Annex K

Florida Division of Library and Information Services
Results of Constituent Survey
November 30, 2011

INTRODUCTION

Background: This report summarizes the responses to the LSTA Evaluation Survey, conducted between October 25 and November 8, 2011. Karen Strege, Liz Bishoff and Nancy Bolt drafted the initial survey questions; the Division of Library and Information Services provided comments and feedback, which were incorporated into the final questions. Dr. Rachel Applegate also reviewed the questions and provided the analysis below. **This report does not interpret survey results;** the interpretation will be included in the final evaluation report, along with the information and interpretation gathered from focus groups, interviews, and document review.

Organization: The report has four sections. The first contains general information about the survey's respondents. The second section presents the responses to questions about LSTA priorities and LSTA funding allocations. These results are presented by overall results and any significant statistical differences among respondents in the following groups.

- Library type, including these three types: public; academic (combining community colleges and four-year colleges and universities); all other library types.
- Region, including the Panhandle, Northeast, Central, Southeast, Southwest areas, (when necessary, these regions are abbreviated in the tables).
- Respondents with MLS or no MLS.
- Respondents with different years of library experience.

The third, and longest, section provides the responses to questions about particular topics or programs. These results are presented by overall results and any significant statistical differences among respondents in the following groups.

The fourth section contains the answers to two open-ended questions about the needs of the respondents' communities and libraries.

Statistical significance means that there IS a difference among groups and that this difference is not simply by chance.

Survey rating questions: All questions with ratings used a 1 to 5 rating scale in which 1 was the least preferred; 3 was neutral; and 5 was the most preferred. As with most presentations of a five-point scale, the average score was four (4.04 for all rated items in this survey). Interpretation of scores is:

- 4.5 and above   Very Good
- 3.5-4.5   Medium
- 3.5 and below   Poor or Weak (*These low scores are indicated by grey shading.*)

Section One – Respondents

- A total of 555 respondents began the survey and 252 completed surveys were submitted. Most respondents (67%) were with public libraries, 18% from academic libraries and the rest from special, school or other.
- Almost 40% were from Central Florida, with the others roughly evenly divided among the other regions.

| | Region Percent | Total | Public | Academic | | All Other | | |
				Comm. College	Univ.	Special	K-12/ School	Other
Panhandle	12%	66	27	9	7	10	3	10
Northeast Florida	18%	99	71	6	8	1	4	9
Central Florida	37%	204	142	11	27	6	8	10
Southeast Florida	17%	97	71	2	12	3	5	4
Southwest Florida	16%	89	62	2	16	2	4	3
Totals		555	373	30	70	22	24	36
		Library Type Percent	67%	5%	13%	4%	4%	6%

- Those who identified themselves as "Other" included 10 K-12 administrators or district-level personnel, five joint public-college libraries; 18 as administrators of some type; and some from archives, special libraries, or retired.
- The largest job group was administrators (148) and many of those who chose "other" (46) could have selected administrators. The next largest groups were Children/Young Adult (124, only six of whom are from K-12) and Reference (117, 33 academic and 76 public).
- A large percentage of respondents had MLS degrees. The greater the length of work experience, the more likely that respondent had an MLS. Almost all academic library respondents had MLS degrees.

Job	Total	MLS	No MLS
Administration	148	111	37
Children or Young Adult Services	124	76	48
Reference Services	117	103	14
Other (Please Specify)	46	26	20
Circulation Services	33	6	27
Technical Services	31	20	11
One-Person Library	29	22	7
Technology Services	27	12	15
Total	555	376	179

Years of experience	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
3 Years or Less	35	24	7	4
4-10 Years	161	126	18	17
11-19 Years	144	95	24	25
20 or More Years	215	128	51	36
Total	555	373	100	82

Section Two – Priorities

Respondents answered two different kinds of questions about priorities. The first question about priorities asked respondents if the Division should continue to offer each particular program or service. Only those respondents who participated in these programs answered these questions.

The second kind of question about priorities was in the section called "Priorities for the Future." In this section, a question asked respondents to give their priorities for a list of programs. Users and nonusers of particular programs answered this question.

These different types of questions and different types of respondents, user and nonusers, explain the differences between ratings of the same program in two places of the following section. For example, when Ask a Librarian users answered the question about continued support, their average score was 4.21. However, when uses and nonusers scored Ask a Librarian along with other programs, this program's score falls to 3.80.

- Respondents rated a list of priorities and their responses varied somewhat by region and by library type.
- Overall, respondents gave the highest priority rating to supporting delivery of information by electronic networks.
- Services for specific groups were among the more low-rated priorities.

The DLIS should support:	Overall Rating	Pan	NE	Central	SE	SW
Access to Information Resources	4.31	4.55	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.46
Delivery by Electronic Networks	4.12	4.33	4.25	4.01	3.85	4.31
Services to Diverse People	4.01	4.16	4.18	4.00	3.65	4.14
Services to Underserved	3.94	*Ratings did not differ by region.*				
E-Linkages Between Libraries	3.88	4.35	4.09	3.77	3.58	3.98
Public-Private Partnerships w/ Orgs	3.87	4.21	4.10	3.70	3.58	4.06
Services to Those Having Difficulty Using Library	3.87	*Ratings did not differ by region.*				

Children Below Poverty Line *Also differs by library type.*	3.85	3.82	4.25	3.76	3.56	3.92
Range of Number (N) of Responses	*256-311*	*17-24*	*44-60*	*86-109*	*43-56*	*46-61*

- Respondents from the Southeast tended to rate priorities lower than other groups. Respondents from the Panhandle rated almost all elements higher than other groups. Ratings from Northeastern respondents were high, especially for reaching children who live below the poverty line.

