

Evaluation of 2008-2012

Five-Year LSTA Plan

Oregon State Library

Results of Constituent Survey

Submitted by

Nancy Bolt & Associates

Nancy Bolt

Karen Strege

November 4, 2011

Revised January 10, 2012



Results of Constituent Survey

This report summarizes the responses to the LSTA Evaluation Survey, conducted between September 19 and October 8, 2011. Strege and Bolt wrote the initial questions and the State Library's Library Development Services staff members provided comments and feedback, which we incorporated into the final survey questions. Dr. Rachel Applegate reviewed the questions and provided the analysis below. **This report does not interpret survey results.** The final evaluation report combines these results with the information from focus groups, interviews, and document review. .

Contents

- Respondent demographics
- Priorities
- Programs:
 - Competitive grant
 - Statewide Database Licensing (including training)
 - L-Net, statewide online reference service
 - Plinkit, websites for public libraries
 - Youth Services
 - NW Central Network, an online clearinghouse for library continuing education
 - OSLIS, the Oregon school libraries information services
- Technical Note

Within each of these sections, we provide a summary of all responses, followed by the results that **differed** by groups. Groups tested for differences include the following:

- By library type: public, academic and school, omitting other and special
- By job: administration, reference, and children's/youth, omitting all others such as access services and one-person libraries
- By region: Most Respondents were from the Metro Portland and Willamette Valley areas. Respondents from other regions numbered 24 or fewer. These very few responses from these areas should not be used to 'represent' or be generalized to others in those areas.
- By MLS or non-MLS
- For a few topics, size of library was analyzed, but not systematically for all.

The five-item, Likert scales we used are assigned a value from 1 to 5; 1 is the extreme negative, 3 is neutral, and 5 is the extreme positive. We assigned these numeric values to all scales including the following: low priority to high priority; very poor to excellent; and strongly disagree to strongly agree. In scales of this type, the *average* score—the actual midpoint of replies—tends to be midway between neutral and best, or a 4 on a 5-point scale. This is because in surveys, most respondents are 'agreeable', in general, to questions asked. Therefore, a lower-than-average score would be one that is below 4.0 and a very bad score

would be one that is 3.0 or lower. Scores averaging 3.0 or below mean respondents did not agree with a statement, or did not value something, or did not rate something highly. The technical note at the end of this report explains the rationale and process for isolating these groups.

Respondents

There were 296 library staff and 4 public library trustee respondents. By region, respondents were roughly equally divided among Metro Portland, the Willamette Valley, and the other locations. By the type of library, respondents were almost one-half public, a third academic, a fifth school, and a small amount of ‘others.’ Others included consultants and a few school library workers who reported they worked in elementary schools.

Respondents by Regions	Number	%	Type	Number	%
Metro Portland	109	37%	Public	132	45%
Willamette Valley	106	36%	Academic	94	32%
Coastal, Central, Eastern, Southern	81	27%	School	58	20%
Total	296		Other	12	4%

In which type of library do you work?	In which part of Oregon do you work?						
	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Public	11	14	47	36	15	9	132
Academic	2	1	36	46	3	6	94
Special	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
K-12 School	2	5	21	19	5	6	58
Other	0	0	4	2	1	0	7
Totals	15	21	109	106	24	21	296

Respondents by library size: Most respondents worked in small libraries, with between less than one and 10 FTE.

Type of library	What is the number of full-time equivalent staff that work in your library?						
	< than 1 to 10	11 to 30	31 to 50	51 to 100	101 to 200	Over 200	Total
Public	67	30	10	10	5	10	132
Academic	21	28	9	16	16	4	94
K-12 School	57	0	0	1	0	0	58
Special	3	0	2	0	0	0	5
Other	5	0	2	0	0	0	7
Number	153	58	23	27	21	14	296
Percent in that size library	52%	20%	8%	9%	7%	5%	

Respondents by primary job: Administrators were the most frequent respondents.

	Other	One-person library	Admin	Tech. Serv.	Circ.	Ref. Serv.	Child YA	Technology
Public	12	6	39	7	15	21	29	3
Academic	12	3	18	23	7	29	0	2
Special	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
K-12 School	7	36	3	0	0	0	11	1
Other	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total	34	47	63	30	22	51	40	9

Respondents by MLS or not: Over half of the respondents have an MLS degree *except for schools* where a MLS is rare.

