

Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners

Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)

Grants to States Implementation Evaluation

FFY 2013 – FFY 2017

Evaluators:

Martha Kyrillidou, Ph.D.

William Wilson

Sara Laughlin

Ethel Himmel, Ph.D.



QUALITYMETRICS

Helping libraries achieve success

www.qualitymetricsllc.com

March 24, 2017

Commissioned by

Dianne Carty, Director



Massachusetts Libraries

BOARD OF LIBRARY COMMISSIONERS



Table of Contents

Evaluation Summary	3
Evaluation Report	8
A. Retrospective Questions	8
B. Process Questions	33
C. Methodology Questions	33
Appendix A: List of Acronyms	36
Appendix B: List of people interviewed	38
Appendix C: Bibliography of all documents reviewed	40
Appendix D: Survey Instrument	41
Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol	58
Appendix F: Coding of Interviews and Focus Groups	59
Appendix G: Summary of Survey Results	61
Appendix H: LSTA Funding Allotments 2013-2015 Mapped to Goals	68
Appendix I: Measuring Success Focal Areas for MBLC LSTA Projects	70
Appendix J: Target Audiences for MBLC LSTA Projects	72

Evaluation Summary

State context. A growing population, above-average educational achievement, and slowly-expanding employment in Massachusetts presented a positive environment for those working in local libraries and those making state-level policy and funding decisions, as Massachusetts recovered from the challenging first decade of the 21st century.

The population of Massachusetts increased 4.0% from 2010 to 2016, according to US Census estimates, compared with a national increase over the same period of 4.1%. Massachusetts had a slightly higher percentage of residents 65 or older (15.4%) than the US as a whole (14.9%), and lower percentages of children under 5 (5.4% compared with 6.2%) and children under 18 (20.4% compared with 22.9%). Residents in the prime earning years between 19 and 64 made up the remaining 63.2% in Massachusetts, slightly higher than the US total of 62.2%. Massachusetts was less diverse than the US overall, with 82.1% white, compared with 77.1% in the US, a higher proportion of Asian residents (6.6% compared with 5.6%), and lower proportions of African American (8.4% compared with 13.3%), and Hispanic residents (11.2% compared with 17.6%). The 7.9% proportion of individuals under age 65 with disabilities in Massachusetts was lower than the 8.6% national rate.

Massachusetts's total employment increased 0.8% from 2013 to 2014, while the country as a whole saw a 2.4% increase. Sixty-two percent of Massachusetts residents owned their homes, with a median value of \$333,100, compared with 63.9% of American homeowners, whose homes had a median value of \$178,600. Massachusetts excelled in educational achievement, with 89.8% of residents who are high school graduates, compared with the US 86.7%, and 40.5% college graduate number significantly higher than the 29.8% national figure. The median household income in Massachusetts was \$68,563, compared with the US median of \$53,889; per capita income in the past 12 months was \$38,895 compared with \$29,930 nationally. Twelve percent of Massachusetts residents lived in poverty, compared with 13.5% in the US. The Commonwealth had a population density of 839.4, more than ten times the national average of 87.4.

Library environment. Massachusetts' high levels of education and income would seem to present a rosy picture for those working in local libraries and those making state-level policy and funding decisions. However, the pace of change was demanding at every level of the library system, from local library to consortia to state agency. In an interview, the recently retired Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners LSTA Coordinator noted "Library funding is in jeopardy. Towns are struggling. Small libraries feel threatened."

Statewide, regional, and local library service delivery. In Massachusetts, public libraries and their users were the primary recipients of LSTA-funded services. LSTA funding leveraged state and foundation funding and many hours of MBLC, consortia, and local library staff time, energy, and resources, but annual State Program Reports documented only a small amount of local matching or other funding.

Participants in focus groups and individual interviews praised MBLC's leadership and complimented individual staff for their commitment to expanding access for all. They said they depended on state and regional support to make them aware of changes and to support their individual and organizational efforts to make the changes necessary to thrive in the 21st century. They valued the availability of opportunities to apply for funding, saying it helped them prioritize important projects and try new ideas.

"Great program that invites librarians to take a risk to benefit their communities."

They praised the MBLC staff who supported and encouraged them:

"Advisors are key. They make the connections, hold our hands, so we can generate ideas."

In focus groups and interviews, they made mostly positive comments on the LSTA proposal process:

"LSTA grants are pretty accessible."

“Pretty logical process. It’s important to do your homework. I like that they pushed me to think about outcomes.”

Two focus group participants described the challenges of reporting:

“Grants are more difficult than you think. It has been streamlined. Only two reports now instead of four, and shorter.”

“We had a two-year grant. It was the first time I’ve paid a salary. It was hard to get the report in so fast.”

They offered general support for the \$7,500-\$10,000 range of sub-grants:

“Depends on the size of the library. For us, \$7,500 is a big deal.”

“It would have to be at least \$10,000.”

Comments in focus groups and project reports suggest the grants have an impact beyond the grant period:

“Impact that can go on for many years... still bearing fruit.”

“With LSTA grants, 2 + 2 = 5. In addition to allowing cash-strapped libraries the opportunity to offer more than business-as-usual services, these grants heighten morale, attract considerable local PR buzz, and are handily leveraged to attract more funds and recognition from local agencies and businesses.”

Outcomes. Massachusetts’ “LSTA Long-Range Plan 2013 to 2017” included three goals, each of which included objectives, detailed tasks, output and outcome targets. By the end of 2015, most of the activities were underway or have been completed. While it was abundantly clear MBLC was following the specific objectives outlined, its reporting was not always in line with the measures. In this narrow respect, the evaluators were not able to judge progress toward each measurable target. On the other hand, in some cases larger and more important outcomes have been achieved, which made evaluators wonder whether the targets were too narrow.

Notable for absence of useful output or outcome data are several large, statewide projects, which accounted for more than half of all funding, including Databases and eBooks (29.6%), Public Library Advisory (7.5%), Virtual Catalog (7.3%), and Data Coordination (7.1%). The “logic model” for these projects is decidedly more complex and reaching the ultimate beneficiaries of the service is difficult. However, MBLC will not be able to understand user needs and behavior without tackling this challenge.

GOAL 1: SUPPORT LEARNERS OF ALL AGES WITH THEIR INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL AND LEARNING GOALS.

LSTA projects addressing this goal accounted for \$2,073,602, 22.2% total LSTA expenditures.

- Objective 1: Partner with MLS to provide statewide databases and training for these resources. MLS continued licensing databases and ebooks on behalf of Massachusetts citizens. Librarians in the state considered this to be one of the core services of LSTA.
- Objective 2: Support literacy programs for all ages. Several projects supported the literacy continuum, Mother Goose on the Loose” and “Full Steam Ahead” projects encouraged libraries to add science, technology, engineering, art, and math concepts to early literacy programming and “Science Is Everywhere” projects continued the STEAM focus for upper elementary and middle school students.

The “Summer Reading Program” addressed summer-time reading. “On the Same Page,” stimulated libraries and partners to celebrate and lead community conversations about thought-provoking books and “Reader’s Advisory” grants developed the capabilities of front-line staff to connect patrons with books they would enjoy.

- Objective 3: Support outreach programs to identified audiences with particular learning needs. “Conversation Circles,” “Libraries for Job Seekers,” “Next Chapter,” and “Serving People with Disabilities” grants to libraries encouraged staff training, content and technology development, and stimulated partnerships to reach new target groups.
- Objective 4: Develops partnerships with state agencies, nonprofits, and others to meet learning needs. At the Commonwealth level, MBLC developed powerful partnerships within the state and beyond around STEAM learning and continued to work hand-in-glove with Massachusetts Library System, regional consortia, and a variety of vendors and consultants. At the same time, MBLC encouraged local libraries to collaborate with schools, local government, nonprofits, and other libraries. A handful of projects demonstrated the positive results. One school librarian confirmed the value in her comment in the October 2016 online survey:

“What I have always thought would be helpful to school libraries would be a small grant (say \$500 to \$1,000) that would support innovation, e.g., starting a maker space... or students creating book trailers... or supporting reading at home.”

GOAL 2: IMPROVE ACCESS TO LIBRARY SERVICES AND RESOURCES FOR ALL RESIDENTS OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

Projects funded under this goal accounted for \$4,615,382, 49.3% of total LSTA expenditures.

- Objective 1: Improve and support technological infrastructure to link multi-type libraries across the state. MBLC, MLS, and regional consortia addressed priority technology infrastructure needs, tested new approaches, and improved the customer experience of websites, databases and ebooks.
- Objective 2: Support resource sharing using electronic technology and provide easy access to resources. MBLC used LSTA funds to improve interoperability of consortium-based integrated library systems. It made a contribution to national efforts to make searching more seamless with its NCIP project, and undertook important research to determine issues of privacy and data vulnerability in the complex social media environment.
- Objective 3: Ensure access to literary treasures by preserving and digitizing, offer disaster preparedness training and provide assistance after disasters. MBLC funded preservation and environmental assessments for local libraries and trained and consulted on emergency preparedness plans. Five libraries received grants to undertake conservation and digitization of unique and vulnerable collections. At the Commonwealth level, MBLC took a lead in ongoing statewide disaster planning and communications.

GOAL 3: IMPROVE ACCESS TO LIBRARY SERVICES AND RESOURCES FOR ALL RESIDENTS OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

Projects funded under this goal totaled \$2,666,411, 28.5% of total LSTA expenditures.

- Objective 1: Provide training and support to library staff, trustees, and friends of public libraries. Advisory services provided by MBLC were highly valued by library staff. MBLC redesigned its consumer portal to make it easier to use for those seeking the nearest library or a host of other services.

- Objective 2: Provide libraries with information needed to assess and deliver services. MBLC maintained a comprehensive portal, where libraries could access data to compare their services with others' and submit proposals and reports.
- Objective 3: Support and encourage the library's role as convener. Massachusetts librarians praised the MBLC's role in identifying trends, calling librarians and other partners to the table, and challenging them to find innovative solutions.

In the October 2016 online survey, Massachusetts librarians were in solid agreement with the importance of nine program areas:

- 92.3% Technology-related topics
- 88.8% Youth services/literacy topics
- 84.8% Library management issues
- 83.0% Access to statistical data about Massachusetts libraries
- 82.8% Early literacy/family literacy training
- 81.8% Customer service training
- 78.8% Preservation/digitization topics
- 78.7% Training/workshops on other topics
- 76.3% STEM/STEAM training/workshops

They also made recommendations about the level of emphasis MBLC should place on these areas going forward. They recommended greater emphasis on:

- 77.1% Technology-related topics
- 65.7% Early literacy/family literacy training
- 61.8% Customer service training
- 58.5% STEM/STEAM training/workshops
- 56.1% Youth Services/literacy topics
- 50.6% Library management issues

They suggested MBLC maintain current levels of support for:

- 64.9% Access to statistical data about Massachusetts libraries.
- 48.5% Preservation/digitization topics

They suggested none for reduced emphasis.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation conducted by QualityMetrics, Inc. was designed to provide a balance of quantitative performance data and qualitative assessment by administrators and primary beneficiaries (libraries) of LSTA funding. Evaluators utilized four methods –review of financial and planning documents, interviews with Library of Virginia leaders, an online survey, and two virtual focus groups. In a few instances, evaluators sought additional information after the initial review, in order to clarify and deepen their understanding.

Document review. Evaluators collected and reviewed documents that described and summarized the performance of LSTA-funded programs during Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2013, 2014, and 2015. They scanned FFY 2012 documents, looking for any shifts in emphasis or dramatic growth or decline in usage. Documents reviewed included “Massachusetts LSTA Long-Range Plan 2013 to 2017” and State Program Reports (SPR) for FFY 2013, 2014, and 2015. See the bibliography of additional documents reviewed in Appendix C.

Interviews. Evaluators conducted one-on-one interviews on October 3-4, 2016, with nine MBLC leaders and 11 individuals knowledgeable about LSTA initiatives. For the list of interviewees, see Appendix B. For the discussion guide, see Appendix D.

Focus groups. Evaluators conducted two focus groups attended by nine representatives of libraries/consortia which had received LSTA funding during the evaluation period 2013-2015. They applied content analysis techniques to find major points of agreement and satisfaction, and incorporated summaries of those statements with individual examples in the report. See the list of focus group participants in Appendix B, the focus group guide in Appendix D, and the summary of coding in Appendix E.

Online survey. Two hundred and three individuals responded to an October 2016 online survey. Among respondents, 176 (86.7%) were from public libraries; their responses are the bases for comments included in the report below. Answering just questions relating to preservation/digitization were 10 from academic libraries, five from special libraries, and two from library consortia; their responses to the survey were included in those project areas. Eight school libraries also replied; this response was too small to allow evaluators to draw any valid conclusions, so their responses are not incorporated.

Among public libraries, 37.0% served fewer than 10,000 population, 34.7% served 10,000-24,999, and 28.3% served 25,000 or more. See the complete survey in Appendix D.

Conclusions/Recommendations

1. Continue strategic investments in the development of resource sharing infrastructure to support 21st century needs for customized, mobile, ubiquitous access, and in training for librarians and awareness for residents.
2. Continue to support innovation, in a rigorous needs assessment and outcomes-based environment, at the local, consortia, and state level. Share results widely. This evaluation confirms that when libraries and groups of libraries concentrate on improving service to a target audience, armed with best practice research, staff learning, community partners, a commitment to assessment, and support (and a little pressure) from funders and colleagues, they produce amazing results.
3. MBLC has done a superb job of collecting data and reporting short-term outcomes from LSTA-funded sub-grants. Individual program reports show good assessment design and use of a variety of tools. Local practitioners and those supporting them could use assistance in analyzing and synthesizing the data to draw conclusions. One approach for example, might be to convene all the STEAM grant recipients after projects have concluded, to review data across projects, reconsider assessment designs, and make recommendations for others, under the guidance of a knowledgeable assessment expert. The result would be an initiative-wide assessment and a practical framework for others to use in the future.
4. Less clear is whether MBLC has applied similar logic to its own statewide projects or used the data to make improvements across individual sub-grants and grant categories. MBLC should focus on devising methods to capture significant outputs and outcomes from the largest projects (i.e., those receiving most funding and those benefitting the largest number of patrons), regularly reviewing outcome data to make improvements, and devising ways to extend outcomes assessment to capture longer-term changes in individual users, organizations, and communities.
5. Attempt to better identify matching cash and in-kind contributions. In several instances, large grants allowed MBLC initiatives to expand and/or continue, but that funding is not credited in the SPR. Similarly, state and local funding, and significant contributions of time and effort are necessary to carry out the initiatives funded by LSTA. To fully understand and recognize the players, and to appreciate the leveraging impact of LSTA, a better accounting of their contributions is essential.

Evaluation Report

A. Retrospective Questions

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

GOAL	Description	Status
GOAL 1	LIFELONG LEARNING. Support learners of all ages with their individual educational and learning goals.	<i>Partially Achieved</i>
GOAL 2	ACCESS. Improve access to library services and resources for all residents of the Commonwealth.	<i>Achieved</i>
GOAL 3	LIBRARY CAPACITY BUILDING. Enhance the quality of library services offered to residents of the Commonwealth.	<i>Achieved</i>

GOAL 1: LIFELONG LEARNING

Administration

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, LSTA Administration accounted for 4.0% of Commonwealth LSTA expenditures (Table 2).

Activities. The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) carried out accounting activities to meet State and Federal requirements.

Year	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$122,484
FFY 2014	\$124,590
FFY 2015	\$127,141

Conversation Circles/Community Languages

Intent. 1.2: Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, Conversation Circles projects accounted for \$41,250, 0.4% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 3).

Activities. Three libraries developed Conversation Circles for English Language learners to supplement existing tutoring programs. Each purchased supporting resources and recruited and trained volunteers, who provided structured opportunities for adult English language learners to practice conversational English and connect with others in a welcoming and relaxed environment.

Year	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$16,250
FFY 2014	\$17,074
FFY 2015	\$7,926

(2013) Attleboro Public Library (LSTA \$10,000, no match) A series of sensitivity trainings for staff supported the importance of understanding cultural differences.

(2013) Wellesley Free Library (LSTA \$6,250, no match)

(2014) Northborough Free Library (2014: LSTA \$6,250; 2015: LSTA \$6,250; no match)

(2014) Peabody Institute Library (2014: LSTA \$10,824; 2015: LSTA \$1,676, no match) Peabody Institute Library created a new "Finding our Way" stepped Curriculum Guide that could be used at three levels, each with 12 lesson plans, to be shared with other libraries.