- Public library respondents rated the following two priorities higher than those from other types of libraries.

Priorities	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Services to Underserved	3.94	4.05	3.67	3.48
Children Below Poverty Line	3.85	3.99	3.40	3.31
Range of Number (N) of Responses	*256-311*	*184-188*	*40-42*	*16-17*

LSTA Funding Allocations: Respondents, numbering 265 for this question, choose among options between funding statewide projects and competitive grants.

Options for LSTA Funding Allocation	Percent	Number
The DLIS should place more money in statewide programs.	50%	132
The current allocation of funds is just about right.	36%	95
The DLIS should place more money in competitive grants.	7%	18
The DLIS should eliminate the competitive grants.	7%	20
Answered Question Skipped Question (%)		265 294 (53%)

- Results show support for decreasing funding for competitive grants and spending more on statewide programs.

- Among LSTA-supported programs, respondents chose continuing education, statewide databases, and the summer reading program as the most important priorities. Consulting services and local library digitization initiatives were rated low, below 3.5.

- Summer reading programs were more important to public library respondents; interlibrary loan and Ask-a-Librarian were most important priorities to those respondents from academic libraries.

Priorities for LSTA Funding	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Providing Continuing Education Opportunities for Library Staff	4.35	*No Difference*		
Statewide Databases, Gale and First Search	4.35			

Florida Library Youth Program Statewide Summer Reading Program	4.31	4.44	3.71	3.88
Interlibrary Loan Program Including the DLLI Courier System	4.17	4.10	4.65	3.78
Supporting the Work of the Multi-Type Library Cooperatives	4.14	4.07	4.50	4.00
The Competitive Grants Program	3.96	*No Difference*		
Projects to Promote the Use of E-Government Services	3.90	4.00	3.63	3.38
Ask a Librarian	3.80	3.68	4.36	3.75
Statewide Resource Sharing and Collection Development from the Division	3.69	*No Difference*		
The Florida Memory Project	3.65	3.47	3.96	4.43
The State Union Catalog (FloridaCat)	3.62			
Local Library Digitization projects for materials important to FL history/ culture	3.22	*No Difference*		
Consulting services from the Division	3.22			
Range of N	266-310	201-227	31-54	21-28

- Respondents with an MLS valued the statewide databases more than those respondents without an MLS; those respondents valued the Summer Reading Program and competitive grants more than those with an MLS.

Priorities	Total	MLS	Non-MLS
FL Youth Summer Reading Program	4.31	4.24	4.48
N	283	198	85
Statewide Databases Gale First Search	4.34	4.46	4.04
N	310	226	84
Competitive Grants	3.96	3.88	4.14
N	269	189	80

DLIS Programs Support

In most of the survey's sections about particular programs, three questions asked if the DLIS should support that program, if that program were essential, and about the respondent's overall satisfaction with that program. These answers are particularly valuable data because participants were focused on that particular program when these questions occur.

Question	Total	N	Public	Academic	All Other
Support E-Gov	4.50	120	*No Difference*		
Support DLLI	4.49	202			
Support FL Memory	4.47	203	4.36 (131)	4.54 (39)	4.78 (33)
Support Databases **	4.46	307			
Support ILL	4.45	355	4.40	4.68	4.34

			(247)	(73)	(35)
Offer E-Gov Grants	4.44	206			
E-gov is Essential	4.36	150			
Support Leadership Programming	4.31	137	*No Difference*		
Satisfaction-FL Memory	4.25	186			
Support Ask a Librarian	4.21	174			
DLLI is Essential	4.21	200			
ILL is Essential	4.19	352	4.13 (243)	4.44 (70)	4.12 (34)
Satisfaction-DLLI/ILL	4.12	225	4.16 (154)	3.95 (60)	4.18 (11)
FEL Databases are Essential	4.06	228	4.13 (224)	3.67 (45)	4.03 (34)
Satisfaction-FL-Cat	3.89	128	3.81 (88)	4.15 (27)	3.92 (13)
Ask a Librarian is Essential	3.80	166	*No Difference*		
Satisfaction-FEL-Database Training	3.57	155			

** The support for databases is the only item in which respondents from regions differed significantly (highest to lowest): Central 4.56, Southeast 4.51, Southwest 4.48, Northeast 4.35, Panhandle 4.11.

Database Priority	Pan	NE	Central	SE	SW
Support Databases	4.11	4.35	4.56	4.51	4.48
N	27	60	105	57	58

Section Three – Programs and Services

Return on Investment Report

- Awareness of the report was quite high overall with its targeted users, public libraries; 75% of the respondents from this type library were aware of the report.