Type of library	Do you have a MLS or MLIS degree?			% of type
	Yes	No	Total	
Public	80	52	132	61%
College or University	72	22	94	77%
Special	4	1	5	80%
K-12 School	12	46	58	21%
Other	5	2	7	71%
Total	173	123	296	58%

Priorities

Overall, the highest priorities for all respondents are for databases, summer reading, and early literacy. Respondents were less likely to choose consulting and Plinkit.

Priorities by library type: Respondents identified their priorities for the use of LSTA funds for 2013 through 2018. Answers differed significantly by the respondents' library type. School librarians tended to value each priority more than other groups, with OSLIS being most important. Academic librarians were lukewarm on most priorities except databases.

Library Type	Public	Academic	School
Summer reading program	4.53	3.65	4.14
Statewide databases	4.44	4.16	4.73
Early literacy programs	4.39	3.89	4.10
CE for library staff	3.95	3.35	3.97
Plinkit	3.74	3.00	3.54

OSLIS	3.55	3.38	4.69
Expanding consulting services	3.24	2.98	3.41

Priorities by primary job: Note that administrators view expanding consulting serves as not a priority.

By job	Admin	Reference	Child/YA
Summer reading program	4.30	3.84	4.67
Early literacy	4.22	4.07	4.58
Competitive grants	4.00	3.25	3.63
Reaching unserved residents	3.39	3.85	4.15
OSLIS	3.55	3.55	4.12
Expanding consulting services	2.33	2.95	3.48

Priorities by region: There were no significant differences in priority ratings among regions.

Priorities by MLS or non-MLS: Three items were rated statistically significantly higher by non-MLS than MLS.

By MLS or no MLS	MLS	Non
Summer reading program	4.04	4.40
OSLIS	3.63	4.09
Providing CE for staff	3.61	3.96

Priorities by library size: Four priorities differed significantly by size of library. The smallest libraries valued each of these (databases, OSLIS, continuing education, and providing websites (Plinkit)) more highly than those from larger libraries.

Library staff size	Databases	OSLIS	CE	Plinkit
Less than 1 to 10	4.55	4.12	3.92	3.72
11 to 30	4.36	3.46	3.80	3.32
31 to 50	4.00	3.38	3.20	3.21
51 to 100	4.47	3.33	3.50	3.15
101 to 200	4.07	3.55	3.38	3.09
Over 200	4.00	3.75	3.38	3.25
Total	4.41	3.81	3.74	3.47

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

The survey contained a section with questions about individual statewide programs and the competitive grants program. These sections were structured in the following way: a question asked if the respondents used the service or program, if respondents answered yes, then they continued to provide feedback about their satisfaction and to identify the results of the particular program. If the respondents answered that they did not use a program or service, then they were asked to identify reasons for non-use. The following charts only highlight results when there are significant differences between responder groups, such as library type or size.

The difference between areas was tested with the chi-square test. The respondents from areas other than Metro Portland and the Willamette Valley are too small to draw conclusions.

Competitive Grant Program

Highlights

- 76% (224 of 295 respondents) know about the competitive grants program.
- Responders least likely to have heard about this program are from the Willamette Valley. Responders from the Coast are most likely to know about this program.
- Only 62% of the school responders know about the LSTA grant program; 82% of the responders from public libraries report knowing about this program.
- School library respondents rated elements of the competitive grants process more highly than respondents from other types of libraries.
- Only school library respondents thought the peer evaluations were very helpful (rated above 4.0, agreed); respondents from other types of libraries rated these evaluations as 3.5 or below.
- 34% of all respondents say they have applied for a grant.
- Of those who said they did not apply, they selected these reasons most often.
 - 27%, no time to write
 - 17% no ongoing funding
 - 17% don't know
 - No other choice was above 10%.

Competitive Grants by library type:

By library type: do you know about?	Yes	Percent Yes	Total
Public	107	82%	131
Academic	69	73%	94
School	36	62%	58
Special or other	9	90%	10
Total	221	75%	293

Applicants by library type:

Have you applied?	Yes Percent	Why not? Major Reason	Percentage of Response
Public	46%	No time to write proposal	40%
Academic	41%	No ongoing funding	20%
School	25%	Didn't know about eligibility	22%

Rating of the LSTA Competitive Process: Ratings of the process are not statistically different by library type *except* for the following: Peer evaluations are helpful (public, 3.61, academic, 3.38, school, 4.37).