Outputs. Conversation Circles project outputs are summarized in Table 4.

Outcomes. Attleboro PL staff learned

	2013	2014	2015
Programs	8	82	100
Program participants	92	540	500

many older residents were eager to introduce bilingual materials to their children and grandchildren. Working with leaders who were trusted by their own cultural communities was the most effective way to reach a broader audience. The “quiet success” of the Wellesley Free Library program and the steady number of participants seeking to improve their English-speaking skills emphasized how needed and welcome this program is for the people of Wellesley. The library was invited to participate in initiatives of other organizations, including Wellesley Diversity Summit and a cable TV program about diversity in Wellesley. Networking with Wellesley Housing Authority paved the way for offering an English class for parents of children in Head Start. At Northborough Free Library, 86% of participants had active library cards. Usage of Mango Languages ESL increased by 156%. Because ESL tutors and volunteers engaged project participants in weekly conversations rather than formal classroom exercises, mutual exchanges of culture and customs arose naturally. Two barriers to consistent attendance were lack of transportation and/or child care. At Peabody Institute, the project director received a Massachusetts Literacy Champion award

Customer Experience

Intent. 3.1: Improve the library workforce.
(some selected 1.2, 3.2, or 3.3)

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Customer Experience project accounted for \$141,930, 1.5% of Massachusetts LSTA expenditures (Table 5).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$54,780	\$16,757	\$71,537
FFY 2014	\$57,400	-	\$57,400
FFY 2015	\$29,750	-	\$29,750

Activities. The goal of the libraries involved in Customer Experience projects was to increase customer satisfaction and position their libraries as community resources for those needing information and assistance with new technologies. *(In FFY 2013, these projects were included under GOAL 3. They are reported here in order to give a complete picture.)* Each project included staff training and opportunities to practice and share learning, purchase of equipment, and one-on-one sessions and workshops. Most also included policy review and website improvements. Below are the ones from 2015:

- (2015) Falmouth Public Library (LSTA \$10,000, match) completed technology training for all library staff to attain minimum technology standards; redesigned the library web page; and upgraded wireless access points.
- (2015) Barre, Woods Memorial Library (LSTA \$9,750, match) and staff from Barre and three neighboring rural libraries received training on new technologies.
- (2015) Yarmouth Town Libraries (LSTA \$10,000, match) established a team of peer trainers, to plan training focused on technology, the library’s web presence, digital media, and online customer service.

Outputs. Customer Experience project outputs are summarized in Table 6.

Outcomes. Outcomes reported by Customer Experience grantees confirm staff became more confident with electronic resources and used their knowledge and skills to help patrons. For example, Beaman Memorial PL

staff showed a 25% increase in confidence and ease of use of ebook devices and ILS, 12% increase in knowledge/skill in using databases, 18% increase in ability to assist patrons with technology of all types. Using the Edge Assessment, Mashpee PL learned benchmarks

	2013	2014	2015
Staff training sessions	3		71
Staff training attendees	30		848

and best practices and evaluated its electronic resources with a fresh perspective. The survey allowed the library to determine how its patrons were using its resources and what was important to them in everyday technology use. At Lakeville PL, the library director used a tally sheet before and after training to observe staff ease at answering patron questions on the digital collection. Before, staff were reluctant

to attempt helping patrons and would often refer them to another staff member. After training, staff were all able to offer assistance. On average, four of five patrons who needed help received it from the staff member at the desk and did not need to be referred. At Woods Memorial Library, the project opened a larger conversation among directors and Boards of four rural public libraries about providing adequate training and resources to staff to help them feel confident in their abilities to effectively assist patrons.

Full STEAM Ahead

Intent. 1.2: Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Full STEAM Ahead project accounted for \$144,020, 1.5% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 7).

FFY 2014	\$76,520
FFY 2015	\$67,500

Activities. In 2014, eight public libraries received \$7,500 Full STEAM Ahead grants; two received other amounts, noted below; in 2015, nine \$7,500 grants were awarded for initiatives to incorporate STEAM programs for preschool children. Each participating library received an Exploration Station with changing activities. Here's a selective listing:

(2015) Amesbury Public Library added a monthly STEM-focused sensory story time for special needs children.

(2014) Ashland Public Library hosted Storywalk events with Ashland Garden Club and Ashland Farmer's Market.

(2014) Berkshire Athenaeum created an ongoing Hands-on Activity Station which offered rotating learning toys.

(2015) Concord Public Library linked with schools to offer hands-on STEAM activities and collaborated with town departments, environmental groups, arts organizations, and recreational groups in providing outdoor learning.

Outputs. Full STEAM Ahead project outputs are summarized in Table 8.

	2014	2015
Programs	244	87
Program attendees	4,437	3,192

Outcomes. Every participating library reported increased attendance and circulation and unexpectedly strong interest in STEAM programming and informal exploration centers. Most also described productive community partnerships that resulted in additional expertise, promotional channels, and future possibilities. The projects brought positive media attention to the libraries. Many libraries employed the KWL assessment method, asking children at the beginning of programs "What do you already know?" and "What do you want to learn?", then concluding the program with "What did you learn?" At Concord PL, attendance at library programs increased 15%. In a follow-up survey, 100% of partners planned on incorporating STEAM activities in their programming with children. Library staff noticed the change in behavior in the children's area as children now approach the STEAM-decorated entrance with a sense of wonder and enthusiasm. Caregivers spend more time actively engaged in playing with children. Many adults enjoy playing with toys. Teens wander play with the light panel. A community weaving project or large puzzle brings adults and children together - a chance for adults to model the importance of play. Ashland PL received the Ashland Farmers Market Mini-Grant. Jonathan Bourne PL reported: "It's become typical to hear a caregiver say, 'Oh, we could do this at home.'"

In the October 2016 online survey, one respondent commented:

"The grant enabled the library to collaborate with many more community organizations who had not previously understood the breadth and depth of our STEAM activities and the role libraries can play in stimulating interest in the sciences among young children and families."

A focus group participant noted:

“We didn’t want the grant to end. We took a proposal to a foundation and got funding to continue.

Innovative Projects

Intent. Turner Free Library and Westborough High School addressed **Intent 1.1:** Improve users’ formal education. Joseph H. Plumb Memorial Library and Malden, Newton, and Worcester public libraries focused on **Intent 1.2:** Improve users’ general knowledge and skills. Blackstone Public Library and Peabody Institute Library worked on **Intent 2.1:** Improve users’ ability to discover information resources, while Chicopee Public Library tackled **Intent 2.2:** Improve users’ ability to find and/or use information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2014 through 2015, Innovative projects accounted for \$106,779, 01.1% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 9).

	LSTA	Local	Total
FFY 2013	\$27,360	\$98,355	\$120,715
FFY 2014	\$40,375	-	\$40,375
FFY 2015	\$44,044	-	\$44,044

Activities. Libraries carried out a wide variety of innovative projects like the following:

(2015) Blackstone Public Library/Pathways to Success (LSTA \$5,000) offered a series of programs on health/wellness issues and how to use the licensed statewide database for health and wellness information.

(2013) Chicopee Public Library/Find Yourself at Chicopee Public Library (LSTA \$5,000) offered computer-based and non-computer-based genealogy classes. It became a Family Search Affiliate, so a wider variety of resources were available to patrons. Springfield Family History Center transferred microfilm and fiche on extended loan.

(2014) Joseph H. Plumb Memorial Library/My Own Back Yard (MOBY) Exploring the Ecosystem of SE MA (LSTA \$10,000) and the libraries of Rochester, Mattapoisett, and Marion collaborated with local organizations, including Buzzards Bay Coalition and local Land Trusts to present a series of hands-on ecology programs. They held a MOBY Fair and created themed backpacks for families to check out.

Outputs. Innovative project outputs are summarized in Table 10.

	2013	2014	2015
Events	55	742	96
Event participants	428	2,825	2,849

Outcomes. Chicopee PL participants expressed great interest in using computers for research. Attendance at evening programs went up approximately 40%; those that incorporated multimedia and audience participation had particularly high attendance. Usage of the local history room increased 30% and online by 16%. Joseph H. Plumb Memorial Library fostered children’s interest in becoming citizen scientists and future stewards of the environment. *School Library Journal* published an online article about MOBY: <http://www.slj.com/2015/06/programs/stem-themed-library-backpacks-encourage-outdoor-exploration/#>. At Malden PL, 44% of participants were first time visitors to the library; 53.5% had never visited the library’s art galleries; 80.3% learned something new. Following the program, 15 made return visits to the library’s galleries. Newton Free Library programs helped staff learn and create together. At Peabody Institute Library, there was a waiting list for essentially every class. In end-of-session surveys, more than 90% of participants reported they learned skills that enabled them to make a physical or digital project; 98% planned to use skills they learned; and 100% saw the Peabody Library as a community space that facilitated innovation and creation. At Turner Free Library, students who attended the Student Success Center reported higher grades and better understanding of topics, and formed lasting relationships with mentors. Westborough High School library was contacted by school and public libraries seeking resources to create similar curricula and programs.

Libraries for Job Seekers

Intent. 4.1: Improve users' ability to use resources and apply information for employment support.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the Libraries for Job Seekers project accounted for \$14,800, 0.2% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures.

Activities. Two libraries were funded in 2013: Jonathan Bourne Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) offered workshops on resume writing, interviewing, job searching, Internet navigation, creating e-mails, and basic computer skills, created a job seekers web page highlighting resources, and formed an advisory group with Chamber, Council on Aging, and community members. Wellfleet Public Library (LSTA \$7,300) became an active center for job seekers on the Outer Cape. It added print and digital careers resources and DVDs, licensed Learning Express database, developed a career webpage, and trained staff. The library collaborated with organizations across the Cape involved in assisting job seekers.

Outputs. At Jonathan Bourne PL, six workshops attracted 27 participants. Wellfleet PL offered five program series. Books circulated 213 times; 745 individuals completed 1,034 actions on the Job Seekers Resource page on the library website and accessed Learning Express databases 57 times.

Outcomes. At Jonathan Bourne PL, staff used new tools to assist customers with job and career needs. One participant reported she got a job. Wellfleet PL became a highly respected resource for job seekers in the community. Staff became sensitive to and knowledgeable about the issues job seekers face. The project attracted adults 40 and over. With partners, the library will continue to offer job-related activities. Participants in the 'Finding and Creating Work on the Outer Cape and Beyond' series got so involved the library has continued to provide opportunities for this committed group.

Massachusetts Center for the Book

Intent. 1.2: Improve users' ability to discover information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the MA Center for the Book project accounted for \$67,110, 0.7% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 11).

FFY 2013	\$33,570
FFY 2014	\$18,540
FFY 2015	\$15,000

Activities. MBLC was a funding partner of the nonprofit Massachusetts Center for the Book, which sponsored programming to expand the circle of readers and deepen their understanding of and appreciation for the past, present and future of the book, book arts, and the book's central role in civic and cultural life. In 2013, the Center announced the Massachusetts Book Award winners at the MLA Conference, presented a program on "Letters about Literature," and staffed a booth at National Book Festival. In 2014, the Massachusetts Book Awards highlighted the cultural role of libraries in reading promotion.

Outcomes. In FFY 2015, the Center for the Book began to receive state funding. Funding was increased for FY 2016, and the Center will absorb the Book Award costs in the state budget it receives.

Mother Goose on the Loose

Intent. 5.3: Improve users' ability to apply information that furthers their parenting and family skills.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the Mother Goose on the Loose project accounted for \$16,064, 0.2% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 12).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$7,500	\$57	\$7,557

Activities. Ipswich Public Library (LSTA \$7,500, \$57

match) worked with Birth to Three to offer programs to engage parents in early literacy and offered resources about reading, brain development, and early learning. It targeted families who had recently moved to Ipswich and were living in low-income housing. Susan Marx and Barbara Kasok, co-authors of *Help Me Get Ready to Read*, gave a presentation to parents, teachers, and caregivers of young children. The library set up a new Parenting Collection.

Uxbridge Free Public Library (LSTA \$1,064) librarians used the Mother Goose on the Loose script in 10-week sessions held twice weekly for stay-at-home families and working parents. The library lost its director and children's librarian during the course of the project, so the initial award granted had to be reduced. The library's limited space could not accommodate large groups of families.

West Bridgewater Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) provided an infant/toddler lap-sit nursery rhyme program that offered pre-reading literacy activities to families and caregivers of young children and hosted a parenting workshop, "Turn Your Day into Play." South Bay Early Intervention provided the instructor. Tips included literacy-focused activities to enjoy with young children. The library also offered three music-making workshops.

Outputs. Mother Goose on the Loose project outputs are summarized in Table 13.

Story hour sessions	84
Story hour participants	2,057

Outcomes. Ipswich PL saw an increase in attendance at the Toddler Story Time. because of families' comfort with the infant program. At Uxbridge Free PL, the program introduced new families to the library. At West Bridgewater PL, after participating in Mother Goose on the Loose programs, children who attended six sessions began to anticipate what came next and what was expected; they were able to take turns and move flannel board pieces. They shared, sang and danced. They marched and used instruments and clearly expressed joy.

Next Chapter

Intent. 1.2: Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 and 2014, the Next Chapter project accounted for \$15,000, 0.2% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 14).

	<i>LSTA</i>	<i>Match</i>	<i>Total</i>
FFY 2013	\$7,500	\$19,589	\$27,089
FFY 2014	\$7,500	-	\$,7500

Activities. Westborough Public Library (2013: LSTA \$7,500, \$19,589 match) developed programs for residents aged 50+ to help them learn and feel comfortable using new technologies, participate in lifelong learning opportunities, and energize their minds. The library trained seven volunteers to become gadget gurus; it was harder than anticipated to attract volunteers.

Pembroke Public Library (2014: LSTA \$7,500) planned events and classes based on surveys of adults 50 and older and adjusted through the year depending on demand and waitlists. Class topics included various computer software programs, photography, painting, crafts, and relaxation through meditation and coloring. Standalone workshops on gardening, resume writing, and an author presentation were offered.

Outputs. Next Chapter project outputs are summarized in Table 15.

Outcomes. Pembroke PL program participants posted compliments on the library's Facebook page.

	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>
In-library programs	70	20
In-library program attendance	306	265
Materials circulated	521	

On the Same Page

Intent. 1.2: 6.2: Improve users' ability to participate in community conversations around topics of concern.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the On the Same Page project accounted for \$22,500, 0.2% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 16).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$22,500	\$3,333	\$25,833

Activities. Three libraries hosted community read projects to give a sense of civic pride and camaraderie, promote a culture of literacy, and provide opportunities for residents of all ages to join community discussions.

- Lynnfield Public Library (LSTA \$7,500; no match) read Bill Bryson's *A Walk in the Woods: Rediscovering America on the Appalachian Trail*. Younger readers were encouraged to read *Navigating Early* by Clare Vanderpool. Attracting the largest audiences were programs for children including a showing of the movie *Lorax* and scavenger hunts in a town nature preserve.
- Morrill Memorial Library (LSTA \$7,500; no match) chose Tom Ryan's *Following Atticus*. It held book discussions, author talks, and movies, and worked closely with public schools, town theater and department of public safety. The "Norwood Reads" Facebook page had 128 'likes' by the second month of the project launch. The library collected new dog and cat pet supplies and donated them to the local rescue shelter. Sixty quilts for strays made by Norwood Sewstainability group were donated to two local organizations.
- Rowley Public Library (LSTA \$7,500; \$3,333 match) featured *The Orchard: a Memoir* by Massachusetts author Adele Crockett Robertson. Participants attended book discussions and other library events around the themes of local history, farming, beekeeping, apples, memoir-writing, and life during the Great Depression. Events for children included story times on apples and farms and a hayride at a local orchard.

Outputs. On the Same Page project outputs are summarized in Table 17.

Outcomes. Lynnfield PL experienced low turnout at most programs, but print and audio books were borrowed a total of 222 times and backpacks 74 times. In the future, the Library will involve community partners and staff in planning. Morrill Memorial Library did not expect the Tom Ryan visit to be so popular, with newspaper coverage, Facebook likes, website hits, and general buzz. The library saw an increase in program attendance, after communicating with attendees via email and phone. "Rowley Reads" allowed the library to try creative and effective marketing strategies. Many events included sharing of personal remembrances of times past by participants.