- There were no statistically significant differences by *region*.

- Respondents with more years of experience were more likely to know about the report: 75% for the 20+ year veterans, vs. 65% for those in the 11-19 year bracket.

- Respondents with MLS degrees were more aware of the report: 72% vs. 60% for non-MLS.

- Most of the items received below-average ratings (below 4.0) with "media covered" the lowest.

Return on Investment Report	Public	N
Should Update Report	4.25	297
Helped Me Understand Value	4.17	318

Helped Local Officials	3.90	284
Helped State Legislators	3.76	275
Helped Me Develop Publicity	3.64	265
Media Covered the Report	2.83	250

- Respondents said that they shared the report's results both internally and externally, although primarily internally. Sixteen percent of respondents shared the results with someone outside of the library. Respondents could select more than one response, and not all survey respondents answered this question.

Did you share the report with the following:	
Other library staff members	212
Did NOT share results	118
Other (please specify)	88
City-county elected	81
Library board	76
City-county staff	73
State legislators	42
Local-regional news	34

- 118 said they did not share the results; when asked why, 99 gave an answer: 19 said they had no time, and many of the others (60 other) said that someone else at the library had shared the results.

Ask a Librarian (AaL)

- Use of Ask a Librarian is high across all groups, and many respondents answered this topic area (512 out of 555 total: 92%).

- Differences were statistically significant in both library type and region. Academic and public library respondents were much more likely to use the service than the Other group. Respondents from the Panhandle were less likely to have used it.

Ask a Librarian Use	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Use	417	294	85	38
No	95	49	11	35
Total Responding	512	343	96	73
Percent Yes	81%	86%	89%	52%

Ask a Librarian	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Yes	42	76	156	76	67
Of those from region	66%	85%	86%	83%	79%

- When asked why they did not use this service, respondents most often chose the answer that their library did not have enough staff members to do so, or that handling questions through Ask a Librarian was too time-consuming.

- One respondent commented that students were "lazy" in going directly to Ask a Librarian, and two others commented that school policy prohibited students from using it.

Why does your library not use Ask a Librarian?	Count	Percent
Not enough staff members.	38	40%
Don't know why not.	18	18%
My library can answer all our users' reference questions.	17	17%
Don't know enough about it.	8	8%
Used it but stopped.	4	4%
Other	21	21%
Answered Question: Skipped Question: (%)	99 456 (82%)	

Ask a Librarian Training

- Responses to questions about training participation differed both by library type and by region. Only 20% of those from the Panhandle participated compared to 31%-43% of respondents from other regions. Academic respondents were more frequent training participants (55%) than public.

- MLS librarians were much more likely to participate in Ask a Librarian training: 47% of those with an MLS answering this question versus 15% of those without.

Ask A Librarian Training	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Attended	150	99	46	5
No	255	190	37	28
Percent Yes	37%	34%	55%	15%

Ask A Librarian Training	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Attended	8	32	64	25	21
Of those from region	20%	43%	42%	35%	31%

- The most common reason not to participate in training was job-related (not a reference librarian) although there was also ignorance of its availability. The format of the training had little effect on nonparticipants.

Why not AaL training?	Overall	Public	Academic	All Other
Not a reference librarian.	151	111	29	11
Didn't know about availability.	53	30	6	17

Don't have the time.	48	35	4	9
Library does not participate.	46	24	8	14
Not enough employees to cover.	36	26	3	7
Already know how to use.	8	6	1	1
In-person too far.	7	6	0	1
Don't like webinar.	2	2	0	0
Other/N.A.	62	37	4	21

Ratings

- No aspect of Ask a Librarian was rated very high (above 4.5). Most respondents rated the media impact of Ask a Librarian very low and did not believe that it increased the use of on-site library materials.

- None of the ratings, of the service or of the training, differed significantly, by library type or by region.

- Knowledge, use, or ratings of Ask a Librarian did not vary by the respondents' experience level.

Ask a Librarian ratings	Rating	N
DLIS should continue to fund Ask A Librarian.	4.21	174
Users better served with longer hours.	4.13	171
Users are better served with specialists.	3.95	166
Is an essential part of library's services.	3.80	166
Increased use of electronic.	3.76	155
Increased use of on-site.	3.52	155
Library received media coverage.	3.20	137

Ask a Librarian Training ratings	Rating	N
Improved my ability to use it.	4.08	147
Improved my ability to train others.	3.82	143

LSTA Competitive Grants Program

- This program is relatively well known, with 75% overall and 79% of public library respondents aware of it (74%, other library types and 62%, academic).

- The more experienced the respondent, the more likely they were to be aware of the program: 80% of those with 20+ years; 59% of those with 1-3 years.

- Respondents with an MLS were slightly more likely to be aware of this program (77% vs. 71% of those without).

Ratings

- Ratings for the competitive grants program were generally lukewarm, with all items below average (4.04). Items about fairness ("unbiased"), the review process, and the Toolkit were low rated.

- Ratings did not differ between regions or library types.
- More-experienced respondents were much more likely to know aspects of the grant process.