Competitive Grants by primary job: Administrators are significantly more likely (55% of respondents, vs. 24% of reference, 35% of child/YA) to report that they applied for a grant. Competitive Grants by region: We found a significant difference in knowledge about this program: 83% yes for Metro Portland and 70% for Willamette Valley. There were no differences in ratings among other regions.

Know about OSL's LSTA competitive grants Program?	In which part of Oregon do you work?						Total
	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	
Yes	14	11	91	74	18	16	224
No	1	10	18	31	6	5	71
Total	15	21	109	105	24	21	295
Percent yes	93%	52%	83%	70%	75%	76%	

Competitive Grants by MLS or non-MLS: Those with an MLS (88%) were much more likely to apply for a grant than those without a MSL (59%). MLS respondents are more likely to have heard about the program through colleagues, and non-MLS through contact from the State Library.

Statewide Database Licensing Program

Highlights

- Most respondents to this question know about the database program (92% of public respondents, 78% of academic, 85% school).

Know about the database program?	In which part of Oregon do you work?						Total
	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	
Yes	14	11	91	74	18	16	224
No	1	10	18	31	6	5	71

Total	15	21	109	105	24	21	295
Percent yes	93%	52%	83%	70%	75%	76%	

Frequency of use	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Daily	11	5	11	28
At least once a week	33	18	17	70
At least once a month	16	11	6	33
A few times a year	22	15	8	49
I do not use	8	6	4	19
Total	90	55	46	199

Database Training

- 2/3 of public, ¾ of school, and ½ of academic respondents had participated in database training.
- The most prevalent reasons for *not* participating were that they already knew how to use them (48%), “no time” (39%), “didn’t know” (33%). 78% of academic library respondents answered that they “already knew” compared to 29% public and 22% school.
- About 22% of both public and school library respondents (who did not use training) cited that the in-person workshops were too far; *no* academic library person said too far.
- No staff coverage was a problem for public library respondents (25%) and school (22%) but not academic (7%).
- By region, those in Metro Portland (54%) and Willamette Valley (59%) were the least likely to have participated in database training. “Already know” and “no time” were the most important reasons for not attending. 46% of Metro Portland respondents said they did not know about the training

Participated in Gale or Learning Express training?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	7	10	33	36	13	14	113
No	4	4	28	25	3	2	66
Total	11	14	61	61	16	16	179
Percent yes	64%	71%	54%	59%	81%	88%	63%

Number selecting reason for not attending:

Why not? By Region	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
No time	1	4	10	10	1	0	22

F2F too far	1	3	1	2	1	0	8
Didn't know	2	3	13	3	0	1	22
Library can't do webinars	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Don't like webinars	1	0	3	1	0	0	5
Already know	2	1	14	12	2	1	32
Don't use	0	0	3	5	1	0	9
Don't know enough	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
No staff coverage	1	1	3	5	1	0	11
Other	2	3	19*	14*	2	0	40

*Some of the "other" responses include "I did attend training."

Ratings for training providers were overall relatively positive except academic librarians who rated Gale negatively, (1= poor, 5= excellent).

Rating of training providers by library type:

Trainer	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Gale	3.66	2.90	4.23	3.68
Oregon State Library	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.12
Learning Express	3.55	3.20	4.11	3.53
A combination	3.57	4.00	4.20	3.70

Database impacts (includes training) and overall ratings:

Because of training	Overall
Improved understanding	4.09
Improved ability to help users	4.04
Because of program	Overall
Saved money on print	3.83
Saved money on online	3.92
More use	3.38
Could not offer equivalent	3.82
Essential part	3.77
Users depend on databases	3.56
Promotional materials effective	3.24

Database impacts and ratings by library type: Ratings differed by library type (except for OSL and Learning Express training). Academic libraries rated all impact statements lower.

By library type	Public	Academic	School
Database training offered by Gale	3.66	2.90	4.23

DB training improved my understanding	4.10	3.67	4.36
DB training improved ability to help	4.06	3.38	4.38
Library saved money on print	3.96	3.24	4.35
Library saved money on online	4.02	3.40	4.39
Library receives more use	3.55	2.86	3.63
Couldn't provide equivalent	4.13	2.85	4.43
DBs are an essential part of my lib	4.13	2.79	4.23
Users depend on the DBs	3.80	2.70	4.18
Promotional materials effective	3.33	2.67	3.80

Other significant differences in responders' answers to the database impact questions:

By Library Type	Public	Academic	School
Percentage who know about DB program	92%	78%	85%
Participating in training	66%	47%	79%
Why not training, proportional responses except			
I already know how to use	8	21	2

Database impacts by primary job: Children's Librarians and Administrators are enthusiastic about the database impacts but Reference workers are far less so.