Programs	53
Program attendance	2,162

Outreach to the Underserved

Intent. 2.2: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Outreach to the Underserved project accounted for \$217,233, 2.3% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 18).

Activities. MBLC provided advisory services to assist libraries in reaching out to people having difficulty using the library. It collaborated with the MA Department of Correction, After School Study Commission, Department of Early Childhood and Care/Preschool Literacy Coalition, and MA Family Literacy Consortium and maintained online information on literacy and English as a Second Language (ESOL) programs and the Accessibility for People with Disabilities database. MBLC helped MA Department of Correction librarians with long-range planning, after which they were eligible to apply for LSTA funds; changes within the MA Department of Correction made MBLC support for 12 DOC librarians more important. Libraries seeking to develop programs for people with disabilities soared, thanks to better coordination among state organizations serving the disability community. MBLC worked with staff of Perkins School for the Blind and the MA Commission for the Blind to provide an overview of planning for serving people with disabilities. Working directly with a committee convened by the MA Legislature, MBLC informed policy makers about the key role libraries play with after-school and out-of-school youth. The MA Department of Early Education and Care provided workshops for libraries on brain development, Storywalks, and STEM education for preschoolers. In 2015, MBLC participated in a panel on outreach to LGBTQ Youth at MLA, with panelists from MA Department of Public Health, Simmons College LIS, and LGBTQ advocacy organizations. MBLC incorporated development of executive-function life skills from the research-based program “Mind in the Making” into rethinking strategies for early literacy programming.

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$60,556	\$2,260,003	\$2,320,559
FFY 2014	\$76,222	\$2,906,371	\$2,982,593
FFY 2015	\$80,455	\$2,963,521	\$3,043,976

on literacy and English as a Second Language (ESOL) programs and the Accessibility for People with Disabilities database. MBLC helped MA Department of Correction librarians with long-range planning, after which they were eligible to apply for LSTA funds; changes within the MA Department of Correction made MBLC support for 12 DOC librarians more important. Libraries seeking to develop programs for people with disabilities soared, thanks to better coordination among state organizations serving the disability community. MBLC worked with staff of Perkins School for the Blind and the MA Commission for the Blind to provide an overview of planning for serving people with disabilities. Working directly with a committee convened by the MA Legislature, MBLC informed policy makers about the key role libraries play with after-school and out-of-school youth. The MA Department of Early Education and Care provided workshops for libraries on brain development, Storywalks, and STEM education for preschoolers. In 2015, MBLC participated in a panel on outreach to LGBTQ Youth at MLA, with panelists from MA Department of Public Health, Simmons College LIS, and LGBTQ advocacy organizations. MBLC incorporated development of executive-function life skills from the research-based program “Mind in the Making” into rethinking strategies for early literacy programming.

Outputs.

Outreach to the Underserved project outputs are summarized in Table 19.

	2013		2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change	
Workshops		5		8		60.0%
Workshop attendees		145		140		(-3.5%)

STEM and STEAM

Intent. 5.3: Improve users’ ability to apply information that furthers their parenting or family skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the STEM and STEAM project accounted for \$263,575, 2.8% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 20).

FFY 2013	\$66,721
FFY 2014	\$50,225
FFY 2015	\$146,629

Activities. MBLC developed and supported “Full Steam Ahead” and “Science is Everywhere” grants as necessary components of 21st century literacy and worked closely with the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care, which received a federal Race to the Top grant including libraries and museums. MBLC and Boston Children’s Museum distributed STEM kits to more than 100 libraries, many of which served families with greatest needs. In 2014 and 2015, MBLC partnered with the State of Maine and Cornerstones of Science on a Library Leadership STEM grant. MBLC convened a STEM/STEAM workshop for all the “Full STEAM Ahead” and “Science is Everywhere” projects at the Boston Children’s Museum, reviewed materials developed by the Race to the Top initiative, including the STEM Sprouts kit, and distributed kits (donated by Lego) to grant libraries. The Children’s Museum offered tours of science exhibits and a Storywalk. In 2015, MBLC worked with three libraries to create STEM development plans for funding and implementation in 2017. A panel of five librarians who had received LSTA grants involving science presented at the 14th Massachusetts STEM Summit.

Outputs. STEM and STEAM project outputs are summarized in Table 21.

	2013	2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change
Workshops		1		2	100.0%
Workshop attendees		35		180	414.3%

Outcomes. As a result of involvement in the Race to the Top initiative, many libraries are now working with local Coordinated Family and Community Engagement programs (CFCE). “Science is Everywhere” and “Full Steam Ahead” resulted in a cadre of libraries across the Commonwealth whose staff are trained and frequently share with colleagues.

Science is Everywhere/Shaking Up STEM

Intent. 1.1 Improve users’ formal education; 1.2 Improve users’ general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Science is Everywhere project accounted for \$80,000, 0.9% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 22).

FFY 2013	\$15,000
FFY 2014	\$42,500
FFY 2015	\$22,500

Activities. Science Is Everywhere activities like the ones below focused on engaging children in upper elementary (usually grade 3-5) in hands-on STEM activities:

(2014) Dedham Public Schools (LSTA \$5,000, no match) established a 20-week Makerspace program in two school libraries before school and during recess, where students built, created, and participated in hands-on problem-solving. Two local authors and bookstore owners presented in each school on creativity and collaboration. Classroom teachers worked with librarians at each school in support of the science framework.

(2014) Hamilton-Wenham Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) worked with science educators to create hands-on science and technology workshops. The library created three videos of eight workshops.

(2014) Milford Town Library (LSTA \$7,500) hosted monthly after-school presentations and workshops called: "Science Questers" for students in grades 5-8. The library purchased a microscope and telescope.

(2014) North Adams Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) partnered with the North Adams School District to sponsor a five-week Summer Science Camp focused on inventions and inventors.

(2014) Winchester Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) used LEGO Education We Do kits to teach science, engineering, and computer programming concepts.

(2015) Medway Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) sponsored hands-on workshops led by science educators and staff, family STEM programs, and an embryology club in cooperation with 4-H.

(2015) Pembroke Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) programs gave children a chance to step into the roles of scientist, oceanographer, technician, engineer, geologist, chemist, archeologist, and more.

(2015) Shirley Hazen Memorial Library (LSTA \$7,500) expanded children’s programming with hands-on exploration of STEM topics, created a STEM Maker-Space, and offered passes to nearby science museums.

Outputs. Science Is Everywhere project outputs are summarized in Table 23.

	2013	2014	2015
Workshops	52	233	58
Workshop attendees	1,220	4,141	1,151

Outcomes. At Abington PL, KWL charts indicated children had very simple, general knowledge of the workshop topics before each program. For example, students knew that “compost” had something to do with recycling. After the container gardening program, students were able to define compost as “a mixture of organic substances that are slowly breaking down” and had discovered that a Styrofoam cup will take decades and decades to decompose. In the summer, the library garnered new attendees who had not been present for any of the school year programs. At the beginning of the project, between 27% and 54% of Bellingham students in grades 3-6 had scores of

“needs improvement” or “failing” on standardized math and science tests. Surveys from Library programs showed a great interest in the science topics and summative assessments of students noted higher levels of engagement, interest and participation in topics relating to the earth’s structure, forces, engineering, and design and construction technologies. As a result of relationships formed during the Medway Library grant, the local 4-H expressed interest in collaborating with the Library to hold more hands-on science workshops.

Serving Tweens and Teens

Intent. 1.2: Improve users’ general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Serving Tweens and Teens project accounted for \$209,999, 2.2% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 24).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$59,969	\$18,912	\$78,881
FFY 2014	\$85,455	-	\$85,455
FFY 2015	\$64,575	-	\$64,575

Activities. The primary goals of this project were to create welcoming spaces for teens, increase participation at programs, and offer opportunities for teens to develop leadership skills by participating in Teen Advisory Boards (TAB) and other planning capacities. These components were included in all projects.

(2014 2015) Ames Free Library of Easton (LSTA \$9,550; 2015: LSTA \$5,450) funded a new teen space and programs, digital resources, and hardware for its teen & tween community.

(2015) Attleboro Public Library (LSTA \$6,800) involved youth in creating videos at school and in the community.

(2015) Brockton Public Library (LSTA \$7,500) visited Brockton High School classes and science fair.

(2014 2015) Chicopee Public Library (2014: LSTA \$9,120; 2015: \$5,880) started a Teen Tech Club and acquired a variety of technology tools and toys to foster creativity and innovation.

(2014 2015) Clapp Memorial Library (2014: LSTA \$7,500; 2015: LSTA \$7,500) formed TABs for middle and high school students to plan programs and share opinions. The Library hosted Marvel movies, Giant Games Day and Coding with Minecraft.

(2015) G. A. R. Memorial Library (LSTA \$7,500) held 3-D Pen and online creating writing programs.

(2014 2015) Lee Library Association (2014: LSTA \$9,000; 2015: \$6,000) created a TAB and transformed the reference room into a bright, inviting teen space. It hired a YA Services Librarian and offered regular programs.

(2013) Marstons Mills Public Library (LSTA \$6,039) serves a small working class community; schools and town community building are several miles away. The library created an inviting space and programs for tweens and teens, who produced two plays.

(2013) Mattapoisett Free Library (LSTA \$7,100), with input from a TAB, created a welcoming teen space.

(2013 2014) Maynard Public Library (2014: LSTA \$9,800; 2015: \$5,200) focused on the arts, with a strong collaborative effort with schools and teens, whose input helped shape the programs, materials and outcomes. The school provided buses from the high school so teens could participate in an improv class, taught by a local actor at the library. Projects which required group participation were highly successful.

(2014 2015) New Salem Public Library (2014: LSTA \$7,500; 2015: LSTA \$7,500) announced weekly 'Teen Time', with the library open four hours every Wednesday afternoon for 11 to 18 year olds only, with movies, computers, and friends in a newly renovated area.

(2013) Newburyport Public Library (LSTA \$9,080, \$6,500 match) bolstered its collection, created additional space in the Teen Loft, and increased teen programming and teen involvement in decisions.

(2013 2014) Sunderland Public Library (2013: LSTA \$7,500, \$9,059 match; 2014: \$7,500) formed TABs for middle and high school students, who provided valuable input into the direction of purchasing materials, holding programs, and selecting comfortable furniture in a space designated for them.

(2014 2015) Thomas Crane Public Library (2014: LSTA \$9,205; 2015: \$5,795) collaborated with public schools to offer after-school programs at seven locations and created leadership opportunities with new homework assistance program for children in grades 1-6, staffed by teen volunteers.

(2013 2014) Wayland Free Library (2013: LSTA \$10,350; 2014: \$4,650) converted space into a Teen Zone and created a TAB with middle and high school students. Eighth grade earth science students attended programs on seismology, manga, 3-D printing, and Dr. Who. Teens showcased their art and drew attention to their talent.

(2014 2015) West Tisbury Free Public Library (2014: LSTA \$10,350; 2015: \$6,450) offered programs to the tween and teen year-round population after school and on weekends. The library attracted tween/teen summer residents with increased programming: more yoga, more movies, nutrition classes, and more makerspace opportunities.

(2013) Worcester Public Library (LSTA \$10,100, \$3,353 match) created a digital media lab, student exhibit space, and a homework area.

Outputs. Serving Tweens and Teens project outputs (as reported in SPRs) are summarized in Table 25.

	2013	2014	2015
Tween/teen programs	45	408	201
Tween/teen program attendees	1,324	3,806	3,547

Outcomes. Brockton PL tweens and teens who participated in science fair prep workshops created real research plans that showed practical solutions and interests in improving human welfare. In an economically disadvantaged urban area, the library reached out to local civic leaders and made solid partnerships that stand to benefit the Library and the community. Clapp Memorial Library learned from the TAB that some of the things it proposed were not what teens wanted. The town provided funding for a YA librarian five hours/week, thanks to letters of support written by the Teen Advisory Board. G. A. R. Memorial Library noted “The separate teen space in the library... became a community spot... friendships were found and formed, kids felt safe and welcome. When the monthly Teen Advisory Board attracted few teens, the librarian gathered in a structured but informal way during the first week of each month.” Lee Library Association reported teens increased their knowledge of technology; the TAB gained leadership experience and volunteered with community partners. At Mattapoisett Free PL, more students used the library in a wider variety of ways. Young adult circulation increased 8.4%, teen card registration by 10%, and teens began to volunteer. New Salem PL teens lobbied successfully for continued funding for the teen librarian position. In New Salem, teens, with the help of a presenter, designed their own versions of a video game called “Flappy Bird.” At Sunderland Public Library, in a school-based survey of fifth and sixth grade students, there was a 35% increase in those selecting the library as a place to hang out; 67% reported visiting the library monthly or weekly. The library noticed an exceptional change in many Junior and Senior TAB members, who previously had little interaction with library staff and visited the library infrequently; they began to regularly spend time in the young adult room. High school students won third place for a robot they entered in to the FIRST Robotics Competition District Tournament at the University of Massachusetts, after using the 3-D printer at Wayland PL to help make parts. Now, the planning committee for a new library is paying particular attention to the need for quality space for teens. At West Tisbury PL, activities were nearly always full and teens wanted more. Year-round and summer teen residents formed friendships around common interests.

Skill Building Techniques for Stress Reduction, MA Department of Correction

Intent. 1.2: Improve users’ general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Skill Building project accounted for \$8,421, 0.1% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 26).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$6,018	\$18,458	\$24,476
FFY 2014	\$2,403	-	\$2,403

Activities. This project introduced humor-based stress-coping mechanisms to aid inmates in avoiding aggression during incarceration and after release, using the library and its resources as the therapeutic base. The treatment model employed a variety of service delivery modes including active listening, active viewing, journaling, laughter yoga, lectures, and reading.

Outputs. Twenty-four inmates each attended 8 sessions.

Outcomes. Program evaluators found the dominant sense of humor exhibited by most inmates tended toward the destructive and negative. Once this style was revealed through participating in a 'Personal Humor Style' exercise, inmates learned techniques to incorporate more positive, constructive aspects in their daily lives.

Summer Reading

Intent. 1.2: Improve users' general knowledge and skills.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Summer Reading project accounted for \$350,706, 3.7% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 27).

FFY 2013	\$91,390
FFY 2014	\$130,391
FFY 2015	\$128,525

Activities. The MA Summer Library Program used the Collaborative Library Summer Program (CSLP) in libraries across the state for children, teens, adults, and families participating together. MBLC offered online registration, book review, and progress tracker through Evanced, working with the MLS. It switched to Evanced's Wandoo software for summer 2016. MBLC partnered with the Boston Bruins to promote the program and encourage reading. The partnership evolved to include Bruins visits during winter months; MBLC developed a Bruins Winter Kit and posted it in the online Newsroom. During Summer 2016, the Bruins expanded their partnership and offered similar prizes to the New Hampshire State Library. In 2013, MBLC worked with Buyer Advertising to develop a statewide media plan to promote summer reading. Online ads led potential participants to both <http://readsinma.org/> (the LSTA-funded online summer reading program through Evanced), and back to <https://libraries.state.ma.us/> for more information. In 2015, MBLC worked with Buyer Advertising to develop digital posts libraries could use to promote their program through social media (<http://http://mblc.state.ma.us/newsroom/photos/album/18/>).

Outputs. Summer Reading project outputs are summarized in Table 28.

Outcomes. In the October 2016 online survey, 93.6% of public library respondents reported they used the program for children age 6-12, 88.2% for pre-school children, 84.1% for tweens, 71.6% for teens, and 49.7% for adults. More than three-quarters of respondents agreed the summer reading program increased the visibility of the library in the community (89.5%), increased the number of families using the library (83.6%), helped address "summer slide" in reading levels (76.6%), strengthened the library's connection with schools (76.5%). A lower percentage agreed the program prepared pre-school children for entering school (70.2%), improved the literacy level of the community (64.9%), helped the library engage underserved populations in the community (62.0%), and strengthened the library's connections with businesses in their community (52.0%). Most comments were positive:

"Feedback from parents is overwhelming... the program motivates their children to read over the summer..."

"Through the Summer Reading Program, we were able to increase not only our readership, but also engage non-residents' interest, thereby increasing interest in funding and the Friends of the Library."