LSTA Grant Ratings	Rating	N
I understood what was needed.	3.74	164
Grant cycle timetable is reasonable.	3.69	166
I understood types of grants.	3.67	167
DLIS staff helped with application.	3.64	157
DLIS staff helped after grant given.	3.57	156
Online info helpful.	3.56	157
I understood the review process.	3.51	157
Process is unbiased.	3.48	157
Toolkit helped me do OBE.	3.30	153

- Very few respondents answered the questions about why they did not user outcomes-based evaluation (OBE).

If you received an LSTA grant and DID NOT use **outcome based evaluation,** why not?	Overall	% of Those Who Said They Had Applied
Did not know how to conduct OBE.	13	33%
Did not have the resources.	4	10%
Not enough time has passed.	7	18%
Other / N.A.	33	85%
Total	57	

Florida Electronic Library (FEL) Databases

Usage
- Usage of the databases is relatively high; 74% of those who answered this question (460) or 62% of all survey respondents (555) said that they used databases. Differences were significant by library type, but not by region. FEL appears to be more important to public libraries than to academic libraries, although frequency of use did *not* differ by library type.
- Respondents with MLS degrees were more likely to use the databases then those without an MLS.

Databases Use	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	342	245	55	42
No	118	69	32	17
	460	314	87	59
Percent of library type	74%	78%	63%	71%

- Just over half of respondents to the frequency question use FEL at least weekly (52%).

- Most frequent reasons for not using FEL databases were that respondents did not work in a position that required them to do so or that other library databases provided needed information.

Database Training
- Participation in database training differed significantly by library type and by region. Academic librarians and those in the Panhandle were least likely to participate.

- Overall satisfaction with training was 3.57, which is below average. Satisfaction differed by region.

- Respondents selected very few reasons for not participating in training: the reason most selected was "I do not need training, I already know."

Database Training	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Participated	200	155	27	18
No	135	87	26	22
	335	242	53	40
Percent of Library Type	60%	64%	51%	45%

Database Training	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Participated	16	48	63	32	41
No	17	15	50	30	23
Totals	33	63	113	62	64
Percent Participated	48%	76%	56%	52%	64%

Satisfaction with Database Training					
Overall	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
3.57	3.61	3.37	3.61	3.38	3.79

- The answers to "what topics to cover" covered the basics.

What **topics** would you like to have covered?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Searching Databases	32	24	5	3
Training Library Users to Use	31	22	5	4
Differences Among Databases	31	22	4	5
Promoting Databases to Users	28	21	5	2
Integrating Databases into Curriculum	17	7	5	5
Other	1	0	0	1

Ratings
- The highest-scored item, with scores well-above average, is that the DLIS should continue to support the database program. The other items scored at or below average are that databases are essential; that libraries save money because of this project; and that libraries could not offer the equivalent resources.

- Respondents rated their overall satisfaction with training and promotional materials relatively low.

- While academic library respondents strongly agreed that the DLIS should support databases, they did not agree that this project was an essential part of their services, or that without the databases they could not offer equivalent services.

- *Where ratings are absent for types of libraries, those items did not differ significantly by library type.*

FEL Databases	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
DLIS should continue to support.	4.46	4.43	4.69	4.35
FEL are essential part.	4.06	4.13	3.67	4.03
Library saved money on online.	3.95	*No Difference*		
Library saved money on print.	3.93			
If not, could not offer equivalent.	3.91	3.98	3.38	4.10
Users depend on FEL.	3.79	3.84	3.47	3.90
Library gets more use.	3.59	*No Difference*		
Overall satisfaction with training.	3.57			
Promotional materials effective.	3.49			
Number of Respondents	297-307	224-228	41-45	29-34

- Only one item differed significantly by region, "FEL should continue to support the databases." Respondents from the Central region tended to agree with this statement while Panhandle respondents rated the item lower.

Continue Databases	Total	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Continue the Database Program	4.46	4.11	4.35	4.56	4.51	4.48
Respondents	307	27	60	105	57	58

- By years of experience, those in the next-most-senior grouping were more positive about databases.

Databases Impacts	< 3 years	4-10 years	11-19 years	20+ years
My library receives more use.	3.23	3.47	3.82	3.57
N	13	836	74	110
Databases are an essential part.	3.60	3.93	4.28	4.05
N	15	93	82	113

- MLS librarians supported the statement, "DLIS should continue to support" at 4.52 compared to 4.27 for non-MLS. However, MLS librarians were less

appreciative of the promotional materials, rating these 3.42 compared to non-MLS respondents' 3.70 (both rating are below average).

ILL and Courier Service

- Overall, 88% of respondents said their libraries provided ILL services, and 52% reported using the DLLI Courier system. Both of these items differed significantly by region and by library type. Those from academic libraries and those in the Panhandle are the most intensive users of both. Respondents from the Southeast region and from other library types reported low use of the DLLI Courier system.