Ratings by job	Admin	Reference	Children/YA
Impacts of Training			
DB training improved my understanding	4.24	3.68	4.18
DB training improved my ability to help	4.16	3.58	4.13
Impacts of Databases			
Library has saved money on print	4.11	3.40	4.13
Library has saved money on online	4.29	3.46	4.09
Library receives more use	4.29	3.46	4.09
Without DBs library could not offer as much	4.13	3.05	3.94
Library's users depend on the DBs	3.74	3.31	3.90
Promotional materials are effective	3.31	2.73	3.52

Database impacts by region: No real differences by region except that respondents from Metro Portland more often said they did not know about availability of training than Willamette Valley respondents, but there were only a few respondents overall who did not know about the databases.

Database impacts by MLS or non-MLS: MLS respondents were more likely to know about the database program (94% vs. 75% of Non-MLS), although the frequency of their usage is not different. Non-MLS responders were more likely to have participated in training (71% vs. 58% for MLS). Ratings were similar except for the following four items; MLS respondents rated these lower than non-MLS.

MLS or non-MLS	MLS	Non-MLS
Ratings of database training from Gale	3.50	3.95
Improved ability to assist users	3.86	4.26
Could not offer equivalent	3.60	4.25
Promotional materials effective	3.05	3.59

L-net, Statewide Online Reference

Highlights

- The most important sources of information about L-net (“where did you first hear” choose only one) were conferences (22%, especially for school librarians) and colleagues (22%, especially for public and academic). Email was the next most important (13%, more for public and academic).
- Usage is even across library types with 45% of the total of respondents answering that they used L-Net.
- Only 5 respondents said they had tried the service and were unhappy. More common reasons for not using it were, do not know enough about the service (for public), and can answer ourselves (all types, especially school).
- Schools were almost never L-net partners (3 respondents yes, 43 no; the other types, evenly divided).
- For public and academic library respondents, the most important reasons for being an L-net partner were giving back for what the library receives (especially for public) and wanting to contribute to statewide needs. Public library respondents were more likely (not tested statistically) to say they like networking and it makes the job more interesting.
- Most were satisfied with the process of giving answers, and with the answers they received, (all above 4.3, but this question had few respondents).
- In general, users rated most aspects highly, but were skeptical of its impacts on users; they praised tech support and training.
- On the impacts rating questions, users were generally positive with all scores above 3.35. The lowest had to do with whether it increases visibility or users depend on L-net: scores were 3.35 to 3.49. L-net “local” questions received higher scores. (Not tested statistically)

How respondents heard about L-net:

Overall	Number	Percent of respondents
I am not aware of this program.	33	12%
Colleague	60	22%
Conference or meeting	59	22%
Email message or listserve	37	14%
I don't recall	34	13%
Contact from the State Library	21	8%
Brochure or newsletter	6	2%
Other (please specify)	20	7%
Total	270	

L-Net impacts and other questions by library type: Academic respondents were slightly less likely to have heard about L-net (17% do not know, vs. 12% overall). Regarding **L-net local**, which is a program to provide online chat reference services to their local community, responses from different types of libraries showed significant differences:

Do you use L-net local?	Public	Academic	School
Percent using L-net local	23%	29%	9%
Percent who are an L-net partner	47%	54%	7%

L-net by library type: Responses about L-net’s impacts do not differ by type except for the following.

L-net impacts	Public	Academic	School
Users are better served	4.35	4.27	3.83
L-net is an essential part of my lib	4.00	3.96	3.26

L-net use and impacts by primary job: The ratings of L-net elements do not differ by job. However, the use of L-net and L-net local does vary by job.