Some librarians experienced success using the Evanced program, especially for book reviews:

"I am still a HUGE fan of Evanced. This was our second summer using only Evanced (no paper logging), and not only did the summer go incredibly smoothly, but also kids wrote an enormous number of book reviews online. As part of our summer reading program, we had 353 book reviews submitted."

	2013	2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change
Public libraries participating	80.5%	79.7%	(0.8%)	72.7%	(7.0%)
Participating libraries using Evanced registration	40.6%	40.6%	-	49.4%	8.8%
Youth/adults participating	412,695	437,568	6.0%	432,843	(-1.1%)
Registered on Evanced	11,025	107,671	876.6%	113,268	5.2%
Summer reading website views		2,744,997			
Bruins visits		6		11	45.5%

Many librarians commented on the appeal of the Bruins partnership:

“Bruins being involved is such a great draw for boys (and boys are a target audience as they tend to be reluctant readers).”

The online campaign (through Facebook, Google, YouTube and twitter) for summer 2015 was highly successful, with a click-through rate of 0.23%, substantially higher than the average.05%.

GOAL 2: ACCESS

Consumer Portal

Intent. 2.1: Improve users’ ability to discover information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Consumer Portal project accounted for \$476,906, 5.1% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 29).

FFY 2013	\$127,306
FFY 2014	\$100,962
FFY 2015	\$248,638

Activities. The consumer portal <https://libraries.state.ma.us/> offered access to the statewide eBook program, statewide databases, summer reading, and Commonwealth Catalog and was a key to attracting new users to the Commonwealth’s 370 public libraries. In 2013, MBLC worked with Buyer Advertising to increase ease of access and seamlessly connect people to eBooks. Among the challenges: some digital resources on the portal required a library card to log in; others, like the databases, were accessible to anyone who was geolocated. MBLC also wanted individuals without a library card to see what was available. After changes, residents could understand what was accessible without a library card, see everything accessible with a library card, and connect to get a library card online. MBLC created an “eBooks for Everyone” page, which highlighted three ways in which residents could access eBooks. All users saw the Digital Commonwealth; for other digital resources, users’ experiences were tailored to their location and status. In 2014, MBLC removed job search information, based on low usage. Staff moved videos for New Americans to the YouTube Channel for use in social media and other outreach. MBLC added a persistent search box for the new virtual catalog, “Commonwealth Catalog” and designed the site to be responsive to whatever device a resident was using to access it.

Outputs.

Consumer Portal project outputs are summarized in Table 30. The most visited location on the site was Libraries Online which highlighted databases, access to digitized resources, and the newly added eBooks for Everyone page. When staff promoted the site at the Boston Book Festival in October 2014, portal usage spiked. During May, June and July, the summer reading page was the second most visited on the site. The portal is used by most libraries to authenticate users for the LSTA-funded databases; patrons who visit their local library website to use databases are actually going through the portal to get access. Because this is a “pass through,” data is not captured by Google analytics.

	FFY 2013		FFY 2014		FFY 2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change	
Page views	458,708	340,315	(-25.8%)	317,211	(-6.8%)	

Access to Licensed Electronic Resources/Statewide eBook Pilot Project

Intent. 2.2: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Access to Licensed Electronic Resources and Statewide eBook Pilot projects accounted for \$2,773,630, 29.6% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 31). In addition, local matching funds contributed \$1,124,989.

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$931,936	\$359,000	\$1,290,936
FFY 2014	\$975,763	\$481,920	\$1,457,683
FFY 2015	\$865,931	\$284,069	\$1,150,000

Activities. **Databases:** MBLC, in partnership with MLS, contracted with Gale Cengage, ProQuest, and Encyclopedia Britannica to provide Commonwealth residents with access to 59 databases (<https://libraries.state.ma.us/check>), through their library or at home, school or academic institution via geolocation. Ready-made web pages were provided for libraries (<http://mblc.state.ma.us/grants/licenses/links>). In 2013, MLS added Encyclopedia Britannica products to meet the needs of students and schools. Britannica trainers and MBLC staff held workshops around the state for staff from all types of libraries, covering basic and advanced features. Webinars covered scholarly and business resources, e-reference books, common core standards, celebrating the winter holidays, and outreach and mobile access. In 2014, MBLC created a LibGuide reference to address frequently-asked questions about set-up and troubleshooting. In summer 2016, MLS took over primary responsibility for support and training.

eBooks: MLS led a pilot eBook project to demonstrate feasibility and potential of a statewide eBook platform. Goals were a user-friendly platform, a broad collection of ebooks where ownership was a priority, ability to upload local content and make it available statewide, and partnerships with the MBLC, libraries, networks, and vendors to work with publishers to ease the restrictions of libraries obtaining ebooks. In 2013, 51 libraries, a mix of public, academic, school, and special, participated in the pilot. MLS contracted with three vendors – Baker and Taylor, BiblioLabs, and EBL – with three different platforms to study how each might meet content needs. An opening day collection of 10,000 items included bestselling and popular titles, academic and research titles, and public domain content, including locally curated content from the pilot libraries. MLS and vendors provided training in person and through webinars. MLS contracted with Bywater, Inc., to develop an ebook catalog available through MassCat. Some other networks loaded records into their catalog. A few pilot libraries used BiblioBoard Creator to upload local content and share with all. User groups shared feedback with vendors, which made changes to their interfaces and administrative portals. Pilot libraries developed a funding model that would sustain the project into the future. At the end of FFY 2013, the project moved into the Beta phase. IN FFY 2014, the project surpassed the 340 libraries needed to be sustainable. MLS made several mid-course corrections to internal program support, program training and the funding model. Ease of use continued to be a challenge, especially with Axis 360. To address multiple access points, MBLC came up with a brand, "Books for Everyone," that highlighted all the ways residents could get eBooks through libraries. "Commonwealth eBook Collections" was chosen as the title for the beta project. When the single search platform is ready, it will be Commonwealth eBook Collections, with the same logo and look and Books for Everyone will be the tagline. In 2015, LSTA funding covered platform fees so funding from MLS and participating libraries could provide expanded access to content. Participating libraries reconsidered Proquest EBL, and decided to retain it. The Commonwealth eBook Collections Steering Committee voted to recommend the program exit its "beta" phase and go live.

Table 32: eResources Outputs

Outputs. Access to Licensed Electronic Resources project outputs are summarized in Table 32.

	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015
Training sessions	39	44	21
Training session participants	632	880	210
Boston Globe sessions	307,572		
Gale Database page views			
ProQuest page views			
Encyclopedia Britannica sessions	2,700,000		
Pilot Participating libraries	51	478	

Outcomes.
Databases: Surveys of library needs provided

valuable and reliable information which informed the scope of statewide databases. When new content was introduced, it took more than a year for libraries to train staff, promote to their patrons, and work new resources into the curriculum in schools. In October 2016 focus groups, librarians described databases as “the bread and butter” of universal access:

“[databases] allow us to collaborate with the schools more effectively. Students have similar resources.”

eBooks: In 2013, MLS conducted surveys of library staff and users in the pilot libraries. Overall, the project was a success. Surveys showed that there was still work to be done on training and promotion for staff and patrons. Some interfaces were easier to use than others. Patrons reported a successful search 89% of the time, while library staff results were 55%. In July 2015, MBLC conducted a survey to gauge effectiveness of promotion. Most libraries used some but not all promotional materials. They asked for a step-by-step instructional brochure, assistance with digital and social media, and more training. MLS used the pop-up survey embedded in Baker & Taylor’s Axis 360 interface to achieve a good response rate from end-users. Survey results confirmed significant improvements in the Axis 360 interface. Surveys and anecdotal evidence highlight growing satisfaction and excitement for the self-publishing capabilities in BiblioBoard. October 2016 focus group participants agreed with the direction of the ebook program:

“We need to move more to sharing digital content online.”

NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP) Collectors for Commonwealth Catalog/Network Connections and Servers

Intent. 3.2: Improve the library’s physical and technological infrastructure.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the NCIP Collectors and Network Connections and Servers projects accounted for \$302,742, 3.2% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 33).

FFY 2013	\$120,467
FFY 2014	\$182,275

Activities. In FFY 2013, consortia installed NCIP collectors. In 2013 and 2014, Massachusetts’ library consortia installed servers, switches, routers, firewalls, and wireless hubs.

(2013 2014) Cape Libraries Automated Materials Sharing (2013: LSTA \$39,380, 2014: LSTA \$19,821) contracted with Innovative Interfaces to modify its NCIP module to function with the new Commonwealth Catalog, which allowed both CLAMS and Minuteman Library Network to act as interlibrary lenders on the Auto-Graphics SHAREit system. In 2013, CLAMS replaced integrated library system (ILS) and training servers at 35 CLAMS libraries. In 2014, it installed 34 switches in member libraries.

(2013) Central/Western Massachusetts Automated Regional Sharing System (C/W MARS) (LSTA \$15,000), with Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (MVLIC) and North of Boston Library Exchange (NOBLE), created a NCIP responder for the open-source Evergreen integrated library system.
(2013 2014) Minuteman Library Network (MLN) (2013: LSTA \$34,955; 2014: LSTA \$22,680) replaced telecommunication switches at 15 member libraries and the end-of-life core switch at the Central Site in Natick.

(2014) North of Boston Library Exchange (NOBLE) installed 142 new switches at 21 public library outlets, got all telecommunications equipment under maintenance contract and 24x7 monitoring, and replaced a central site router and switch.

(2013 2014) Old Colony Library Network (OCLN) (2013: LSTA \$31,132; 2014: \$69,224) installed, configured, and tested a SirsiDynix Symphony NCIP connector for the interoperability with the Commonwealth Catalog. At the time of the final project report, with the “Cancel Request Item” message was still failing. OCLN and the other SirsiDynix-based ILS in Massachusetts, SAILS, hope to participate in the Commonwealth Catalog by spring 2015. It replaced end-of-life production and tested integrated library system (ILS) servers that support 37 library outlets. In 2014, OCLN replaced end-of-life routers, 30 firewalls, and 24 switches and began to experiment with secure access points for protected staff-accessible Wifi at a third of member libraries.

(2014) SAILS, Inc (LSTA \$35,528) upgraded switches in 45 libraries and installed staff-only wireless networks with access points at four member libraries to test the SirsiDynix Mobile Circulation app.

Outputs. Outputs for the NCIP and for the Network Connections project are summarized in Table 34.

Outcomes. With new servers, consortia reported dramatic reductions in service outages, time required to run reports, log-in and search wait time. For example, CLAMS software outages were reduced by more than 99%. In a Minuteman member survey, satisfied/very satisfied levels were high: 95% for LAN connectivity, 90% for Internet connectivity and speed, 81% for file transfers from the local library server, 90% for speed of materials

delivered from central site servers, and 95% for the installation process. Thirty percent of NOBLE libraries reported somewhat faster throughput speeds. At OCLN, ebook usage jumped 24%, and user satisfaction with ebooks increased 3%, but libraries were slow to adopt roving reference and mobile circulation. At SAILS, downtime and outages due to switch failure ceased. The roll-out of wireless circulation services to four volunteer member libraries -- Swansea, Dartmouth, Seekonk, and Plainville – was not successful.

	FFY 2013	FFY 2014
NCIP connectors	3	
Servers replaced	4	
Switches installed	205	89
Routers replaced	2	
Firewalls		30
Wireless access points		117

Virtual Catalog/Open: New Virtual Catalog, Fenway Libraries Online, Inc. (FLO)

Intent. 2.1: Improve users’ ability to discover information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Virtual Catalog and Open: New Virtual Catalog project accounted for \$678,456, 7.3% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 35).

FFY 2013	\$259,115
FFY 2014	\$208,777
FFY 2015	\$210,564

Activities. Old catalog: FLO provided server hosting, system administration, help desk support, and member billing functions to 13 participating systems of the Massachusetts Virtual Catalog. In 2014, FLO managed the transition process from Virtual Catalog to Commonwealth Catalog, including concluding the contractual relationship with SirsiDynix, clearing out complete transactions, and generating final reports for participating library systems, while it continued to operate the Virtual Catalog for those not yet migrated. In 2015, FLO closed the massvc.org domain, which hosted secondary documentation, contact information, and statistical compilations. Staff visited three consortia to train consortium staff and member libraries and worked with University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth and Auto-Graphics to develop EZProxy integration with the SHAREIt system, since the library’s Alma software did not treat library user records using the same paradigm as a classic integrated library system. Problems with NCIP continued to crop up; the SHAREIt ILL systems’ inability to handle local barcode replacements became a major issue for some participating systems.

New catalog: In partnership with MBLC, FLO continued work with Auto-Graphics to add and test contractually-required features to the SHAREit interlibrary loan system. In 2013, participants formally accepted the new software, but the summer 2014 roll-out was cancelled due to significant software instability issues, resolved by Fall 2014. At the same time, connectivity with the initial group of library consortia via a combination of z39.50 and the NCIP direct consortial borrowing message set failed rigorous testing, and FLO put several networks back on the old Virtual Catalog. In 2014, work on new connectors for Evergreen-based consortia (C/WMARS, NOBLE, and MVLC) was completed and tested; the Koha-based system (MassCat) connector was nearly completed. FLO was not able to connect to

Virtual Catalog participants using OCLC WMS, since the search and borrowing API's were not available, and OCLC did not support NCIP DCB.

	2013		2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change	
Help desk tickets completed	230	208	10.6%	1,100	428.9%	
Training sessions		7				
Training participants		140				
Libraries in catalog		181				
Commonwealth Catalog lending		6,673				

Outputs. Virtual Catalog project outputs are summarized in Table 36.

Outcomes. Solutions developed for Massachusetts were immediately adopted by Wisconsin, Kansas, and others. The new SHAREit product was the first completely NCIP-driven resource sharing system deployed.

Resource Sharing/Network Retreat

Intent. 3.2 Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the Resource Sharing/Network Retreat totaled \$11,462, 0.1% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures.

Activities. MBLC hired a facilitator to convene a meeting of the nine automated networks and MassCat, a program of the Massachusetts Library System. Forty-three participants identified strengths and weaknesses of the current support MBLC provided to networks, identified performance measures that could improve and inform the telling of the network story, and gave input in the future direction of support for networks from MBLC.

Outputs. Participants asked MBLC to look at ways to improve resource sharing, such as a discovery system and statewide RFID. They wanted resource sharing to be available to all libraries, with MBLC continuing support for the Small Library in Networks program. They noted current technologies were a necessary network infrastructure and should be funded. MBLC held a follow up meeting to discuss findings and began to implement.

Small Libraries in Networks/Small Public Libraries (funded under GOAL 3, but reported here)

Intent. 2013: 3.2: Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure; 2014: 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 only, the Small Libraries in Networks project accounted for \$149,884, 1.6% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 37). Matching funds added \$409,344.

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$123,494	\$82,700	\$193,694
FFY 2014	\$26,390	\$326,644	\$353,034

Activities. Two consortia received funding in 2013; in 2014, the funding formula changed; libraries received subsidies directly:

(2013) C/W MARS (LSTA \$110,994, \$82,700 match) offset the cost of network membership for 47 libraries in communities serving fewer than 10,000 residents.

(2013) Merrimack Valley Library Consortium (LSTA \$12,500) used grant funds to subsidize cost of membership for five libraries in communities serving fewer than 10,000 residents.

(2014) MBLC (LSTA \$26,390; match \$326,644) partnered with automated networks and MLS to review its Small Library in Network Program and the sustainability of small libraries. The Small Library in Network committee developed a new formula for funding; MBLC now supports all network members with populations under 10,000 with state-funded network membership subsidies ranging from \$1,200 to \$2,700. In partnership with MLS, MBLC hosted and underwrote attendance for the first Small Library Forum including a presentation by Jessamyn West, table talks, and a presentation on statewide resources which support small libraries.

Outputs. In 2013, C/W MARS reported small library borrowing decreased 2.4%, while overall borrowing increased 70.7%, and small library lending increased 1.4%, while overall lending jumped 64.0%. No outputs were reported for Merrimack Valley Library Consortium. In 2014, six focus groups attracted 30 participants; 147 attended the Small Library Forum.

Outcomes. According to focus group participants, state funding for small libraries was critical, but phasing it out over five years would allow libraries to make budget adjustments. Belonging to a network was beneficial and recognized by the community. Some felt they and their libraries were falling further and further behind with technology and requested IT assistance, beyond the MLS help currently offered. Training for library staff was critical, but attending meetings was difficult due to scheduling and travel costs. Participants requested expanded delivery service, a statewide library card, and policies consistent across the state.

