and material purchased.	100 new bilingual and Spanish titles added. 76 packs assembled and distributed to libraries.	No evidence.		
2005	3B	Allegheny County Library Association	Provide equal access to libraries with substantive programming by creating "canned programs."	Creation of canned programs and delivery of those programs.	Composed 50 cyber book discussion kits, 7 Pittsburgh Remembrance Kits, 13 movie book talk kits, and 48 travelers or cultural site kits. Created performance roster, 8 arts education programs, 165 programs. 20 librarians trained. Increased the number of summer reading programs and enhanced One Book One Community program.	Pre/post surveys showed librarians trained felt more comfortable leading book discussions. Program attendees appreciated programs and felt it enhanced their family's library experience.		
2005	3B	Allentown Public Library	Urban Library Project.	Separately analyzed.				
2005	3B	Berks County Public Library - West Lawn-Wyomissing	Expansion and enhancement of the library's Homework Center for students in grades 6-12.	10 wireless laptops and printer purchased. Collaboration with Wilson School District Superintendent.	Average of 6 students per day using Center.	Informal discussion groups and surveys showed students reported less stress in completing research projects. Many report that they don't have to compete with siblings for at home computer time.	After installation of wireless laptop computer usage increased 25%.	
2005	3B	Blair County Library System	Family Place	Separately analyzed.	11 staff from 5 libraries trained. 25 Parent/Child workshops. 23 community professionals donated 30 hours of time.			
2005	3B	Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh	PC Center	Separately analyzed. (Urban Library Grant)				
2005	3B	Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh	Pre-K Early Learning Outreach Program	Created a Pre-K Early Learning Outreach program	Improved library services for children with limited literacy skills.			

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	3B	Degensatein Community Library	Enhance and update science and technology resources.		508 new books purchased. 7 topical booklists created.		54% increased usage in that portion of the collection.	
2005	3B	Erie County Public Library	Urban Library Project.	Separately analyzed.				
2005	3B	FLP	Urban Library Project.	Separately analyzed.				
2005	3B	Franklin County Library System	Improving services to a group of 670 at-risk urban residents of a subsidized housing community to increase the reading level of children through collection development and collaboration with Housing Authority and Boys and Girls Club.	Children were surveyed as to reading preferences and an educator evaluated their reading level. Volunteers worked with children and teens. Kindly Canines visited once a month for kids to read to the dogs.	690 new titles purchased, 40 in multiple copies. About 30% of the items for older adults had multicultural themes. During 2006 23 children participated.	10 out of 12 students who were tracked through the program increased their reading score from Summer 05 -Summer 06. Much data was lost due to children moving in and out of community. In addition, most of the children now pick up books on their own, which they never did before. Partnering was an obstacle due to an ever changing staff and recruiting volunteers was difficult because they were unwilling to commit themselves to any scheduled efforts. Evaluation was done, but was not included with the copy received.		
2005	3B	Free Library of Philadelphia	Customized electronic collection analysis tool	For planning in respect to the renovation and expansion of the central library.				
2005	3B	Fulton County Library	Family Place.	Separately analyzed.				
2005	3B	Jefferson County Library System	Improved collection of children's fiction and non-fiction (grades 1 - 4) as well as chapter books in the 6 member libraries to help reading skills improve.	Staff training on collection development. Books ordered. Bookmarks prepared for promotion of collection. Publicity.	2,909 books purchased. 590 summer reading participants had access to resources.	Pre/post survey indicate increased patron satisfaction and increased ability to get information needed.	99% overall average from survey.	"My two older children 8 and 6 years old have really begun to enjoy the chapter books both fiction and non-fiction. My 8 year old thought the was too "big" for the stories here, but one morning he browsed the shelves asking me what different stories were about. He chose 3 chapter books two of which were historical fiction. We can't go to bed at night without an hour of reading time. We have been enjoying "My America" series. I have to add that my 4 year old really enjoys the Junie B. Jones stories and we read to one another."
2005	3B	Lancaster Public Library/Lancaster Library System.	Creation of business center with emphasis on start-ups and small businesses.	Center created with new shelving, furniture, updated wiring, computers, color copier/printer/scanner/fax. Staffed by full-time librarian who also teaches classes. Brochure professionally developed. Partnerships developed.	From March to June: 365 visits with 51 repeat users, 10 new cards issued, 272 client questions, 93 reference books used, 183 database searches, and 195 websites used.	Client survey, virtual focus group questionnaire.		