L-net & L-net by Type	Administration	Reference Services	Children or Y/A Services
Use L-net to answer reference questions	49%	68%	42%
Do you use L-net Local	15%	45%	27%
Is your library an L-net Partner	40%	59%	33%

L-net use and impacts by region: Usage differs by region. 56% percent answered yes from Metro Portland and 38% for the Willamette Valley. Respondents from Metro Portland were more likely to learn about it from email message/listserv and those from Willamette Valley learn about L-net by contact from the State Library. All ratings are the same by region except:

How did you first hear about L-net?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
I am not aware of this program	1	4	10	14	1	3	33
(Chose a method)	13	17	90	82	21	14	237

Do you use L-net Local?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	2	2	26	18	0	2	50
No	10	14	62	64	20	12	182
Total	12	16	88	82	20	14	232

Is your library a L-net partner?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	4	6	44	30	5	4	93
No	8	10	43	52	14	10	137
Total	12	16	87	82	19	14	230

L-net Rating		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	East	South	Total
Overall satisfaction with L-net reference services.	Average	4.40	3.83	4.24	4.04	4.71	4.00	4.18
	N	5	6	46	27	7	7	98
Overall satisfaction with the staff member response.	Average	5.00	4.67	4.81	4.25	4.60	4.50	4.60
	N	4	3	32	24	5	4	72
Increased visibility in community because of L-net.	Average	3.75	3.75	3.37	3.61	3.71	3.20	3.50
	N	4	4	38	28	7	5	86
Users are better served because we use L-net.	Average	4.40	4.25	4.24	4.18	4.57	4.00	4.24
	N	5	4	42	28	7	6	92
L-net is an essential part of my library's services.	Average	3.75	4.00	3.90	3.76	4.14	3.67	3.86
	N	4	4	41	29	7	6	91

Users depend on L-net to find the information resources	Average	3.25	4.00	3.45	3.29	3.67	3.80	3.45
Total	N	4	4	40	28	6	5	87

L-Net local Rating		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Southern	Total
Overall rating of the L-net Local technical support	Average	5.00	4.50	4.56	4.22		4.48
	N	2	2	16	9	0	29
Overall rating of the L-net Local training	Average	.	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.00	4.34
	N	0	2	17	8	2	29
Overall satisfaction with L-net Local.	Average	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.18	4.00	4.38
	N	1	2	18	11	2	34
Increased visibility in our community because of L-net Local.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.15	3.82	5.00	4.11
	N	1	2	20	11	1	35
Users are better served because we use L-net Local.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.45	3.85	5.00	4.26
	N	2	2	20	13	1	38
L-net Local is an essential part of my library's services.	Average	4.00	5.00	4.15	3.58	4.50	4.03
	N	1	2	20	12	2	37
Users depend on L-net Local to find the information resources	Average	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.45	5.00	3.91
	N	1	2	19	11	1	34

The following are the **only** areas that regional differences that are statistically significantly. For the above ratings, either numbers (N) were too small or the differences in ratings were too small

L-Net Satisfaction	Metro Portland	Willamette Valley
Satisfaction with staff member's response	4.81	4.25

L-Net use and impacts by MLS or non-MLS: Use is significantly higher for MLS respondents (52% vs. 32% for non-MLS). 27 non-MLS respondents said that their reason not to use L-Net

was “don’t know enough.” In addition, MLS and non-MLS rated four impacts differently. Note that in contrast to databases and database training, non-MLS rated L-net items *lower*.

L-Net impacts	MLS	Non-MLS
Users better served, using L-Net	4.34	3.96
L-net essential part	4.03	3.38
Overall satisfaction with L-net Local	4.50	3.83
Users better served, L-Net local	4.41	3.50

Plinkit, Website for Public Libraries

Highlights

- 70 respondents gave reasons why they did not use Plinkit; 28 answered that they were ‘satisfied with own website’; 26 choose ‘other;’ and 16 said that they, ‘don’t know enough.’ Willamette Valley respondents were more likely to say ‘satisfied with own website.’
- Respondents most often chose these ways that they learned about Plinkit: conference (10 respondents), colleague (15), and state library contact (11).
- Regarding Plinkit’s impacts, ratings were relatively homogenous, most ‘agreeing’ at the “4” level that their library saved money, users are better served, and that Plinkit is essential. Overall ratings are lower than for databases and for L-net but higher than for academic library ratings of databases.

Plinkit Ratings & Impacts	Overall
Tech support	4.20
Materials like the manual	3.81
Training	3.91
Saved money on web services	4.30
Users are better served	4.09
Plinkit is essential	4.07

Because Plinkit is a public library project, we did not perform a library-type analysis. Respondents from different regions did not answer differently concerning use and ratings. Many more MLS respondents said the reason not to participate was “are satisfied” with own website: 25 respondents (vs. only 3 non-MLS).

Youth Services

Highlights:

- 75 respondents said they had used the services of the State Library Youth services consultant (almost all of these were from public and school). 48% of public library respondents and 30% of school library respondents said they used these services.