Social Log-in Risk Assessment

Intent. 2.2: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Social Log-in Risk project accounted for \$59,554, 0.6% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 38).

FFY 2013	\$165,897
FFY 2014	\$286,246
FFY 2015	\$142,100

Activities. In pursuit of a statewide library card solution, MBLC investigated feasibility and associated risk of patron access to library resources using familiar social login credentials, such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and Google. MBLC contracted with a security expert and partnered with NOBLE as a potential pilot library consortium for a future test of social login for authentication.

Outputs. The consultant agreed using social credentials, such as Facebook, LinkedIn or Twitter to log into library resources could be managed so that library activities were not shared with the social platform. Use of middleware solutions to manage social login introduced a much larger risk. Although social login providers would not track library usage directly, while creating the tie between library users and their chosen social platforms, the social login provider grabbed large amounts of data from the user's social platform account and could potentially resell it. In addition to very specific recommendations about social login, the consultant provided general risk mitigation best practices, such as use of a third-party auditor, to ensure general patron login processes were secure.

Preservation and Digitization Projects

Intent. 2.1: Improve users' ability to discover information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, preservation and digitization projects accounted for \$132,123, 1.4% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 39).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$29,028	\$2,761	\$15,437
FFY 2014	\$28,105	-	\$28,105
FFY 2015	\$74,990	-	\$74,990

Activities/Outputs. Five projects were funded:

(2014) Digitizing Historical Resources/Assumption College (LSTA \$13,105) worked with Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC) to digitize and conserve 75 photographs and 300 pages of documents about life on late 1800's Native American reservations and government and missionary schools in Indian Territory.

(2013) In the Zenith of My Glory: Preserving the Legacy of the USS Constitution's 1812 Crew/USS Constitution Museum (LSTA \$12,676, match \$2,761) conserved, digitized, and made accessible two rare intimate volumes, Midshipman Whipple's letterbook and the handwritten recollections of Marine Fifer Byron. Staff created full transcriptions and detailed descriptive inventories, including short biographies and historical context. More than 200 people viewed the manuscripts during US Navy Crew Training and the Museum's Collections Open House in 2014. The Museum's Library and Manuscripts Collections webpage had 852 page views, a 19.2% increase.

(2015) Manuscripts Arrangement and Description/Weymouth PL (LSTA \$29,900) hired a consultant to create an organizational scheme for its collection of one-of-a-kind items from the 18th century, including some related to the Abolitionist movement and to create finding aids. The project resulted in 14 small collections with finding aids.

(2013) Massachusetts in the Civil War/MA Historical Society (MHS) (LSTA \$165,897) created preservation microfilm and digital images of nine collections of Civil War papers, eight containing letters from soldiers to their families back home and the ninth containing papers of a superintendent of the U.S. Sanitary Commission documenting wartime civilian relief efforts. Some of the largest collections and most difficult images were created by NEDCC; others were created in-house. MHS added images of 129 photographs, scanned and converted to microfilm 9,327 digital masters and created 15 reels of preservation microfilm.

(2014 2015) Preservation of Library and Archival Materials/ MA Historical Society (2014: \$15,000; 2015: \$30,000) completed a two-year project to create preservation microfilm and digital images of seven manuscript collections documenting women's activities in the public sphere in Massachusetts. Images will be presented on the institution's website to provide the widest possible access to the collections. Approximately 16,000 color scans were converted to 28 reels of preservation microfilm to be stored offsite.

Outcomes. Following the success of this project, the USS Constitution Museum decided to join the Digital Commonwealth and pursue additional grants to digitize and provide expanded access to additional War of 1812 records. The Weymouth Community Preservation Committee funded the library's preservation request.

In the October 2016 online survey, 90.5% of those who responded (20) agreed library users considered the library a valuable partner, 81.0% that the library identified resources that needed to be preserved, 76.2% that individuals served by the library had access to increased resources, 71.5% that individuals had increased awareness of/access to unique collections, 71.4% that the library was involved in an increased level of preservation activity, 66.7% that library staff had increased knowledge/skills in preservation/digitization, 57.2% that the library had increased capacity to preserve/digitize, and 52.4% that the library identified environmental issues needing to be addressed

Serving People with Disabilities

Intent. 2.2: Improve users' ability to obtain and/or use information resources (5.3 Memorial Hall Library).

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Serving People with Disabilities project accounted for \$45,625, 0.3% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 40).

FFY	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$8,950
FFY 2014	\$13,150
FFY 2015	\$23,525

Activities. All four libraries sought advice from people with disabilities, purchased assistive technology, offered training to staff, and created displays:

(2013) Framingham State University (LSTA \$1,450) met needs of students and others who were blind or visually impaired, deaf or hard of hearing, or who needed assistive technology. The library held an open house.

(2013) Memorial Hall Library/Especially for All (LSTA \$10,000) reached out to parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) with a series of music therapy workshops and lecture series on issues of parenting children with ASD, trained staff, and purchased books and music to support sensory story time.

(2014, 2015) Northampton, Forbes Library (2014 LSTA \$13,150; 2015 \$4,950) collaborated with Clarke Schools for Hearing and Speech, Federation for Children with Special Needs, MA Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, National Federation of the Blind, Northampton Senior Center, Northampton Commission on Disabilities, and Braille and Talking Book Library at the Perkins School for the Blind.

(2015) Pittsfield, Berkshire Athenaeum (LSTA \$8,975) provided programming to families with children on the ASD spectrum and strengthened its relationship with local service providers, in year one of a two-year project.

(2015) Sudbury, Goodnow Library (LSTA \$9,600) targeted improving services for people with visual and auditory disabilities, in year one of a two-year project.

	2013	2014	2015
Training sessions	12	1	3
Training attendees	16	26	56
Programs	4		2
Program participants	40		175

Outputs. Serving People with Disabilities project outputs are summarized in Table 41.

Outcomes. Forbes Library received the Paul Winske Access Award from the Stavros Center for Independent Living (Amherst, MA) for going the extra mile in offering access to persons with disability. At Memorial Hall Library, staff filled out pre- and post-training surveys. They felt empowered to serve children with autism and better understood issues faced by families. They reported changes in children who attended programs: One non-verbal child learned about taking turns, following directions, and waiting. He was calmer, participated more, and was a model for other children. A mother learned to help redirect her daughter through singing, and she was learning to pay attention longer and wait patiently.

GOAL 3: LIBRARY CAPACITY BUILDING

Data Coordination

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Data Coordination project accounted for \$662,542, 7.1% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 42).

FFY	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$210,720
FFY 2014	\$233,273
FFY 2015	\$218,549

Activities. MBLC collected and analyzed usage, financial, demographic, and personnel data about public libraries and compiled, published in 13 reports, and created customized statistical reports for libraries and state and municipal officials on demand. In 2015, MBLC began providing Counting Opinions customer satisfaction survey software to assist public libraries in collecting data from community residents, to be coordinated with data already collected by the agency. It participated in the Public Library Statistics

Cooperative (PLSC) and the State Library Agency Survey. MBLC granted Certificates of Librarianship to applicants based on work experience or educational level as set forth in statute and regulations and required by all Massachusetts public library directors as a prerequisite for municipalities to participate in the state aid program. For municipalities with populations under 10,000, the agency worked with the Massachusetts Library System to provide basic library techniques training courses. Agency staff provided training on collecting data, how to use standard reports and the consumer satisfaction component, and how to customize reports.

O

Table 43: Data Coordination Outputs					
Outputs.	2013	2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change
Data					
Coordination project	Workshops on Counting Opinions	14		14	0.0%
	Certificates of Librarianship	33	35	5.7%	

outputs are summarized in Table 43.

Outcomes. October focus group participants understood the value of statistics:

"[They are] important in selling the library to local officials."

Emergency Assistance/Disaster Recovery/Environmental Monitoring

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations/3.2 Improve the library's physical and technological infrastructure.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Emergency Assistance/ Disaster Recovery and Environmental Monitoring projects accounted for \$413,128, 4.4% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 44).

Table 44: Emergency Assistance/Environmental Monitoring Expenditures	
FFY 2013	\$144,188
FFY 2014	\$120,286
FFY 2015	\$148,654

Activities. Emergency Assistance (2013: LSTA \$77,134; 2014: LSTA \$68,184; 2015: LSTA \$71,754): MBLC attended meetings of the MA Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) and with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The MBLC representative served as Co-Chair of Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness in MA (COSTEP MA). In 2013, MBLC convened community mitigation meetings and held risk assessment/planning workshops. In 2014, under a contract with MBLC, Polygon worked with Norton Public Library. Environmental Monitoring (2013: LSTA \$67,054; 2014: \$52,102; 2015: \$76,900): MBLC managed an environmental monitoring program for all types of libraries, archives, historical societies, museums, and record custodians in Massachusetts. Reports on environmental conditions allowed institutions to optimize long-term preservation and storage of their holdings, prolonging the life of collections and maintaining user access.

O

Table 45: Emergency Assistance/Environmental Monitoring Outputs					
Outputs.	2013	2014		2015	
	Usage	Usage	Change	Usage	Change
Emergency Assistance and Environment	Community mitigation meetings	14		12	
	Risk assessment workshops	4	1		(-75.0)
	dataloggers installed		25	20	(-20.0%)

al Monitoring project outputs are summarized in Table 45.

Outcomes. Documenting environmental conditions has provided document custodians with objective data to begin to institute changes for their collections. In one instance, an organization determined it could not meet recommended conditions and worked with the National Park Service to locate another facility where they would be able to provide significantly better conditions for their collections.

Joint Public Library Planning: South Hadley Public Library

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. In FFY 2014 only, the Joint Public Library Planning project accounted for \$10,000, 0.1% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures.

Activities. The municipal South Hadley Public Library and the independent Gaylord Memorial Library explored options for merging administration and integrating services. They selected a consultant to facilitate the process. Through a series of working meetings between the two libraries, meetings with local officials, and a public forum.

Outputs. A plan was developed for presentation to the town. There is deep affection within South Hadley for the historic legacy and continued existence of the two libraries. Potential legal issues regarding the ownership of the Gaylord Memorial Library building were identified and are being discussed.

Leadership Institute

Intent. 3.1: Improve the library workforce.

Expenditures. In FFY 2014 only, the Leadership Institute project accounted for \$11,863, 0.1% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures.

Activities. MBLC partnered with the MLA to support emerging leaders' attendance at the New England Library Association's NELLIS Conference.

Outputs. Eight emerging leaders and two mentors attended; each developed an action plan.

MBLC Website Support

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the MBLC Website Support project accounted for \$483,559, 5.2% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 46).

FFY 2013	\$144,975
FFY 2014	\$161,216
FFY 2015	\$177,368

Activities. MBLC provided server hosting and maintenance, backups, internet service and a content management system for the MBLC website: <http://mass.gov/mbc>, which held the statewide library directory, library and remote access to statewide licensed e-content and library systems, and statewide virtual catalog, data sets from the state aid and data coordination unit, minutes of board meetings, a special collections directory, information about libraries offering ESL and literacy services, and facilitated more than 30 electronic distribution lists used by libraries. During 2013, MBLC completed testing of a mirrored, fail-over system, in case of catastrophic hardware failure, and upgraded LibGuides service from version 1 to 2, which required redesign work and migration of old content into new formats. MBLC implemented Domain Keys Identified Mail on its mailing lists when Yahoo! and other large email providers announced they would reject email messages as spam if the message appeared to come from somewhere other than the user's own mail host provider. In 2014, MBLC and its hosting provider upgraded operating systems for six virtual servers on two hosts and contracted for redesign of the MBLC site to make it responsive for use on mobile devices. MBLC ran a consumer portal, LibGuides (and planned to add LibAnswers), social media accounts, and blogs. In 2015, the new information architecture and content strategy was completed, all core templates built out in the content management system, and more than half of the retained content rewritten and migrated to the new site.

Outputs. Page views totaled 1,286,926 in 2014; data for 2013 and 2015 was not reported.

Newsroom: Tools for the Library Community

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 and 2015, the Newsroom project accounted for \$132,733, 1.4% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 47).

Activities. The MBLC Newsroom (<http://mblc.state.ma.us/newsroom>) was a one-stop place librarians could go to find important news stories, information, publications, photos, and materials to raise awareness about library services. MBLC staff used the Newsroom to provide easy access to MBLC communications and publications materials, to post and share tools created by librarians, to highlight seasonal events such as LSTA-funded summer reading, and to connect librarians with new statewide initiatives and materials. The Newsroom blog highlighted eBooks and issues surrounding eBooks in libraries and featured information about the LSTA-funded statewide eBook program called Commonwealth eBook Collections.

FFY	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$47,359
FFY 2014	-
FFY 2015	\$85,374

Outputs. Newsroom project outputs are summarized in Table 48. In 2013, the

	2013		2014		2015	
	Usage	Change	Usage	Change	Usage	Change
Website page views	369,021		6,124		8,125	32.7%

Newsroom Blog which featured eBook information and LSTA-funded summer reading were the two most visited locations on the Newsroom. In 2014, MBLC switched to Google Analytics for more accurate reporting.

Planning for Preservation and Digitization

Intent. 2.1: Improve users' ability to discover information resources.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Planning for Preservation and Digitization project accounted for \$184,524, 2.0% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 49).

FFY	Expenditures
FFY 2013	\$20,785
FFY 2014	\$45,297
FFY 2015	\$118,442

Activities. In 2013, MBLC contracted with a consultant to lead a process to plan for future digitization and preservation efforts. State stakeholders, Boston Public Library, Digital Commonwealth, MA Archives, NEDCC, MLS, and members of the Statewide Advisory Committee on Libraries were invited to participate. The consultant facilitated a visioning session, developed a survey, and set up focus groups. From the information gathered, the Advisory Committee determined the Commonwealth needed to be more proactive in locating the rich treasures held in Massachusetts. This led to the creation of the Community Preservation Identification and Recommendations grant. In 2015, the Town-wide Preservation Assessment and Collection Identification project carried on the work. Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC) was awarded grants to meet with four local institutions (see the Preservation Assessment project) to conduct assessments.

Outputs. Each repository created a preservation long-range plan based on its assessment report.

Preservation Assessment

Intent. 3.3: Improve library operations.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Preservation Assessment project accounted for \$27,300, 0.3% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 50).

	LSTA	Match	Total
FFY 2013	\$10,500	\$2,250	\$12,750
FFY 2014	\$8,400	-	\$8,400
FFY 2015	\$8,400	-	\$8,400

Activities. Seven libraries received grants and contracted with NEDCC to complete preservation needs assessments and develop preservation plans:

(2013) Agawam Public Library (2013: LSTA \$3,500, match \$750)

(2013) Brockton Public Library System (2013: LSTA \$3,500, match \$750) assessment identified which collections to prioritize for preservation, including playbills from Brockton theaters, photographs, and high school yearbooks.

(2013) Melrose Public Library (2013: LSTA \$3,500, match \$750) evaluated its local history collections, including those owned by the Melrose Historical Society and housed in the library. The preservation specialist identified best practices the library and historical society should follow in future.

(2014) Langley Adams Library (LSTA \$4,200) assessed preservation needs. Based on the report, the library obtained estimates and presented a proposal to the community for funding.

(2014) Wheelock College (LSTA \$4,200)

(2015) Congregation Library & Archives (LSTA \$4,200)

(2015) Milford Town Library (LSTA \$4,200) evaluated the Paul E. Curran Historical Collections.

Outputs. All seven libraries completed preservation assessments.

Outcomes. The Groveland Community Preservation Committee (CPC) voted to include the Langley Adams Library's request for \$51,000 to carry out its preservation plan in the FY2016 budget. The library will preserve bound volumes and other paper records, serials, archival material, historical maps, photographs and oversized pieces of artwork, microfilm and super 8mm film, and video tape reels.

Public Library Advisory

Intent. 3.1: Improve the library workforce.

Expenditures. From FFY 2013 through 2015, the Public Library Advisory project accounted for \$703,562, 7.5% of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures (Table 51).