Does your library provide **ILL services**?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	387	266	78	43
I Don't Know	11	5	2	4
No	43	31	3	9
Respondents	441	302	83	56
Percent of Type, Yes	88%	88%	94%	77%

Does your library provide **ILL services?**	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Yes	49	78	127	65	68
I Don't Know	2	1	5	1	2
No	1	2	20	11	9
Respondents	52	81	152	77	79
Percent of Region, Yes	94%	96%	84%	84%	86%

Does your library use the **DLLI Courier system**?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	227	154	60	13
I Don't Know	136	115	13	8
No	72	30	8	34
Respondents	435	299	81	55
Percent of Type, Yes	52%	52%	74%	24%

Does your library use the **DLLI Courier system?**	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Yes	32	48	76	26	45
I Don't Know	11	23	51	34	17
No	8	9	24	17	14
Respondents	51	80	151	77	76
Percent of Region, Yes	63%	60%	50%	34%	59%

- Overall, respondents believed that the DLIS should support both DLLI and ILL. Note that fewer people (ranging from 183 to 225) answered the DLLI questions than the ILL questions (ranging from 334-355).

- Respondents with greater years of experience were much more likely to know their libraries used DLLI: 64% for those with 20+ years compared to 32% for 1-3 years, 36% for 4-10 years, and 56% for 11-19 years; respondents without an MLS were much more likely to say they did know about DLLI (40% versus 28% for MLS librarians).

- All items except two received above-average ratings.

- Respondents were most skeptical of a connection between library use and ILL or courier services.

- There were no significant differences on ratings by region. Academic library respondents were more likely to indicate that ILL itself is essential, but were less satisfied with DLLI itself.

- *Where by-type ratings are not given, those items did not differ significantly by library type.*

ILL and ILL Courier Ratings	Total	Public	Academic	All Other	Overall N
DLIS should support DLLI.	4.49	*No Difference*			202
DLIS should support ILL.	4.45	4.40	4.68	4.34	355
DLLI is essential.	4.21	*No Difference*			200
ILL is essential.	4.19	4.13	4.44	4.12	352
Overall satisfaction, DLLI.	4.12	4.16	3.95	4.18	225
Users depend on ILL.	4.11	4.01	4.47	4.12	347
Users depend on DLLI.	4.07				192
Library receives more use due to ILL.	3.81	*No Difference*			334
Library receives more use due to DLLI.	3.76				183
Respondents[1]		154, 247	60, 73	11, 34	

- Only 64 respondents provided a reason for not providing ILL service. Of these, two said that their libraries "used to participate but do not now." The next-highest reason chosen was "My library cannot afford."

- For why they did not participate in DLLI, most (70%) said they did not know.

- Non-MLS respondents were more likely to agree that both ILL and DLLI Courier resulted in their libraries receiving more use.

FloridaCat

- Most (58%) respondents did not know if their libraries participated in FloridaCat. Therefore, the relatively low level of reported use reflects this lack knowledge.

- Knowledge about the use of FloridaCat varied significantly both by library type and by region.

---

[1] The lower number (154, 60, 11) is for the DLLI questions; the higher, for the ILL questions.

Does your library contribute records to **FloridaCat**?	Overall	Public	Academic	All Other Types
Yes	133	92	28	13
I Don't Know	248	186	45	17
No	48	17	8	23
Respondents	429	295	81	53
Percent Yes	31%	31%	35%	25%

Does your library contribute records to **FloridaCat?**	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Yes	11	20	47	23	32
I Don't know	25	51	93	41	38
No	12	8	10	13	5
Respondents	48	79	150	77	75
Percent Yes	23%	25%	31%	30%	43%

- The majority of those who were knowledgeable reported that their records had been in FloridaCat for over 10 years (79%).

- Only 68 respondents said they knew how long their records had been in FloridaCat and only 55 knew how they had been added.

How long have your library's **records** been in FloridaCat	Count	Percent *of Those Knowing*
1-5 Years	3	4%
6-10 Years	11	16%
10+ Years	54	79%
I Don't Know	60	
Answered Question Skipped Question	128 430	

- Compared to other items on the survey, FloridaCat had relatively low ratings, with all below the overall average of 4.04. Participants rated three items particularly low: that users depend on FloridaCat; that the library receives more use; and that they always find the resources they need.

- Academic library respondents had higher overall satisfaction.

- *Where by-type ratings are not given, those items did not differ significantly by library type.*

FloridaCat	Total			
DLIS should support FloridaCat.	4.03	Public	Academic	Other
Overall satisfaction with FloridaCat.	3.89	3.81	4.15	3.92
FloridaCat is essential.	3.63			
Users depend on FloridaCat.	3.45		*No Difference*	
Receives more use due to.	3.41			

FloridaCat				
Always find resources we need.	3.37			
Respondents	92-104	88	27	13

- When asked why his or her library did not contribute to FloridaCat, almost no respondent provided a reason. Comments and the "do not know" choice indicated that most survey respondents did not know cataloging policies or practices.

Florida Memory Project

- Respondents from the Other group in types of libraries, which includes archives, schools, and special libraries, report higher use of the Florida Memory Project.

- Respondents with more experience were more likely to report having used Florida Memory.

- Respondents with MLS degrees were more likely to have used Florida Memory, at 53% vs. 37% for non-MLS.

- Both academic and other types of libraries are more likely to include a link to Florida Memory on their websites.