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	3B	Mifflin County Library	Increase use by Latino residents through the provision of materials and services designed to meet their needs.	Laptop, printer/scanner, and Magellan Pro translation software purchased to loan to community agencies to translate brochures and other material into other languages . Spanish section added to web page. Collections expanded to provide books and periodicals in Spanish. Small collections given to relevant agencies. Signage to include Spanish. Staff training.	10 Latino families have registered and are using library. 3 community agencies have collections of Spanish materials to meet ESL needs. 60+ people registered to use Rosetta Stone language learning software. 16 staff trained.	Observations showed more Latino parents are bring their children to the library. Magellan Pro has not been used as much as hoped due to possible missed promotion opportunities or to the complexity of the software. Project progress slowed by staff who still do not see a need for change or expansion of service.		
2005	3B	Reading Public Library	Create space for senior citizens.	Furniture, computers, magazines, materials, and books purchased. Grand opening. Memoir project created.	32 programs held including 6 meetings of the Memoir project.	Seniors began coming to Branch on more regular basis and were more willing to speak to staff. Observation by staff.		One woman stands out because she was rather timid about her writing initially. So when the time came to order copies of the booklet created by and for the members of the class, she ordered only a copy for her daughter. Shortly after the Memoir Luncheon she called to ask whether she could order more copies. She didn't think her sons would be interested in what she had written. But when they asked for their own copies she was thrilled. So the project gave her more confidence in her own history and an added link to her sons.
2005	3B	Stey-Nevant Public Library	Collection development to acquire 750 easy readers/chapter books appropriate for children in grades 1-4.	Materials selected and purchased. Promotion during National Library Week to sign first graders up. Librarian visited classrooms to promote summer reading program and showed some of the new purchases.	861 books added now making that area 3% of the collection. Easy chapter books checked out 1,868 times which accounts for 22% of circulation.		60% increase in circulation. 20% increase in number of children enrolled in the summer reading program.	Melcieon is a 1st grader who visited the library every day after school. In April, his teacher visited the library and told staff that he never had his homework completed and that his mother refused to listen to him practice his reading skills. He was at the lowest reading group level. Staff decided to give him special attention and suggested they start with the Dick and Jane books. Eventually they read all the Dick and Jane books. Near the end of the school year his teacher told staff he had been able to move up one reading group.

Year	Goal	Library	Project	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Statistics	Anecdotes
2005	3B	Warminster Township Free Library	Make the library a welcoming and friendly place for all members of the community, particularly members of the Spanish speaking population.	Bilingual story time conducted bi-monthly. Partnership with ESL Dept of the Centennial School District. Bilingual collection development for both children and adults. Spanish lessons for children and adults. Family programming to bring the community together as a whole. Bilingual signs installed.	Story time attended by 54 adults and 120 children. Family programs attended by 47 adults and 158 children. Spanish classes attended by 4 adults and 61 children. Bilingual materials added were 185 in juvenile collection and 163 in adult collection.	Surveys distributed in both English and Spanish but many patrons reluctant to respond, perhaps due to their own literacy insecurities or to unfamiliarity with surveys. Survey conducted during Spanish classes very positive as parents appreciative of the opportunity to expose their children to another language and culture.	20% increase over a period of 3 months of non-English speaking patrons using library services (result of a simple survey set up at reference and circulation desks.	This past February, we ran a mother/daughter book discussion and craft time. These programs are usually only attended by regular library users. This time, however, 2 of our ESL students and their mothers came to the program. Their mothers spoke very little English but this certainly did not prove to be an obstacle. The girls were clearly very excited to be at our library and the family fully enjoyed joining in the discussion and doing the crafts. They had heard about the program during one of their story time visits and thought it would be fun.
2005	4	HSLC	Ask Here PA					
2005	4	Schuylkill IU 29 on behalf of C.L.	POWER Library tech support improved.	IU maintained regular daily contact with vendors. Migrated POWER Library.net Information Center and supported CD-ROM Product Pricing Service. Worked directly with AccessPA vendors, produced training materials, and worked with HSLC to upload new records.	2000 unduplicated requests for support.			
2005	1A	Benton Area School District - Appleman Elementary	Collection development to update and expand the reference and research collection.		Over 400 students and 30 staff used collection. Increased use of collection.			
2005	4	PA Humanities Council	Increase adult humanities programming thus raising the capacity of libraries to promote themselves as centers for lifelong learning.	Programs presented. Library Summit with Community Libraries and others to plan future direction. Improved marketing and publicity materials. Took part in an OBE workshop to find ways of improving evaluation system.	Programs presented: 43 at 39 libraries with 3 of those new to PHC. 28 counties reached. 931 attendees.	PHC evaluates all its programs and surveys show that PHC programming increased the ability of libraries to be responsive to their communities and increased the capacity of libraries to promote themselves as centers for life long learning. Evidence is contained in report.	92% of libraries sponsoring Read About It programs said they would not be able to offer this kind of program without the PHC's support. 94% of respondents said they would sponsor another PHC program. 78% said program met the need for adult programming in the community.	"The most astounding thing we learned was how desperate people are for intelligent, stimulating, adult discussion! The discussions were like going back to college without the tuition payments and tests."