FFY 2013	\$241,853
FFY 2014	\$259,404
FFY 2015	\$202,305

Activities. MBLC staff provided assistance to public library directors and staff, trustees, library friends groups, and municipal officials on library issues. Staff advised on laws and legislation, regulations, and policies affecting local public libraries, and on governance issues, roles and responsibilities of trustee and Friends groups. Staff work closely with the MA Library Association, MA Library System, MA Library Trustee Association, and the MA Friends of Libraries to strengthen programs for libraries, trustees, and friends. MBLC required libraries to have strategic plans on file if requesting a LSTA direct grant or construction funding. and staff provided training and consultation to libraries and networks on creating plans. In 2014, MBLC delivered a "Trusty Trustee Pocket Guide" to all libraries. Staff promoted trustee and Friends email groups and developed resources on LibGuides for both groups. Staff responded to advisory questions received from library directors, trustees and friends.

Outputs. Public Library Advisory project outputs are summarized in Table 52.

	FFY 2013	FFY 2014		FFY 2015	
	Usage	Usage	% Change	Usage	% Change
Trustee workshops	10	8	(-20.0%)	7	(-12.5%)
Trustee workshop attendees	266	136	(-48.9%)	147	8.1%

Friends programs	3	4	33.3%	3	(-25.0%)
Friends program attendees	73	180	146.6%	105	(-41.7%)
Consulting requests	300	3,240	980.0%	2,600	(-19.8%)

Outcomes. Participants in October 2016 focus groups were complimentary of the MBLC and their advisory work:

“There is always someone there. They want you to succeed.”

““My grant advisor makes me realize I’m part of something bigger. Neat place to be.”

Reader’s Advisory (RA)

Intent. 3.1: Improve the library workforce.

FFY 2013	\$15,000
FFY 2015	\$22,200

Expenditures. In FFY 2013 and 2015, the Reader’s Advisory project accounted for \$37,200, 0.4% of Massachusetts’ LSTA expenditures (Table 53).

Activities. Four RA projects were funded from FFY 2013 through 2015:

(2013) Marstons Mills Public Library (LSTA \$7,500, no match) offered workshops on the RA process and interview for staff, volunteers, and trustees. Staff held meetings on genre studies and visited six neighboring libraries which had previously done RA training. The library also hosted four mystery author events

(2013) Medfield Memorial Library (LSTA \$7,500, no match) trained staff in RA techniques, including interviewing patrons to determine personalized suggestions, designing engaging library displays, and discussing genres. To identify new genres and encourage a better browsing experience, staff at public service desks kept track of RA interactions. They decided to create eight new sub-collections.

(2015) Chelmsford Public Library (LSTA \$15,000) and Dracut Public Library staff attended RA training in psychological, romantic, historical, political, espionage, and medical suspense sub-genres, then added suspense author programs and created book lists, shelf-talkers, bookmarks, displays and special book labels.

(2015) Mattapoisett Free Public Library (LSTA \$7,200) staff read and discussed mysteries together, using RA vocabulary to build skills and enhance team morale. The library subscribed to Novelist, and staff received training.

Outputs. Reader’s Advisory project outputs are summarized in Table 54.

	2013	2015
Staff training sessions	14	12
Staff training attendees	10	197

Outcomes. All four libraries reported significant changes in attitude, knowledge, skill, and behavior. At Mattapoisett PL, for example, a pre-survey indicated no staff had confidence in making reading suggestions and knowledge about appeal factors, genres and sub-genres and just 10% had prior training in Reader’s Advisory and or had used Novelist or other RA tools. In the post-survey, 100% of staff responded they had received training in Reader’s Advisory and Novelist and engaged in staff discussions about RA skills and tools; 93% indicated they had used RA tools and had increased confidence in responding to adult reader’s advisory questions.

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

Massachusetts projects addressed national priorities associated with the Measuring Success focal areas and corresponding intents. Details of projects are included in section A-1 above and Appendix I.

A-3. Did any groups represent a substantial focus for your Five-Year Plan activities? For those who answer Yes, please discuss to what extent each group was reached.

Three-fourths of Massachusetts' LSTA expenditures from FFY 2013 through 2015 was targeted at the library workforce. Review of documents, discussions with MBLC and library leaders from around the state confirm that MBLC's investment in human capital is paying off handsomely in improved customer service, creative programming, and successful outreach to new audiences, often involving partnerships. Details of project activities and outcomes are included in A-1 and Appendix J.

B. Process Questions

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

New and old SPR data is used annually by the MBLC Director and other staff, especially in relation to their agency strategic plan, to ensure that appropriate overlap of activities is taking place. Elements are included in a variety of the agency's reports to the public, to the library community, and to state government. Data from the SPR is also used to establish benchmarks that are reviewed on a periodic basis to assess progress toward the goals stated in the LSTA 2013–2017 Five-Year Plan, especially in the face of staff changes. SPR data has also been shared with specific outside evaluators, such as QualityMetrics, LLC, for this assessment.

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

There were no formal changes made to the plan. Minor refinements took place in the context of a rich portfolio of sub-grants distributed over the years. The MBLC has an exemplary history of ensuring innovation is taking place through its sub-grants and the libraries in the state have benefitted from their diligent and exemplary administration of the sub-grants; some of them managed with staff that have rich expertise in an areas like preservation for example.

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

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

C. Methodology Questions

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

To ensure rigorous and objective evaluation of the SLAA implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program, the agency joined COSLINE and issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on July 1, 2016 to

solicit proposals to conduct a “Library Services and Technology Act Evaluation.” Proposals were due July 18, 2016.

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

QualityMetrics, Library Consultants has in depth evaluation experience and demonstrated professional competency. Dr. Martha Kyrillidou of QualityMetrics has extensive experience in deploying mixed methods research methods for library evaluation. She has participated in developing many well-known protocols for value and outcomes assessment for libraries. She has deep experience in library evaluation over her 22 years of service at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), has taught Research Methods, Assessment, and Evaluation courses at the University of Maryland and at Kent State University and has extensive practical experience in mixed methods, evaluation and outcomes assessment. Martha is a current member of the Library Statistics Working Group (LSWG), chair of the NISO Z39.7 standard, and mentoring the next generation of public library staff and evaluators. Co-principal consultant, Bill Wilson of QualityMetrics has implemented evaluation studies for three previous cycles of LSTA evaluations starting in 2002. Mr. Wilson is experienced in both quantitative and qualitative methods and has participated in 28 previous five-year LSTA Grants to States evaluations. Sara Laughlin is a nationally recognized library consultant and has deep and rich experience with LSTA evaluation in previous cycles. Ethel Himmel is also an experienced evaluator and library consultant with experience in LSTA evaluations in previous cycles; Dr. Himmel wrote the survey analysis of this report.

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

QualityMetrics consultants deployed a mixed methods protocol for data collection that is multi-faceted and rigorous. After conducting an initial telephone conference call with representatives of MBLC, QualityMetrics completed a site-visit to the Commission offices on October 3-4, 2016. In-person interviews were held with the Director and with key staff engaged in both LSTA and the specific projects carried out under the LSTA Five-Year Plan. A series of phone call interviews were interspersed as each set of activities and goals was reviewed – the combination of in-person interviews with staff responsible for a project and follow up phone calls with specific projects participants provided a rich body of evidence for the evaluators. These interviews were supplemented with focus groups on October 31, 2016 in Springfield, MA. The site visit and the focus groups provided qualitative evidence and context.

The State Program Reports (SPRs) were reviewed in detail and additional reports, documentation, fliers, newspaper articles, and social media feeds were consulted selectively as corroborating evidence. An online survey conducted February 15 – 24, 2017 provided additional quantitative and qualitative information. The survey was reviewed for representativeness to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Additional corroborative evidence from comments collected in the survey served to triangulate the evidence gathered.

Validity and reliability analysis reflect a positivist worldview and in a qualitative naturalistic approach they are being redefined with some divergent views on whether and how one ensures quality and rigor in qualitative inquiry. The notion that naturalistic inquiry needs to exhibit quality, rigor and trustworthiness is more widespread nowadays. The evaluators engaged in conversations through in-person and phone interviews. The quality and rigor of the interviews in the LSTA evaluation of the MBLC has been enhanced by having both evaluators participate in all the interviews. It allowed the evaluators to reflect

and refine their interpretations in a reliable manner. The validity of the inquiry was strengthened with the informed selection of the subjects and inclusiveness of the process. Knowledge of the utilization of LSTA by the interviewee was provided enhancing the interaction and depth of the conversation. Furthermore, Wilson and Kyrillidou participated jointly in the onsite agency interviews allowing for the concept of triangulation to be implemented as evaluators debriefed and compared interpretation and understandings.

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

Evaluators interviewed key MBLC staff engaged in LSTA activities. See Appendix B.

MBLC staff recommended and recruited participants for two onsite focus groups which drew participation from libraries throughout the state. See Appendix B.

Librarians and library staff were engaged through phone interviews as well. See Appendix B.

Librarians and other library staff were engaged through an online survey. See the survey instrument in Appendix D and results in Appendix F.

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

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

Appendix A: List of Acronyms

ALA	American Library Association
ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorder
CFCE	Coordinated Family and Community Engagement
CLAMS	Cape Libraries Automated Materials Sharing
COSTEP MA	Coordinated Statewide Emergency Preparedness in Massachusetts
CSLP	Coordinated Summer Library Program
C/W MARS	Central/Western Massachusetts Automated Regional Sharing System
FLO	Fenway Libraries Online, Inc.
ILS	Integrated library system
IMLS	Institute for Museum and Library Services: http://www.ims.gov
KWL	Know, Want to know, Learn, a system of authentic assessment
LSTA	Library Services and Technology Act, part of the Museum and Library Services Act, which created the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and established federal programs to assist libraries in improving services to the public. LSTA has three purposes: 1) facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; 2) encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public. The LSTA Grants to States program is a federal-state partnership, 3) promote improvements in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States. The program provides funds using a population-based formula to each state and the territories through State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs).
MA	Massachusetts
MBLC	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
MLN	Minuteman Library Network
MLS	Massachusetts Library System
MVLC	Merrimack Valley Library Consortium
NCIP	NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol
NEDCC	Northeast Document Conservation Center
NISO	National Information Standards Organization

NOBLE	North of Boston Library Exchange
OCLN	Old Colony Library Network
RA	Reader's Advisory
SAILS	SAILS Library Network
SLAA	State Library Administrative Agency
STEAM	Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math
TAB	Teen Advisory Board

Appendix B: List of people interviewed

	<i>Name</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Institution</i>
MBLC Interviews, October 3-4, 2016			
	Dianne Carty	Director	MBLC
	Ruth Urell	Head of Library Advisory/Development	MBLC
	Rachel Masse	Assistant to the Director	MBLC
	Shelley Quezada	Consultant to the Unserved	MBLC
	Gregor Trinkaus- Randall	Preservation Specialist	MBLC
	Eric Williams Hart	Trustee/Friends Specialist	MBLC
	Paul Kissman	Library Information Systems Specialist	MBLC
	Celeste Bruno	Communications Director	MBLC
	Cindy Roach	Former LSTA Coordinator, retired	MBLC
Library Leader Interviews, October 3-4, 2016			
	Stephanie Young	Director	Woods Memorial Library, Barre
	Lisa Downing	Assistant Director	Forbes Library, Northampton
	Christina Prochilo		Congregational Library & Archives
	Anne Grimes Rand and Kate Monca		USS Constitution Museum
	Susan Babb	Director	G. A. R. Memorial Library
	Greg Pronevitz and Steve Spohn		Massachusetts Library System
	Kathleen Reilly	Local History Supervisor	Berkshire Athenaeum, Pittsfield
	Susan Pizzolato	Director	Mattapoisett Free Public Library
	Michelle Filleul	Head of Circulation	Reading Public Library
	Bernadette Rivard	Director	Bellingham Public Library
Focus Group, October 31, 2016: 1-2:30 pm Session			

	Deborah Kelsey	Library Director	Gloucester Lyceum & Sawyer Free Library
	Layla Johnston	Information Services Manager	Springfield City Library
	Michelle Eberle	Consultant	Massachusetts Library System
	Lisa Downing	Assistant Director	Forbes Library
	Jennifer Whitehead	Head of Youth Services	Clapp Memorial Library
	Kathleen Reilly	Local History Department Supervisor	The Berkshire Athenaeum
	Madeline Kelly	Supervisor, Reference Services	Berkshire Athenaeum
Focus Group, October 31, 2017: 3-4:30 pm Session			
	Nancy Contois	Library Director	Chicopee Public Library
	Mark Contois	Director of Libraries	Framingham Public Library
	Barbara Friedman	Library Director	Erving Public Library
	Joseph Rodio	Director	South Hadley PL
	Rob MacLean	Director of Library Services	Weymouth Public Libraries

Appendix C: Bibliography of all documents reviewed

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

Institute of Museum and Library Services
Purposes and Priorities of LSTA

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

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

MBLC
LSTA Program Five-Year Plan for Years 2013 – 2017

MBLC
Library Website

MBLC
DC Public Library Evaluation of Library Services and Technology Act 2008–2012

US Census
QuickFacts: District of Columbia, accessed online at:
<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/25>

Appendix D: Survey Instrument

Massachusetts LSTA Survey

WELCOME



Massachusetts Libraries
BOARD OF LIBRARY COMMISSIONERS

Hello!

The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) requests your assistance in evaluating some of the work done on behalf of Massachusetts' libraries using Federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funding. MBLC has engaged QualityMetrics, a library consulting firm, to conduct an independent evaluation of the LSTA program.

QualityMetrics is gathering information in a variety of ways including personal interviews and focus groups in addition to this survey. Consequently, the survey only deals with a few of the LSTA-funded efforts. This survey should take 10 - 12 minutes to complete. Thank you in advance for taking the time to participate.

Your responses will go directly to QualityMetrics (not to MBLC) and your responses will not be identified with your library to the Board of Library Commissioners. The QualityMetrics team will review all survey responses and will include the survey results in their report to MBLC, which is due in March 2017. Thanks for your help!

LIBRARY DESCRIPTION

1) Please describe the type of library or organization you represent.

- Public library
- Academic library
- School library
- Special library
- Other (Please specify below.)

OTHER ORGANIZATION

If you responded "other" in the question above, please indicate the type of library or other organization you represent in the text box provided below.

LIBRARY AND RESPONDENT DESCRIPTION

2) Please select the category that most closely describes your role/responsibilities in the library or other organization you represent.

- Library director
- Manager/ department head
- Children's/youth services librarian
- Adult services/reference/information services librarian
- Interlibrary loan/document delivery librarian
- Technical services librarian (cataloger)
- Archivist
- Library technology specialist
- Other (Please specify below.)

OTHER TITLE

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

LIBRARY SIZE DESCRIPTORS

3) Please indicate the approximate size of the population or academic community served by the library or organization you represent.

- Fewer than 250
- 250 - 499
- 500 - 999
- 1,000 - 1999
- 2,000 - 4999
- 5,000 - 9,999
- 10,000 - 24,999
- 25,000 - 49,999
- 50,000 - 99,999
- 100,000 - 249,999
- 250,000 - 499,999
- 500,000 or more
- DON'T KNOW

4) Please indicate the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff employed in the library or organization you represent.

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

INTRODUCTION TO GOALS AND OUTCOMES

The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' LSTA Plan for 2013 - 2017 includes three (3) goals.

They are:

Goal 1: Lifelong Learning - Support learners of all ages with their individual educational and learning goals.

Goal 2: Access - Improve access to library services and resources for all residents of the Commonwealth.

Goal 3: Library Capacity Building - Enhance the quality of Library Services offered to residents of the Commonwealth.

This survey will explore the impact that services funded in-part or fully with LSTA dollars have had in addressing these goals in recent years.

GOAL 1 - LIFELONG LEARNING - SUMMER READING PROGRAM

Goal 1: LIFELONG LEARNING

Support learners of all ages with their individual educational and learning goals.

MBLC invests some of its LSTA funds to support programs that enhance literacy and provide

opportunities for lifelong learning. Among these programs is the summer reading program. The following questions explore the impact of the summer reading program in your community.

5) Did your library offer a summer reading program in the Summer of 2014, 2015, and/or 2016?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/ Not Sure

SUMMER READING PROGRAM - NONE

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

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

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

7) Are there ways in which MBLC could provide support that would help your library provide a successful summer reading program in the future?