Have you used the **Florida Memory** resources?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Used	205	132	40	33
No	216	158	39	19
Respondents	421	290	79	52
Percent of Type, Yes	49%	46%	51%	63%

Have you **added a link** to Florida Memory?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	86	49	19	18
No	74	46	16	12
I Don't Know	38	32	4	2
Respondents	198	127	39	32
Percent of Type, Yes	43%	39%	49%	56%

- Ratings are quite strong, with all items above average.

- *Where by-type ratings are not given, those items did not differ significantly by library type.*

Florida Memory	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
DLIS should support FL Memory.	4.47	4.36	4.54	4.78
FL Memory resources valuable to my users.	4.29	4.23	4.24	4.56
Overall Satisfaction	4.25	*No Difference*		
Respondents	186-203	120-131	34-39	32-33

- School curriculum is the most frequently reported reason why respondents use Florida Memory, for public as well as K-12 schools. Tourism is the least likely use.
- Many of the "other" comments noted that the respondents had used it for their own personal interests.

Why do you **use FL Memory**?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Work with K-12.	87	67	2	18
Work of local historians.	81	60	10	11
Information needs of higher education.	79	35	32	12
Information needs of genealogists.	72	60	5	7
Information needs of local officials.	37	25	2	10
Community's tourism program.	36	30	1	5
Other	42	27	7	8

E-Government

- Responses were evenly divided among yes, no, and I do not know to the question if their library offered E-Government OR had received a grant.
- Public library respondents were much more likely to answer "yes."
- MLS respondents rated the importance of E-Government training higher than non-MLS: 4.56 vs. 4.27 for non-MLS.

Received a Grant to Offer **E-Gov** or Received Training	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	130	114	9	7
I Don't Know	146	121	16	9
No	141	54	52	35
Respondents	417	289	77	51
Percent of Type, Yes	31%	39%	12%	14%

- Grants and training were popular with respondents, especially in Central Florida. Most respondents did not report that E-Government had resulted in media coverage.

  There were very few non-public library respondents (eight academic and five other) to the rating questions.

- *Where by-region ratings are not given, those items did not differ significantly by geographic region.*

E-Gov Offering or Training	Total	Pan	NE	Central	SE	SW
DLIS should continue E-Gov training.	4.50	*No Difference*				
DLIS should offer E-Gov grants.	4.44					
E-Gov increased use on-site.	4.40	4.25	4.38	4.61	4.11	4.50
E-Gov essential.	4.36	*No Difference*				

E-Gov increased online use.	4.31					
Users better served.	4.31					
Library received media coverage.	3.63	2.25	3.54	4.05	3.50	3.67
Respondents	206-120	8	29	38-41	26-27	14-16

- For non-public library respondents, the reason they do not apply for E-Government grants or take E-Gov training is because they do not know about them or they are not public libraries.

- A considerable number of public library respondents (97) did not know about the E-Government program. For Other many responded that they worked in other parts of the library, or otherwise did not know about it.

Consulting Services

- About one in 10 respondents reported using DLIS consulting services – 14% of public library respondents. A large proportion did not know about these services.   (31%).

- Almost all users of consulting services were experienced: 74% (34 out of the 46 total) had 20+ years of experience, and five more had 11-19 years. 22% of respondents to this question in the 20+ experience group had used consulting services, vs. 4-5% for the other experience groups.

- There were no significant differences by region.

Have you used any **consulting services**?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Yes	46	40	2	4
I don't know	128	103	20	5
No	238	143	54	41
Respondents	412	286	76	50
Percent of type, Yes	11%	14%	3%	8%

- Because only six non-public library respondents said yes, ratings given are only those of public library respondents. Number of respondents varied by question.

- All ratings were above average, and the highest was for the general quality of service, although very few survey respondents answered these questions.

Consulting Services	Rating	N (Public Only)
General Quality of Services	4.54	36
Accuracy of Info Provided	4.53	35
Timeliness of Response	4.49	36
Info & Help E-Rate	4.43	30
Assistance with Tech and E-Rate	4.42	31
Assistance with Long-Range plans	4.42	26
Assistance with Data Collection	4.33	27

Assistance Planning Youth	4.26	28
Info & Help for E-Gov	4.25	25
Help with Program Evaluation	4.22	23
Info & Help Youth	4.20	30
Info & Help with Tech Implement	4.17	21
Info & Help Staffing	4.10	20
Info & Help with Evaluation	4.08	24

- Most respondents to the question of the impact of consulting services chose "improve an existing service." Of those who said "Other," some had not yet had a consultation; the others were complimentary.

What was the **impact of** your use of the consulting services?	Total
Information helped me improve an existing service.	34
Consultant visit helped me improve.	11
Received an answer, resources or training but did not use.	3
Other	7

- The primary reason for not using the service was ignorance of the service or eligibility; although a number of respondents (81) said they had no need, (participants could choose more than one response).

Why do you not use the consulting services?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Did not know about the services.	170	123	29	18
Do not know if my library is eligible.	108	63	29	16
Have no need for these services.	81	49	19	13
Don't think they would help me.	9	5	2	2
Other/N.A.	38	30	2	6

- In Other, many responded that they did not handle such matters or that they did not know about the service.