- 44 said they (11) or another person from their library (33) attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults Institute.
- School respondents were most likely to have asked for resources; public library respondents also asked for resources, but also had questions about services for children and youth.
- Many public library respondents (34) had attended training.
- School people who asked for resources (11) received (10). Those who attended training (38) also said it improved services (38) (possibly not the same people.)
- Relatively few reported that they attended the Focus on Children and Young Adults. 11 said they attended, and 33 said that someone attended from their library.

Focus Institute Impacts from 10 that answered the question	Self	Employee
Changed the way I served	7	16
Developed network of colleagues	4	9
Learned valuable info	8	3
Other	1	4

Representation by the OSL in the Collaborative Summer Library Program (CSLP): Almost all who participated valued that the OSL paid their fees. Respondents are unclear about the role of the State Library in representing them.

How do the OSL and OLA represent you in CSLP?	
I appreciate and have seen changes	46
I don't fully understand but need it for a SRP	36
I appreciate efforts but CSLP is too big	5
Not representing me effectively	1
Other	11

Most said they would still run summer reading programs but they would not be as extensive:

If OSL did not pay for part in CSLP and you did not get manual etc.	
Library would not have a SRP	2
Library would develop own at reduced level	57
Library would develop own and could continue at full level	27
Other	14

Impacts: Most were enthusiastic about the program and its impacts, with ratings above 4.0 (agree) for every item (except Metro Portland, 'materials'), and ratings above 4.5 for parents' appreciation and that participants had fun. (See details in impacts section at end).

Youth services by library type (Academic omitted): There were no differences by type for what might happen if OSL did not pay SRP fees.

Youth services by primary job: Administrators (43%, 24) and Children/YA (76%, 26) are much more likely to use Youth services consultant than Reference staff (9%, 4). Reference staff also rate the Summer Reading Program lower (4.0) than Administrators (4.3) and Children/YA (4.6)

Youth services Impacts (not analyzed statistically):

Have used:	Admin	Children/YA
Asked a question about a service	17	18
Asked for resources	10	18
Asked for a visit	2	3
Consultant called	4	2
Attended training	9	19
Impacts		
Received helpful answer	19	17
Received resources	13	21
Used training to improve service	9	19
Good suggestions from consultant	3	4
Saw no impacts	0	1

Differences in evaluating OSL and OLA with respect to CSLP by job:

OSL and OLA in CSLP	Admin	Ref	Children	Total
Other (please specify)	5	2	1	8
I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP.	11	3	21	35
I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts....	14	6	2	22
I appreciate the efforts of the representative, but CSLP is so large, that I don't think that they can represent me.	2	1	0	3
They are not representing me effectively in CSLP and need to make changes.	1	0	0	1
Total	33	12	24	69

Youth Services by region: No significant differences in the use of programs, opinions, or in impacts responses, except:

SRP materials rating	Metro Portland	Willamette Valley
Rating of the SRP materials provided	3.82	4.26

SRP Rating by Region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Overall opinion of the SRP	Av.	4.33	4.08	4.26	4.25	4.69	4.75	4.31
	N	9	12	39	36	13	4	113
Overall rating of the SRP materials	Av.	3.89	4.30	3.83	4.26	4.54	4.40	4.13
	N	9	10	35	34	13	5	106
SRP participants had a lot of fun & read many books.	Av.	4.75	4.50	4.56	4.40	4.77	5.00	4.56
	N	8	10	36	35	13	5	107
SRP participants maintained or improved their reading skills over the summer.	Av.	4.71	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.54	4.80	4.36
	N	7	10	35	34	13	5	104
More children used the library over the summer because of the SRP.	Av.	4.75	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.69	4.60	4.44
	N	8	10	37	34	13	5	107
The parents in the community appreciated the SRP.	Av.	4.63	4.40	4.62	4.50	4.77	4.80	4.59
	N	8	10	37	34	13	5	107
The teachers in the community appreciated the SRP.	Av.	4.50	4.00	4.42	4.39	4.46	4.00	4.36
	N	6	9	36	33	13	5	102

What is your opinion of how the OLA & OSL and represent you in CSLP?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
I appreciate how they represent me and have seen changes in CSLP.	4	2	13	16	9	2	46
I don't fully understand how they represent me, but I appreciate their efforts.	3	7	11	9	4	2	36
I appreciate the efforts of the representative, but CSLP is so large, that I don't think that they can represent me.	0	0	3	2	0	0	5