SUMMER READING PROGRAM PARTICIPANT

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

	Only reading logs, reading lists, and other resources	Resources provided with staff or other presenters leading events or	No summer reading program offered for this group
--	--	--	---

	provided without staff led events or programs	programs	
Children ages 0 - 5	()	()	()
Children ages 6 - 12	()	()	()
Tweens	()	()	()
Teens	()	()	()
Adults	()	()	()
Seniors	()	()	()
Others (Please specify.)	()	()	()

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

9) Using a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "Strongly disagree" and 5 representing "Strongly agree," please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not Applicable/ Unable to rate
Offering the summer reading	()	()	()	()	()	()

program increased the number of families using my library						
Offering the summer reading program strengthened my library's connection with schools	()	()	()	()	()	()
Offering the summer reading program strengthened the library's connections with business in my community	()	()	()	()	()	()
Offering the summer reading program helped to address the "summer slide" in reading levels	()	()	()	()	()	()
Offering the summer reading program prepared pre-school	()	()	()	()	()	()

children for entering school						
Offering the summer reading program increased the visibility of my library in the community	()	()	()	()	()	()
Offering the summer reading program improved the literacy level in my community	()	()	()	()	()	()
Offering the summer reading program helped my library engage underserved populations in my community	()	()	()	()	()	()

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

GOAL 1 - LIFELONG LEARNING

Goal 1: LIFELONG LEARNING

Support learners of all ages with their individual educational and learning goals.

MBLC invests some of its LSTA funds to support grants that enable libraries to carry out programs that enhance literacy and provide opportunities for lifelong learning. Among these are Full STEAM Ahead grants, STEM and STEAM grants, Serving Tweens and Teen grants, Next Chapter grants, Science is Everywhere grants, grants to enhance services to individuals with disabling conditions, and outreach efforts targeting underserved populations. The following questions explore the impact of these grant programs in your community.

11) Did your library receive a grant in any of the categories mentioned in 2014, 2015, and/or 2016?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/ Not Sure

OTHER LIFELONG LEARNING INITIATIVES - GRANT RECIPIENTS

12) Please identify the category or categories of grants your library received in 2014, 2015, and/or 2016.

	Had a grant or grants in this category	Did NOT have a grant or grants in this category	Don't know/ Unsure
Full STEAM Ahead grant(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
STEM/STEAM grant(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Serving Tweens & Teens grant(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Science is Everywhere grant(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Next Chapter grant(s)	()	()	()
Services to people with disabilities grant(s)	()	()	()
Services to underserved populations grant(s)	()	()	()
Other (Please specify.)	()	()	()

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

14) Using a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "Strongly disagree" and 5 representing "Strongly agree," please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not Applicable/ Unable to rate
The grant(s) increased the number of people using my library	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s) increased the number of families using my library	()	()	()	()	()	()

The grant(s) strengthened my library's connection with schools	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s) strengthened my library's connections with business in my community	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s) changed the way in which my community views the library	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s) enabled people to use the library who would otherwise have a difficult time accessing services	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s) increased the visibility of my library in the community	()	()	()	()	()	()
The grant(s)	()	()	()	()	()	()

improved the overall literacy level in my community						
The grant(s) helped my library engage underserved populations in my community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15) If you have any additional feedback for MBLC regarding its support for lifelong learning grants, please insert that feedback in the text box provided below.

GOAL 2 - ACCESS - PRESERVATION AND DIGITIZATION

Goal 2: ACCESS

Improve access to library services and resources for all residents of the Commonwealth.

MBLC invests some of its LSTA funds to support grants that enable libraries and other organizations to participate in preservation and digitization activities. Among these are environmental monitoring grants, preservation assessment grants, and the actual preservation and digitization of original resources. The following questions explore the impact of these grant programs in your community.

16) Did your library or organization receive an LSTA Preservation/Digitization grant or grants during 2014, 2015, and/or 2016?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know/ Not Sure

PRESERVATION DIGITIZATION RATINGS

17) Please identify the category or categories of grants your library received in 2014, 2015, and/or 2016.

	Had a grant or grants in this category	Did NOT have a grant or grants in this category	Don't know/ Unsure
Environmental monitoring	()	()	()
Preservation assessment	()	()	()
Preservation/digitization of collection(s)	()	()	()
Other (Please specify.)	()	()	()

If you responded "other" above, briefly describe the nature of the Preservation/Digitization grant(s) that your library received.

18) Using a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "Strongly disagree" and 5 representing "Strongly agree," please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	1 - Strongly disagree	2 - Disagree	3 - Neither disagree nor agree	4 - Agree	5 - Strongly agree	Not Applicable/ Unable to rate
The library identified environmental issues that need to be addressed	()	()	()	()	()	()

The library identified resources that need to be preserved and/or digitized	()	()	()	()	()	()
The library is involved in an increased level of preservation/digitization activity	()	()	()	()	()	()
Library staff have increased knowledge/skills in the areas of preservation/digitization	()	()	()	()	()	()
Library users consider the library a valuable partner	()	()	()	()	()	()
Individuals served by our library have access to an increased number of all resources	()	()	()	()	()	()
Our library has an increased capacity to digitize and preserve our unique collections	()	()	()	()	()	()
Individuals served by our library have increased awareness of and access to special and unique collections in Massachusetts' libraries	()	()	()	()	()	()

GOAL 3 - LIBRARY CAPACITY BUILDING

Goal 3: LIBRARY CAPACITY BUILDING

Enhance the quality of Library Services offered to residents of the Commonwealth.

MBLC invests some of its LSTA funds in efforts to help build the capacity of libraries to serve the public. Among these efforts are support for MBLC staff with specific types of professional expertise, support for and provision of continuing education/staff development activities, and the collection, analysis, and distribution of statistical data from Massachusetts' libraries. The following questions explore the impact of these programs in your library and in your community.

19) Using a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing "Very unimportant" and 5 representing "Very important," please provide your assessment of the importance of the following services to your library and to the people it serves.

	1 - Very unimportant	2 - Unimportant	3 - Neither unimportant nor important	4 - Important	5 - Very Important	Not Applicable/ Unable to rate
Library management issues	()	()	()	()	()	()
Technology-related topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Preservation/digitization topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Youth services/literacy topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries	()	()	()	()	()	()
Customer service training	()	()	()	()	()	()

STEM/STEAM training/workshops	()	()	()	()	()	()
Early literacy/family literacy training	()	()	()	()	()	()
Training and workshops on other topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Other (Please specify.)	()	()	()	()	()	()

20) We're interested in whether you believe MBLC should place more or less emphasis on each of the following:

	1 - Less Emphasis	2	3 - Maintain current level of emphasis	4	5 - Greater emphasis	Not Applicable/Unable to rate
Library management issues	()	()	()	()	()	()
Technology-related topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Preservation/digitization topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Youth services/literacy topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries	()	()	()	()	()	()
Customer service training	()	()	()	()	()	()

STEM/STEAM training/workshops	()	()	()	()	()	()
Early literacy/family literacy training	()	()	()	()	()	()
Training and workshops on other topics	()	()	()	()	()	()
Other (Please specify.)	()	()	()	()	()	()

STATEWIDE IMPACT

21) As you have seen, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners uses its LSTA funding to carry out a number of statewide initiatives as well as smaller targeted grant programs. We are interested in your overall impression of the degree to which these kinds of programs impact your library and your community.

	1 - No positive impact	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Significant positive impact	Not applicable/ Unable to rate
Overall impact of Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' programs/initiatives funded with LSTA	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

22) If you have any additional comments about the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act Grants to States program, please feel free to enter them in the text box provided below.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

23) You have reached this page because you indicated that you represent a school library. Unfortunately, this survey was not designed to gather input from school libraries. However, we are still very interested in your opinions about the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' implementation of the LSTA Grants to States program. Feel free to offer your thoughts in the text-box below or contact Bill Wilson (libraryconsultant@icloud.com) to set up a personal interview.

THANK YOU!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your responses are very important to us.

Appendix E: Focus Group Protocol

Interviews with Library Leaders

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

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

Focus Group Questions

1. Which LSTA programs have been most impactful for your library?
2. In Massachusetts, the State Library has supported many statewide activities. Is that the right approach rather than doing subgrants?
3. MBLC has offered many sub-grants to individual libraries in the past. Are the amounts awarded sufficient to justify the effort of applying and reporting?
4. Are reporting expectations reasonable?
5. How important have LSTA sub-grants been in providing opportunities for innovation?
6. A major focus of IMLS has been on assessing outcomes. Have you been able to document outcomes from your LSTA projects?
7. What impact have LSTA-projects had for the residents of your library district?
8. Turning forward, the State Library will begin work on the next five-year LSTA plan soon. What new directions should it take? What would make a difference for your library?
9. Finally, what would you like to say about LSTA?

Appendix F: Coding of Interviews and Focus Groups

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Index Key</i>	<i>Number of Mentions</i>	<i>Total Mentions</i>
Library Leader Interviews, October 3 and 4, 2016			
Advising/consulting	A	1	1
Funding/budget	B	2	2
Consortia/infrastructure	C	3	3
People with disabilities	D	2	2
STEAM/STEM	E	1	1
Needs assessment	H	3	3
Impact/leveraging	I	11	11
Grant process	J	4	4
Early literacy	L	2	2
Econtent	O	4	4
Programming	P	1	1
Regional collaboration	R	7	7
Staff development	S	6	6
Creativity	T	1	1
Customer experience	U	2	2
Preservation/digitization	V	4	4
Focus Groups, October 31, 2016			
Library advisory services	A	3	3
Consortia	C	2	2
People with disabilities	D	1	1
STEAM/STEM	E	1	1
Grant amounts	G	4	4
LSTA grant process	J	9	9
Databases	D	6	6
Ebooks	O	1	1
Preservation/digitization	V	1	1

Appendix G: Summary of Survey Results

Massachusetts Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Web Survey

Two hundred and three people responded to the Massachusetts LSTA web survey. Of these, eighty-seven (87.1) percent represented public libraries. Five (5.0) percent or ten respondents represented academic libraries, four (4.0) percent or eight respondents represented school libraries. Five respondents represented special libraries and two represented library networks. Sixty-eight (68.6) percent of the total respondents identified themselves as library directors. Among the public library respondents, seventy (70.5) percent were library directors.

Thirty-two (32.5) percent, the largest group, said their library served a population of 10,000 to 24,999 people. Two served populations of fewer than 250 people and four served populations of 500,000 or more. Among the public library respondents the largest group (34.7 percent) served populations of 10,000 to 24,999 people. One served a population of fewer than 250 and one served a population of 500,000 or more.

Thirty-four (34.5) percent overall had 5 to 9 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members. Ten (10.8) percent had less than 2 FTE and one respondent, representing a public library, reported a staff of 250 to 499 FTE. The largest group of public libraries (35.2 percent) had 5 to 9 FTE. However, eleven (11.4) percent of the public library respondents reported FTE of less than 2.

The survey was constructed so that public library respondents were asked to answer all but the final question, which was directed solely at school library respondents. Academic, special, and 'other' types of libraries answered the preliminary questions related to size and staffing and then 'skipped' to the questions about preservation/digitization grants.

Summer Reading Program (Public Libraries)

Ninety-eight (98.3) percent of the public library respondents' libraries had offered a summer reading program in 2014, 2015, and 2016. Of the three libraries that had not offered the program two said they had insufficient staff to manage a summer reading program and the third said there were very few children in the community and past attempts to provide the program had been unsuccessful.

When asked to identify the summer reading program services their library had provided to various targeted age groups, eighty-eight (88.2) percent said they had offered resources with staff or other presenters leading events or programs to children ages 0 to 5. Ninety-three (93.6) percent had offered this level of program to children ages 6 to 12; eighty-four (84.1)

percent had offered it to tweens; and seventy-one (71.6) percent had offered it to teens. Forty-nine (49.7) percent offered this level for adults and forty-six (46.0) percent had offered it to seniors. All the respondents' libraries had offered some level of program for children ages 6 to 12. Twenty-nine (29.5) percent had not offered the program to seniors as a separate group. One respondent explained, "For all age groups we have a ticket program for hours read for children or check out of reading material for adults. They can enter their tickets for a drawing. For youth, prizes supplied by community donation and the Friends, for adults supplied by area businesses. Both are very popular. We also have a family program associated with the Summer Reading Program." (Please see survey compilation for complete answers to questions 11 and 12.)

Respondents were asked to use a five-point scale to indicate their level of agreement with eight statements regarding the summer reading program. They were also able to indicate that they were unable to rate the statement, presumably because they were unfamiliar with the program or it was not applicable to their framework. The scale ranged from 1 meaning strongly disagree to 5 meaning strongly agree. In the table below, which is arranged in descending order of the percent saying they agreed with the statement, ratings of 4 and 5 have been combined to indicate agreement and ratings of 1 and 2 have been combined to indicate disagreement.

Statement:	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree
Offering the summer reading program...			
Increased the visibility of my library in the community	89.5%	5.8%	2.5%
Increased the number of families using my library	83.6%	11.7%	2.4%
Helped to address the "summer slide" in reading levels	76.6%	15.8%	1.2%
Strengthened my library's connection with schools	76.5%	15.3%	6.5%
Prepared pre-school children for entering school	70.2%	21.1%	1.8%
Improved the literacy level in my community	64.9%	20.5%	2.4%
Helped my library engage underserved populations in my community	62.0%	28.1%	3.6%
Strengthened the library's connections with business in my community	52.0%	29.2%	14.7%

While more than half of the respondents agreed with all the statements regarding positive outcomes from offering the summer reading program, the highest level of agreement was with the statement, offering the summer reading program increased the visibility of my library in the community. The lowest level of agreement, (52.0 percent) was for the statement, offering the summer reading program strengthened the library's connections with business in my community.

Twenty-four people provided additional feedback regarding the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) support for their library's summer reading program. Most of the

comments were positive and supportive; a few were somewhat critical. “The Adult Summer Reading program which we offered (based on materials obtained through the MBLC) was highly successful and brought many people to the library who had previously never known we existed. Through the summer reading program, we were able to increase not only our readership, but also engage non-residents’ interest, thereby increasing interest in funding and the Friends of the Library.” “Feedback from parents is overwhelming in their feeling that the program motivates their children to read over the summer and that the raffle is important in motivation.” “The focus on summer reading tracking in quantifiable numbers in the ARIS report is short-sighted, outdated to the modern societal dynamic and schedules, and diminishes the flexibility of libraries to address the needs of their constituent patrons.” “We did a spin off summer reading program that we created for all ages and backgrounds. I do not agree that the state summer reading program helps underserved or literacy challenged patrons.”

Lifelong Learning Grants

Fifty-nine public library respondents said their library had received a grant in one or more of six categories.

Category	# having received a grant or grants in this category
Full STEAM Ahead grant(s)	25
Serving Tweens & Teens grant(s)	13
STEM/STEAM grant(s)	11
Science is Everywhere grant(s)	10
Services to people with disabilities grant(s)	4
Services to underserved populations grant(s)	3
Next Chapter grant(s)	2

The highest number of respondents had received a grant or grants in the Full STEAM Ahead category. The lowest number had received a grant or grants in the Next Chapter category.

Eleven respondents chose the ‘other’ button and added specific information in the provided textbox. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to question 17.)* The cited grants ranged from community read to customer service to an ‘open’ category “because our Science is Everywhere grant was a collaboration among three public libraries.”

Question 18 asked respondents to use the five-point scale (1 indicating strongly disagree to 5 indicating strongly agree) to show their level of agreement with nine statements. The statements are listed in the following table in descending order of the percent saying they agreed with the statement. Ratings of 4 and 5 have been combined to indicate agreement with the statement; ratings of 1 and 2 have been combined to indicate disagreement.

Statement:	Agree	Neither agree	Disagree
-------------------	--------------	----------------------	-----------------

The grant(s)...		nor disagree	
Increased the visibility of my library in the community	93.2%	1.7%	1.7%
Changed the way in which my community views the library	88.2%	5.1%	1.7%
Increased the number of people using my library	83.1%	11.9%	1.7%
Increased the number of families using my library	83.1%	11.9%	1.7%
Helped my library engage underserved populations in my community	76.3%	15.3%	3.4%
Strengthened my library's connection with schools	72.9%	20.3%	1.7%
Improved the overall literacy level in my community	67.8%	22.0%	1.7%
Enabled people to use the library who would otherwise have a difficult time accessing services	45.7%	35.6%	10.2%
Strengthened my library's connections with business in my community	40.6%	40.7%	10.2%

The highest percent of respondents agreed that the grants Increased the visibility of their library in the community. The lowest percent (40.6 percent) agreed that the grants strengthened their library's connections with business in their community.

