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Policy research, analysis, and data collection shall be conducted in ongoing collaboration with –

1. State library administrative agencies;
2. national, State, and regional library and museum organizations;
3. other relevant agencies and organizations.

1. **identify national needs for and trends** in museum, library, and information services;

2. **measure and report on the impact and effectiveness** of museum, library, and information services throughout the United States, including the impact of Federal programs authorized under this Act;

3. **identify best practices**; and

4. **develop plans to improve** museum, library and information services of the United States and to **strengthen national, State, local, regional, and international communications and cooperative networks**.
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Data Collection

- Public Library Survey
- State Library Agency Survey
- Public Needs for Library & Museum Services Survey
- Museums Count
- Museum Universe Data File

Public Library Survey (PLS)
The Public Library Survey (PLS) provides national descriptive data on the status of public libraries in the United States & its territories. Data are collected from over 9,000 public library systems with over 17,000 public library outlets. Read more.

State Library Agency Survey (SLAA)
The State Library Agency Survey (SLAA) provides descriptive data about state library agencies for all fifty states and the District of Columbia. Read more.

Public Needs for Library and Museum Services Survey (PNLMS)
The Public Needs for Library and Museum Services Survey (PNLMS) is a household survey designed to monitor the expectations of and satisfaction with library and museum services. The purpose of this collection is to determine attitudes, to assess awareness of issues related to library and museum services, and to track trends in visitation and usage. Read more.

Museums Count
Museums Count is a national web based census of all museums in the United States and its territories. The purpose of Museums Count is to establish comprehensive, reliable data about the size, distribution and scope of the museum sector in the United States. Read more.

Museum Universe Data File (MUDF)
The Museum Universe Data File (MUDF) contains information about known museums in the United States using data collected and aggregated from a variety of sources including IMLS administrative data and records, IRS 990 data, Dun & Bradstreet data, and from other Internet listings of museums. Included in this file are the names and addresses of over 35,000 museums in the United States including aquariums, arboretums, botanical gardens, art museums, children’s museums, general museums, historic houses and sites, history museums, nature centers, natural history and anthropology museums, planetariums, science and technology centers, specialized museums, and zoological parks. Read more.
Reports on Museum and Library Services
IMLS Grant Distribution by Major Program Category, FY08-15
Grants to States Program Basics

- Population-based formula grant program; FY14 allotment ranges $943K (ND) to $15M (CA). Most grants hover around $2M.

- Priorities in LSTA are quite broad; providing states (SLAAs) have great deal of discretion for programing/innovation

- Projects may range from targeted local initiatives to state-wide projects managed by the SLAA in state capital

- SLAAs report over 2,000 projects a year to IMLS
Grants to States: The Visual Experience
Old Grants to States Reporting Structure

- Largely narrative report
- Project information is not comparable or easy to aggregate
- Lack of continuity in project records
- Limited use after admin review
- No built-in links to other data
Goals for developing new Grants to States reporting protocol

• **Participatory planning process** to develop reporting tools that address national and state level priorities

• Build **more dynamic/easy-to-use tool** to capture more data/wider variety of data

• **Standardize reporting process** for basic program characteristics to increase comparability of data

• Highlight (and learn from) projects that are **rigorously assessed**

• **Share data** to facilitate SLAA peer learning; build a catalogue of library program reports; improve data for policy analysis and in-depth evaluation work
Building a foundation... together

- Collectively examined LSTA program priorities
  - Held national meeting followed by 70+ planning workshops with all SLAAs

- Defined set of focal areas to categorize LSTA projects; developed “results chains” to identify critical areas for assessment
  
  | Information Access | Institutional Capacity |
  | Lifelong Learning   | Human Services         |
  | Workforce and Economic Development | Civic Engagement |

- Began reporting tool development with pilot states
Results Chain Example: Lifelong Learning
# Categories of Information for New Reporting Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collect project overview; detailed budget data; grantee information; contact info; <strong>media</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gather detailed point-of-service information (e.g. mode, format, dosage, location of service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gauge type & quality of assessment practices  
Collect reports, instrumentation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measures*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collect outcome information from participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide project profiles for an LIS audience &amp; public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provide comparative data on project resources, services and outputs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify current assessment practices for TA and peer-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlight rigorously evaluated projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide objective outcome measures that can be aggregated and compared across states and project types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support evidence based practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Activity Reports (Point of Service Info)
Assessment Review Part 1: Was an assessment conducted?
Assessment Review Part 2: What was the nature of the assessment?

[NOTE: The questions below will contain close-ended, multiple choice options. They are displayed as simple questions for the sake of presentation. SLAAs will also be asked to share data collection instruments/lessons learned.]
Assessment Review Part 3: How was assessment information used?

Assessment Use Questions/Lessons Learned

Do you anticipate continuing this project after the current reporting period ends? (Y/N) Explain

Do you anticipate any change in level of effort in managing the project? (Y/N) Explain

Do you anticipate changing the types of activities and objectives addressed by the project? (Y/N) Explain

Based on outputs, outcomes and/or other results, explain one or two of the most significant lessons learned for others wanting to adopt any facets of this project. [Free text response.]
Outcome Reporting

- Developed **limit set of (subject neutral) outcomes measures** for national level reporting

- Emphasis placed on **easy-to-collect items** at point of service

- Similar outcome measures for different activity types allows for **comparisons across projects** that are substantively different

- Metrics focus on **three basic outcome areas**:  
  - knowledge gain and knowledge transfer  
  - use and/or re-use of new services  
  - satisfaction with and valuation of services
Outcome Indicators by Activity

Instruction
- participants reporting satisfaction with instructional programming
- participants reporting instructional programming improved their knowledge
- participants reporting they will apply what they have learned
- participants reporting they are likely to return to library

Content (purchase or creation)
- patrons reporting awareness of the resource
- patrons reporting use of resource
- users reporting resource met their needs
- users reporting they are likely to return to library

Planning/ Evaluation
- staff reporting evaluation/research addressed libraries’ needs
- staff reporting satisfaction with the planning/evaluation
- staff reporting they are likely to act on the results

Procurement
- patrons reporting awareness of the resource
- patrons reporting use of resource
- users reporting resource met their needs
- users reporting they are likely to return to library
Leveraging the data for multiple uses (not just for compliance):

- **Project profiles** can be produced directly from state reports
- **Dashboards** for IMLS review
- **Data set** of 1000+ federally funded library projects from across the country; spatially referenced/linkable

Using Grants to States reports as point of departure

- Ability to **rank projects/activities** based on assessment and outcome
- **Clustering like projects** by subject matter or mode of service provides us an overview of current practice across the country
Different approach to administrative data

Developed with the idea that...

a) LSTA data is a public resource that should be easy to access and use

b) data should be useful to the data providers for program planning

c) comparative data is most useful/richer than single-case data

d) IMLS can do more with project reports than monitor compliance
Process and Timeline

**2011**
- Planning Workshops with States

**2012**
- IMLS Secures Contractor; Tool Development

**2013**
- Pilot Testing 16 States

**2014**

**2015**

**2016**
- All States Begin Reporting

**2017**
- Next 5 year summary
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