They are not representing me effectively in CSLP and need to change.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other (please specify)	1	1	6	3	0	0	11
Total	8	10	33	31	13	4	99

If OSL did not pay for your library's participation in the CSLP what would your library do?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
The library would not have a SRP	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
The library would develop its own, less-extensive SRP	6	6	16	18	9	2	57
The library would develop its own program and could continue	1	2	12	9	2	1	27
Other (please specify)	1	1	6	3	2	1	14
Total	8	10	34	31	13	4	100

Youth Services by MLS or no MLS: **No significant differences**

Northwest Central Continuing Education Network

Highlights

- 71 people said they had heard of it (equally through email and conferences); 39 used it to find an event, and 16 participated in one in the last year.
- Only Metro Portland and Willamette had more than 10 people rating “the quality of the event you found,” at 3.80 (5= excellent) and 4.20 respectively. Overall (38 ratings) the quality was 3.90.

CE rating by region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Rate the quality of the CE event that you found on the NW Central database.	Av	3.80	3.00	3.80	4.20	4.25	3.50	3.90
	N	5	1	15	10	4	4	39

NW Central by library type: Only 1 academic library respondent answered this question (and did know about it); only 12 school librarians answered it (of which only 2 knew about it). 102 public library respondents answered, of which 64% knew about it.

NW Central by region: Respondents from Metro Portland was more likely to know about NW Central (73%) compared to Willamette Valley respondents (49%: percent of those saying ‘yes’ vs. total answering the question).

NW Central by MLS or no MLS: MLS were more likely to say they knew about NW Central, 81% vs. 26%, 59 MLS said they knew vs. only 12 non-MLS said they knew.

OSLIS, Oregon School Library Information Service

Highlights

- Schools are the most frequent, but not the only users of the OSLIS portal. School respondents overwhelmingly found out about it from conferences (27, vs. 8 for ‘colleague’)
- In reasons for not using, the most important for academic library respondents was resources not relevant; for public respondents, the reason most cited for not using is that they don’t know enough about it.
- Most of the school library respondents (43 of 51) said they had a link to OSLIS; only 14 public and 2 academic library respondents did.

Why not use OSLIS?	Public	Academic	School	Overall
Resources not relevant	10	46	2	62
Don't know enough	41	14	2	58
Would use if I had training	6	1	1	8
DBs difficult to use	0	0	1	1
Website difficult to use	2	0	1	4
Other	26	15	4	45

- Few said that they did not use it because the website was difficult to use, but there was unanimous rating of ‘disagree’ that it was easy to find information on the website (overall, 2.32). Differences are not statistically significant between library types.
- Most did appreciate the training (overall rating of 4.11, no significant differences by type).

Impacts	Overall
Easy to find info on OSLIS site	2.32
Rate OSLIS training	4.11
Library increased visibility	3.66

Users better served	4.33
OSLIS is essential	3.95
More use	3.64
Could not offer equivalent	4.10
	n = 58-64

OSLIS by library type: *not analyzed*

OSLIS by primary job: Reference respondents were significantly less enthusiastic.

OSLIS	Admin.	Ref.	Children Y
OSLIS training	4.57	3.33	4.56
Increased visibility in school	3.75	2.50	3.67
Users better served	4.00	3.40	4.58
OSLIS is essential	3.38	2.83	4.25
Library receives more use	3.38	2.40	3.75
Could not offer equivalent	3.75	2.83	4.27

OSLIS by region: No significant difference in usage or ratings by region except: Do you use information literacy lessons, 18 from Metro Portland said yes and 9 from Willamette Valley.

Do you use the OSLIS web portal?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Yes	4	8	37	32	7	7	95
No	9	10	58	63	12	9	161
Total	13	18	95	95	19	16	256
Percent yes	31%	44%	39%	34%	37%	44%	37%

Do you use OSLIS to access:	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	Southern	Total
Citation Maker	3	6	26	22	5	5	67
Information literacy lessons	1	5	18	9	3	3	39
Professional resources	3	3	16	13	3	3	41

Which OSLIS resource is used the most by students at your school?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will. Valley	Eastern	South	Total
---	---------	---------	----------------	--------------	---------	-------	-------

Other (please specify)	0	0	12	4	1	0	17
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	3	3	13	18	4	3	44
Citation Maker	1	3	8	7	2	3	24
Information literacy lessons	0	2	2	1	0	0	5
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90