Leadership Programs & Professional Development Workshops

This section of the survey began with the question: Have you participated in at least one of the following workshops, meetings, or programs?

> Annual Public Library Directors' Meeting
> New Public Library Directors' Orientation
> Sunshine State Library Leadership Institute
> Florida Library Jobs Website
> Leadership Lab
> Leadership Symposium

Have you participated?	Count	Percent
Yes	158	39%
No	250	61%

Answered Question	408	
Skipped Question (percent)	151 (27%)	

- There were no significant differences in participation by library type or by region.
- More experienced respondents were more likely to have participated.

DLIS CE	3 Years or Less	4-10 Years	11-19 Years	20+ Years	Total
Participated in Leadership	3	37	42	76	158
No	24	75	70	78	247
Total	27	112	112	154	405
Percent of Group, Yes	11%	33%	38%	49%	39%

- MLS respondents were far more likely to have attended (50%), versus 10% of non-MLS.
- The most frequent reasons for not attending these activities have to do with not being qualified or not having time. Many of the Other responses said the workshops were not relevant to their positions or they were not selected from their library to participate. (No overall total: could select more than one.)

Why haven't you participated in these activities?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
Do not work in a management position.	73	57	12	4
Am not an MLS-librarian.	65	54	3	8
Did not know about them.	62	42	8	12
Don't have the time.	57	45	7	5
Do not need this training.	32	19	9	4
It costs too much.	22	17	3	2
Other	33	18	7	8

Respondents answered another question about CE: "Have you attended at least one professional development workshop through CFLC, NEFLIN, SEFLIN, TBLC, PLAN, or SWFLN?"

- Responses differed by library type and by region. Respondents from other types of libraries and Panhandle respondents were much less likely to have participated in the workshops.
- More experienced respondents were more likely to have participated, as were MLS librarians (86% versus 69% for non-MLS) although attendance by non-MLS respondents was still high.

Attended MLC workshop?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other Types
Yes	327	239	65	23
No	75	41	9	25
Respondents	402	280	74	48

Percent of Type, Yes	81%	85%	88%	48%

Attended MLC Workshop?	3 Years or Less	4-10 Years	11-19 Years	20+ Years	Total
Yes	17	85	89	136	327
No	10	26	21	18	75
Respondents	27	111	110	154	402
Percent of Group, Yes	63%	77%	81%	88%	81%

Attended MLC workshop by network?	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	Southeast	Southwest
Yes	27	64	114	58	64
No	19	12	26	10	8
Respondents	46	76	140	68	72
Percent of Region, Yes	59%	84%	81%	85%	89%

- Relatively few gave answers to "why do you not attend" the MLC Cooperative workshops; the most frequent were a lack of knowledge or a lack of time. Those respondents from other types of libraries mentioned that the workshops were not related to their jobs, their supervisors did not allow, or there was no budget.

I do **not attend MLC Workshops** because:	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
I don't know about them.	27	14	4	9
I cannot get away from work to attend.	18	9	1	8
They are not on topics I need.	17	7	3	7
They are too far away.	7	3	2	2
They are not offered at a convenient time.	4	4	0	0
Other	21	11	2	8

When asked about their attendance at specific training events, most respondents selected webinars from WebJunction.

Which of the following **training opportunities** sponsored by the **DLIS** have you participated in?	Total	Public	Academic	All Other
WebJunction Webinars	219	168	33	18
DLIS Webinars	177	139	18	20
Florida Electronic Library	167	129	19	19
WebJunction Florida On-Demand Courses	115	84	19	12
College of DuPage Library Webcasts	115	67	37	11

None	74	41	14	19

- The only reason for not participating that received more than a handful of answers was "didn't know about them" (24, all others < 7).

- Respondents rated the impact of workshops relatively low. Only two items were above average, that the DLIS should support the Leadership programs and that the workshops improve the development and delivery of services for learning.

Workshops	Ratings	Total N
DLIS should support Leadership Program.	4.31	137
Improve services for learning.	4.09	101
Improve service to underserved.	3.91	94
Improve delivery by e-networks.	3.88	97
Target diverse individuals.	3.87	97
Develop partnerships.	3.86	98
Target services to persons having difficulty.	3.82	97
Improve services to children in poverty.	3.79	94
Improve use of e-links between libraries.	3.69	91

Summer Reading Program (SRP)

- Participation in the Florida Library Youth Program Summer Reading Program varied by library and by region, with the Southeast and Southwest less likely to participate.

Summer Reading Program Use	Total	Public
Yes	265	248
I Don't Know	28	21
No	104	7
Respondents	397	276
Percent of Type, Yes	67%	90%

Public Library Participation By Region					
Summer Reading Program Use	Panhandle	Northeast	Central	SE	SW
Yes	18	50	91	45	44
I Don't Know	2	5	4	6	4
No	1	2	0	2	2
Respondents	21	57	95	53	50
Percent of Region, Yes	86%	88%	96%	85%	88%

- Respondents to rating questions were very positive about most items, rating the positive impact on parents and children well above average. The lowest rating (below average) was for the materials provided.