Eight people provided additional feedback regarding support for lifelong learning grants. *(Please see survey compilation for complete answers to question 19.)* All comments were positive about the impact of having had the grant. "Our grant had a targeted audience and we found them returning for each of the programs we offered. They have also become, themselves and their families, strong library users." "The grant enabled the library to collaborate with many more community organizations who had not previously understood the breadth and depth of our STEAM activities and the role that libraries can play in stimulating interest in the sciences among young children and families." "With LSTA grants, 2+2=5. In addition to allowing cash-strapped libraries the opportunity to offer more than business-as-usual services, these grants heighten staff morale; attract considerable local PR buzz; and are handily leveraged to attract more funds and recognition from local agencies and businesses. Kudos to MBLC for its support of these grants."

Preservation/Digitization Grants

Respondents from all types of libraries except the school libraries were asked to respond to questions 20 through 23.

Of the 191 respondents, twenty (10.5 percent of the total) indicated they had received preservation/digitization grants. Of these twenty, seventeen were public libraries. Twelve had received preservation assessment grants; nine had received preservation/digitization of collection(s) grants; and five had received environmental monitoring grants.

Respondents were asked to use the five-point scale to indicate their level of agreement with eight statements regarding the preservation/digitization grants. As before the statements are listed in the following table in descending order of the percent saying they agreed with the statement. Ratings of 4 and 5 have been combined to indicate agreement with the statement; ratings of 1 and 2 have been combined to indicate disagreement. A column for those indicating they were unable to rate the statement has been included. (Note that the percents are based on 21 people who chose to respond to this question. Consequently, one person’s response equals 4.8 percent.)

Statement	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Unable to rate
Library users consider the library a valuable partner	90.5%	0.0%	4.8%	4.8%
The library identified resources that need to be preserved and/or digitized	81.0%	9.5%	4.8%	4.8%
Individuals served by our library have access to an increased number of all resources	76.2%	14.3%	4.8%	4.8%
Individuals served by our library have increased awareness of and access to special and unique collections in Massachusetts’ libraries	71.5%	9.5%	9.5%	9.5%
The library is involved in an increased level of preservation/digitization activity	71.4%	9.5%	14.3%	4.8%
Library staff have increased knowledge/skills in the areas of preservation/digitization	66.7%	9.5%	19.1%	4.8%
Our library has an increased capacity to digitize and preserve our unique collections	57.2%	14.3%	19.0%	9.5%
The library identified environmental issues that need to be addressed	52.4%	9.5%	4.8%	33.3%

Over half of the respondents agreed with each of the statements. The highest percent of respondents to this question (90.5 percent) agreed that library users consider the library a valuable partner. The lowest percent (52.4 percent) agreed that the library had identified environmental issues that need to be addressed.

MBLC Topics/Services

Question 24 asked public library respondents to indicate their assessment of the importance of nine topics/services provided by the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners using a five-point scale in which 1 represented very unimportant and 5 represented very important. As before the statements are listed in the following table in descending order of the percent saying the topic/service is important to their library and to the people it serves. Ratings of 4 and

5 have been combined to indicate important; ratings of 1 and 2 on the scale have been combined to indicate unimportant. (The percents in this table are based on 171 responses.)

MBLC Topic/Service	Important	Neither important nor unimportant	Unimportant
Technology-related topics	92.3%	3.6%	2.4%
Youth services/literacy topics	88.8%	8.2%	1.8%
Library management issues	84.8%	7.0%	3.5%
Access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries	83.0%	12.9%	3.0%
Early literacy/family literacy training	82.8%	10.1%	1.8%
Customer service training	81.8%	11.2%	3.6%
Preservation/digitization topics	78.8%	16.5%	3.5%
Training and workshops on other topics	78.7%	12.4%	1.8%
STEM/STEAM training/workshops	76.3%	15.4%	2.4%

Over three-fourths (76.3 percent) of the respondents indicated each of the nine items listed were important to their library and to the people it serves. The highest percent (92.3 percent) said technology-related topics was important. The lowest percent (76.3 percent) in importance of the nine items was for STEM/STEAM training/workshops.

The next question (Question 25) asked respondents whether they believe MBLC should place more or less emphasis on each of the nine items listed in the previous question. As with the previous question the topics/services are listed in descending order of the percent of respondents saying that items should receive greater emphasis. Ratings of 4 and 5 have been combined to indicate greater emphasis; ratings of 1 and 2 on the scale have been combined to indicate less emphasis. (The percents in this table are based on 171 responses.)

MBLC Topic/Service	Greater Emphasis	Maintain Current Level	Less Emphasis
Technology-related topics	77.1%	17.6%	1.8%
Early literacy/family literacy training	65.7%	27.9%	2.9%
Customer service training	61.8%	30.6%	4.1%
STEM/STEAM training/workshops	58.5%	31.6%	4.7%
Training and workshops on other topics	57.8%	32.7%	1.8%
Youth services/literacy topics	56.1%	39.8%	1.2%
Library management issues	50.6%	39.5%	2.4%
Preservation/digitization topics	43.2%	48.5%	4.7%
Access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries	33.4%	64.9%	0.0%

Technology-related topics received the highest percent of greater emphasis ratings (77.1 percent) and access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries received the lowest percent (33.4 percent) saying it should be given greater emphasis. The interesting ratings to note are those given to maintaining the current level and giving less emphasis. Respondents clearly want MBLC to maintain the current level of emphasis on access to statistical data about Massachusetts' libraries; they do not want less emphasis on that topic/service. No one said they wanted less emphasis on that topic/service. The highest percents wanting less emphasis on the topic (4.7 percent) went to the STEM/STEAM training/workshops and preservation/digitization topics.

Massachusetts Priorities for LSTA

Sixty-one (61.8) percent of the respondents (not including schools) said the overall impact of MBLC programs/initiatives funded with LSTA was significantly positive. (Ratings of 6 and 7 on a seven-point scale.)

Twenty-nine respondents provided additional comments about the MBLC implementation of the LSTA program. Many were positive about the value of the grants to local communities. Some provided recommendations for improvements. "In the past we have had numerous LSTA Grants which were service-changing and transformative for the community." "Our library received the Equal Access LSTA grant in FY09, which encouraged us to improve and increase our programs for active older adults. Since implementation, our adult program attendance has grown each year, and we now have 300% greater attendance than before the grant. The success of our adult programming has also inspired neighboring libraries to offer more adult programs." "I wish the requirement to have a Strategic Plan was not part of receiving an LSTA grant. I do not feel the time and effort to prepare a Strategic Plan will benefit my library enough to spend the time doing it." "...The more frequent offering of the required librarian certification courses would go a long way to address this critical need. Older librarians are wisely retiring while they can; younger candidates are avoiding the librarian role put off by the atrocious low pay and the needless circuitous route to certification."

School Library Responses

Two respondents from school libraries provided comments. "I am very grateful that the LSTA grant program exists! While I have not yet applied for a grant..., I look forward to taking advantage of the opportunity in the future." "What I have always thought would be helpful to school libraries would be a small grant (say \$500 to \$1,000) that would support innovation—for example, starting a maker space...or students creating book trailers...or supporting reading at home..." *(Please see the survey compilation for the complete answers to question 28.)*

Appendix H: LSTA Funding Allotments 2013-2015 Mapped to Goals

MASSACHUSETTS FFY 2013-2014-2015: LSTA STATE GOALS - LSTA INTENT - PROJECTS - EXPENDITURES							
<i>LSTA Intent</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Grantee</i>	<i>LSTA 2013</i>	<i>LSTA 2014</i>	<i>LSTA 2015</i>	<i>Total LSTA</i>	<i>% Total LSTA</i>
	LSTA Administration	MBLC	\$122,484	\$124,590	\$127,141	\$374,215	4.0%
1.2	<i>Conversation Circles</i>	(4 sub-grants)	\$16,250	\$17,074	\$7,926	\$41,250	0.4%
1.2/3.1/3.3	<i>Customer Experience</i>	(16 sub-grants)	\$54,780	\$57,400	\$29,750	\$141,930	1.5%
1.1/1.2/5.3	<i>Full STEAM Ahead</i>	(19 sub-grants)	\$0	\$76,520	\$67,500	\$144,020	1.5%
1.1/1.2/2.2	<i>Innovative Projects</i>	(9 sub-grants)	\$27,360	\$40,375	\$39,044	\$106,779	1.1%
4.1	<i>Libraries for Job Seekers</i>	(2 sub-grants)	\$14,800	\$0	\$0	\$14,800	0.2%
1.2	Massachusetts Center for the Book	MBLC	\$33,570	\$18,540	\$15,000	\$67,110	0.7%
5.3	<i>Mother Goose on the Loose</i>	(3 sub-grants)	\$16,064	\$0	\$0	\$16,064	0.2%
1.2	<i>Next Chapter</i>	(2 sub-grants)	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$0	\$15,000	0.2%
1.2/6.2	<i>On the Same Page</i>	(3 sub-grants)	\$22,500	\$0	\$0	\$22,500	0.2%
2.2	Outreach to the Underserved	MBLC	\$60,556	\$76,222	\$80,455	\$217,233	2.3%
1.2/2.1/2.2	<i>Science is Everywhere</i>	(11 sub-grants)	\$15,000	\$42,500	\$22,500	\$80,000	0.9%
1.1/1.2/5.3	<i>Serving Tweens and Teens</i>	(17 sub-grants)	\$59,969	\$85,455	\$64,575	\$209,999	2.2%
1.2	Skill-Building Techniques for Stress Reduction in a Correctional Library	MA Department of Corrections	\$6,018	\$2,403	\$0	\$8,421	0.1%
5.3	STEM and STEAM	MBLC	\$66,721	\$50,225	\$146,629	\$263,575	2.8%
1.2	Summer Reading	MBLC	\$91,390	\$130,791	\$128,525	\$350,706	3.7%
	Sub-total GOAL 1					\$2,073,602	22.2%
2.1	Consumer Portal	MBLC	\$127,306	\$100,962	\$248,638	\$476,906	5.1%
2.2	<i>Databases and eBooks</i>	(2 sub-grants to MLS)	\$931,936	\$975,763	\$865,931	\$2,773,630	29.6%
3.2	<i>NCIP + Network Connections</i>	(8 sub-grants to consortia)	\$120,467	\$182,275	\$0	\$302,742	3.2%
2.1/3.2	<i>Virtual Catalog</i>	(2 sub-grants: FLO)	\$259,115	\$208,777	\$210,564	\$678,456	7.3%
3.2	Resource Sharing/Network Retreat	MBLC	\$11,462	\$0	\$0	\$11,462	0.1%

MASSACHUSETTS FFY 2013-2014-2015: LSTA STATE GOALS - LSTA INTENT - PROJECTS - EXPENDITURES							
<i>LSTA Intent</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Grantee</i>	<i>LSTA 2013</i>	<i>LSTA 2014</i>	<i>LSTA 2015</i>	<i>Total LSTA</i>	<i>% Total LSTA</i>
3.2/3.3	<i>Small Libraries in Networks</i>	(3 sub-grants)	\$123,494	\$26,390	\$0	\$149,884	1.6%
2.2	Social Log-in Risk Assessment	MBLC	\$0	\$0	\$59,554	\$59,554	0.6%
2.1/2.2	<i>Digitization/Preservation</i>	(5 sub-grants)	\$29,028	\$28,105	\$59,990	\$117,123	1.3%
2.2/5.3	<i>Serving People with Disabilities</i>	(5 sub-grants)	\$8,950	\$13,150	\$23,525	\$45,625	0.5%
	Sub-total GOAL 2					\$4,615,382	49.3%
3.3	Data Coordination	MBLC	\$210,720	\$233,273	\$218,549	\$662,542	7.1%
3.2/3.3	<i>Emergency/Environmental</i>	(2 sub-grants)	\$144,188	\$120,286	\$148,654	\$413,128	4.4%
3.3	Joint Public Library Planning: South Hadley Libraries	SOUTH HADLEY PUBLIC LIBRARY		\$10,000		\$10,000	0.1%
3.1	Leadership Institute	MBLC		\$11,863		\$11,863	0.1%
3.3	<i>MBLC Website</i>	(2 grants MBLC)	\$192,334	\$161,216	\$262,742	\$616,292	6.6%
2.1	Planning for Preservation/Digitization	MBLC	\$20,785	\$45,297	\$118,442	\$184,524	2.0%
2.1/3.2/3.3	<i>Preservation Assessment</i>	(7 sub-grants)	\$10,500	\$8,400	\$8,400	\$27,300	0.3%
3.1	Public Library Advisory	MBLC	\$241,853	\$259,404	\$202,305	\$703,562	7.5%
1.2/3.1/3.3	<i>Reader's Advisory</i>	(4 sub-grants)	\$15,000	\$0	\$22,200	\$37,200	0.4%
	Sub-total GOAL 3					\$2,666,411	28.5%
	TOTAL		\$3,062,100	\$3,114,756	\$3,178,539	\$9,355,395	100.0%

Appendix I: Measuring Success Focal Areas for MBLC LSTA Projects

	<i>Lifelong Learning</i>		<i>Information Access</i>		<i>Institutional Capacity</i>			<i>Economic/ Employment Development</i>		<i>Human Services</i>			<i>Civic Engagement</i>	
	1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	5.1	5.2	5.3	6.1	6.2
MA GOAL 1														
Conversation Circles		x												
Customer Experience		x			x		x							
Full STEAM Ahead	x	x										x		
Innovative Projects	x	x		x										
Libraries for Job Seekers								x						
MA Center for the Book		x												
Mother Goose on the Loose												x		
Next Chapter		x												
On the Same Page		x												x
Outreach to the Underserved				x										
Science is Everywhere		x	x	x										
Serving Tweens and Teens	x	x										x		
Skill Building Techniques for Stress...		x												
STEM and STEAM												x		
Summer Reading		x												
MA GOAL 2														
Consumer Portal			x											
Databases / eBooks				x										
NCIP / Network Connections						x								
Virtual Catalog			x			x								
Resource Sharing / Network Retreat						x								
Small Libraries in Networks						x	x							
Social Login Risk Assessment				x										
Digitization/Preservation			x	x										
Serving People with Disabilities				x								x		
MA GOAL 3														
Data Coordination							x							
Emergency / Environmental						x	x							
Joint Public Library Planning							x							
Leadership Institute					x									
MBLC Website							x							
Planning for Preservation/ Digitization			x											
Preservation Assessment			x			x	x							
Public Library Advisory					x									

Reader's Advisory			x		x		x								
-------------------	--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix J: Target Audiences for MBLC LSTA Projects

Target Audiences for Massachusetts LSTA Projects

	<i>Library work force</i>	<i>Living in poverty</i>	<i>Un/under employ</i>	<i>Immigrant/refugee</i>	<i>Disabilities</i>	<i>Child (age 0-5)</i>	<i>Youth (age 6-17)</i>	<i>General</i>
MA GOAL 1								
Conversation Circles				0.4%				
Customer Experience	1.5%							
Full STEAM Ahead						1.5%		
Innovative Projects								1.1%
Libraries for Job Seekers			0.2%					
MA Center for the Book	0.7%							
Mother Goose on the Loose						0.2%		
Next Chapter								0.2%
On the Same Page								0.2%
Outreach to the Underserved					2.3%			
Science is Everywhere							0.9%	
Serving Tweens and Teens							2.2%	
Skill Building Techniques for Stress...		0.1%						
STEM and STEAM	2.8%							
Summer Reading							3.7%	
MA GOAL 2								
Consumer Portal								5.1%
Databases / eBooks	29.6%							
NCIP / Network Connections	3.2%							
Virtual Catalog	7.3%							
Resource Sharing / Network Retreat	0.1%							
Small Libraries in Networks	1.6%							
Social Login Risk Assessment								0.6%
Digitization / Preservation								1.3%
Serving People with Disabilities					0.5%			
MA GOAL 3								
Data Coordination	7.1%							
Emergency / Environmental	4.4%							
Joint Public Library Planning	0.1%							
Leadership Institute	0.1%							
MBLC Website	6.6%							
Planning for Preservation / Digitization	2.0%							
Preservation Assessment	0.3%							
Public Library Advisory	7.5%							
Reader's Advisory	0.4%							
TOTAL	75.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	2.8%	1.7%	6.8%	8.5%