Which OSLIS resource is used the most by the teachers at your school?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Other (please specify)	0	1	12	8	1	1	23
Databases (Gale and LearningExpress)	4	3	17	18	3	4	49
Citation Maker	0	3	3	3	2	0	11
Information literacy lessons	0	1	3	1	1	1	7
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90

Have you participated in OSL training about OSLIS?	Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	South	Total
Yes	3	4	14	18	5	3	47
No	1	4	21	12	2	3	43
Total	4	8	35	30	7	6	90
Percent yes	75%	50%	40%	60%	71%	50%	52%

OSLIS Rating by Region		Coastal	Central	Metro Portland	Will Valley	Eastern	South	Total
OSLIS training	Av.	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.00	3.50	4.11
	N	3	3	14	18	5	2	45
Increased its visibility in our school because of OSLIS.	Av.	3.33	3.25	3.90	3.41	3.83	4.33	3.66
	N	3	4	20	22	6	3	58
My library users are better served because of OSLIS.	Av.	4.25	4.60	4.32	4.28	4.00	4.80	4.33
	N	4	5	22	25	6	5	67

OSLIS is essential for my library.	Av.	3.67	4.20	4.14	3.72	3.67	4.75	3.95
	N	3	5	22	25	6	4	65
	N	3	5	22	25	6	4	65
My library receives more use, because of OSLIS.	Av.	3.67	4.25	3.60	3.48	3.50	4.67	3.64
	N	3	4	20	23	6	3	59
	N	3	4	20	23	6	3	59
If my library did not have OSLIS, my library could not offer the same information resources.	Av.	3.67	4.40	4.13	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.10
	N	3	5	23	25	7	5	68
	N	3	5	23	25	7	5	68

OSLIS by MLS or non-MLS: No significant differences

Technical Note

Analysis by Groups

We created four types of groups.

- By library type: public, academic and school, omitting other and special. Represents 96% of the whole.
- By position: administration, reference, and children’s/youth, omitting all others such as access services and one-person libraries. Represents 52% of the whole.
 - Tech services people are almost exclusively academic; one-person libraries, almost all K-12 school.
- By region: Metro Portland and Willamette, omitting all others. Represents 73% of the whole
- Data for most regions is based on so few respondents that it may be easily misinterpreted. An ‘average rating’ of 4.0 may be based on only four people. All items requested by OSL have been provided.
- By MLS or non-MLS. Includes all responders, except trustees.

Overall results include answers from each person answering the question. For the group analysis, only those respondents who fell into each group named were included. That means the “MLS/non” numbers were the highest because everybody (but not a trustee) answered that question.

Why omit the other categories, for example, special libraries or the other regions? They were omitted **only** for the group comparisons. In these comparisons, we wanted to provide OSL with reports on only those group differences that are statistically significant. Statistical significance does not simply mean that there is a difference or that that difference is big (the 'magnitude' of

a difference.) Instead, statistical significant mainly means that there IS a difference instead of a difference simply being by chance.

Detecting a statistically significant difference depends on three things: the magnitude of the actual difference, the amount of data, and fuzz. First, a difference in a rating between 3.3 and 3.4 would usually not be statistically significantly different, but one between 3.3 and 3.9 might be. Second, if there are few respondents in any group, there is not enough data to determine statistical significance. This is one reason for eliminating some regional group respondents. In addition, if we know how respondents from academic libraries answered a question, we also know what respondents who work in technical services responded because the academic library group includes most of the technical services respondents. Third, if we left respondents from these small groups into the math of the analysis, this would create a ‘fuzz’ that makes detecting differences among the major groups difficult. We found only enough respondents in the named groups to make our analysis meaningful.

All questions with answers except “select any that apply” were tested for statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. For scale questions (ratings), this was a one-way ANOVA and for categories (including yes/no) this was a χ^2 test.

Roughly speaking this means there is high confidence (95% certainty) that an observed *difference* is real, that, for example, a difference between 3.3 and 3.9 is meaningful.

Statistical significance does not refer to the magnitude of a difference, but to the certainty that it is not just sampling error. Thus, something is not *very* statistically significant. A difference can be *very large*, and statistically significant.

For questions with answers that allow the respondents to “select any that apply”, e.g. what are reasons to be an L-net partner, we reviewed the responses to see if they were roughly proportionate. For example, if 60% of respondents overall were from public libraries and 30% from academic, then if 20 public and 10 academic respondents selected something, their responses were proportionate. We noted those where the responses were **not** proportionate.