Summer Reading Program Impact	Rating	Total N
Parents Appreciated	4.57	245
SRP participants had fun and read.	4.56	246
More community use.	4.47	244
SRP participants maintained skills.	4.33	238
Teachers appreciated SRP.	4.32	236
Overall Rating of Materials	3.92	263

- In the absence of DLIS support, responses split between libraries developing their own programs or having a shortened version. Very few said that their library would have no summer reading program.

- The most-experienced group (20+ years) was much more likely to say that they would develop their own (full) program and much less likely to say that the library would decrease the SRP: 48% develop own versus 26% for 11-19 year veterans; 26% of 20+ years group would have shorter version versus 39% of those in the 11-19 group.

If the DLIS **did not** purchase the membership and **summer reading program** materials, what would your library do?	Count	Percent
The library would develop its own program and could continue.	97	37%
The library would decrease the length of the summer reading .	95	36%
Other (please specify)	58	22%
The library would not have a Summer Reading Program.	13	5%
Answered Question Skipped Question (percent of public library total)	263 110 (29%)	

Statewide Resources Sharing and Collection Development Services

- In this section respondents provided ratings and usage indicators for services provided statewide by the DLIS.

- A relatively small number of people answered this set of questions; ILL was most known, used, and most highly rated.

- None of the ratings differed by library type or by region, but there were some lower ratings for special collections and state documents in the people with medium experience (4-10 years).

Statewide Services— General Quality	Rating	N
ILL Services	4.29	129
Reference Services	4.25	99
State Docs Collection	4.22	85
Special Collections	4.21	89

Statewide Services — General Quality	< 3 Years	4-10 Years	11-19 Years	20+ Years
Special Collections	4.25	3.85	4.52	4.29
N	4	27	23	35
State Docs. Collection	4	3.8	4.57	4.33
N	4	25	23	33

Statewide Service Use	N
Used ILL	119
Used Special Collections	55
Borrowed from Collection	47
Asked a Reference Question	41
Used State Docs	26
Other	14
Not Used Services	*232*

- The most frequent reason given for not using the services is that the respondent did not know about them.

- Most "other" responses were that they had no need or that it was not part of their job.

Why do you **not use** these **statewide services**?	N
I did not know about the services.	91
Our library can answer any reference questions.	26
Our library uses FLIN or another ILL service.	38
Our library users do not have a need for specialized collections.	27
Our library users do not have a need for the state documents.	26
Other	41

- However, a large number (110, or 20% of the entire survey population) reported a positive impact from using the services.

What was the impact of your use of these services?	
Info I received helped me serve my library users.	120
I saw no impact.	21
Other	12

Section Four – Community and Library Needs

This last section contains the answers received to two open-ended questions about the survey participants' opinions about what issues face their communities and their libraries.

1. **What are your library top five needs to best serve your users in the next five years?**

This question received 195 answers. Not all respondents identified five needs. Answers fell into these broad categories. Each of these needs has multiple dimensions and each is interrelated.

*   Technology
*   Funding
*   Collections
*   Staffing
*   Programs

Technology encompasses not only the need to upgrade equipment, but several respondents mentioned the idea that their library needed to "keep up with technology," which means more than just hardware or software replacement, but had implications for staff training. Some said their library needed more computers and faster connections to help users for E-Government purposes, such as job searching, filling out state applications, and for the unemployed. In addition, respondents identified a need for staff members who are fluent in all technology, so that they, in turn, can help their users use and learn about technology.

Many respondents identified increased **funding** as a general need, but several were specific about the purposes of increased funding. Again, they mentioned funding for technology, but also identified collection needs, for e-books, which several respondents mentioned, and other digital materials, and for the print collection as well. The idea of increased funding permeates throughout the responses to this question.

As noted above, respondents linked funding to the need for improved and expanded **collections**. In addition to the already mentioned collection needs, several respondents expressed a need for more online databases.

Respondents identified several needs in the **staff** area. Many mentioned that library staff members have training needs, especially in the areas of emerging technology and how to provide assistance to users to find government assistance. Other areas of need include staff who can, "adapt quickly to new ways of providing information;" staff who can speak languages other than English; and better pay for all staff.

The need to offer **programs** was expressed by respondents. The need for programs fell into two categories. The first was recreational programming, with audiences of all library users, particularly children and young adults. The second type of needed programs mentioned are those focused on education, in particular, classes that teach job-seeking and technology skills.

2. What are the top five issues or needs that your community, campus, or school will face in the next five years?

This question received 211 answers. Not all respondents identified five needs and over half of the responses focused on library needs, instead of their community's needs. Answers fell into these broad categories and each of these needs has multiple dimensions.

- The economy
- Increased community diversity
- Education or literacy needs

Most respondents said that their communities had needs based on the county's poor economy, identifying these problems.

- Lack of health care
- Lack of jobs and the need for job training
- High unemployment rate
- Homelessness
- Reduced budget for government services

Respondents also identified **diversity** as an issue for their communities. No respondent identified that increased diversity was a problem, but as an issue that presents challenges to community institutions.

Another theme identified by respondents was the need for improved **education.** Respondents were not specific about what level of education was an issue for their communities. Others identified adult "literacy" as an issue; one respondent wrote t38/99+hat Florida ranks third in adult literacy.