



2011-2012
Public Library Funding and
Technology Access Survey:
Survey Findings and Results

June 19, 2012

by

John Carlo Bertot, Ph.D.
Director and Professor

Abigail McDermott
Graduate Research Associate

Ruth Lincoln
Graduate Research Associate

Brian Real
Graduate Research Associate

Kaitlin Peterson
Graduate Research Associate

Acknowledgment

Large-scale national surveys such as this involve substantial effort and support from a number of individuals and groups. While impossible to mention each person or group, we would like to acknowledge the efforts of those who provided substantial assistance.

The study team wishes to express their gratitude to the American Library Association (ALA) and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for their generous support of this survey. It would not be possible to continue these surveys without such funding.

The study team would like to recognize the significant efforts of the state librarians, the state data coordinators, and other state library agency staff members. As with all of the studies conducted since 1994, the amount of time, energy, and support that the state library community invested in this study contributed directly to the survey's high response rate – we cannot thank them enough for all of their efforts.

We also extend a debt of gratitude to all the public librarians who completed the survey. We realize that it takes a great deal of time, effort, and commitment to participate in the survey. Without your participation, we simply would not have any data. Without data, this study would have no ability to affect policy, practice, and engagement in networked services by public libraries. The time you take to provide the data in this report offers valuable information for national, state, and local policymakers, library advocates, researchers, practitioners, government and private funding organizations, and others to understand the impact, issues, and needs of libraries providing public access computing. The data also provide public librarians with the opportunity to advocate for the communities that they serve.

We are also in debt to the study's Advisory Committee. These individuals assisted us in a number of key study areas including issue identification, question development, survey pretesting, and providing perspectives on study findings. Our thanks to Stacey Aldrich (California State Library), Nancy Ashmore (Prairie du Chien Public Library), Robert Bocher (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division for Libraries), Linda Crowe (Peninsula Library System), Denise Davis (Sacramento Public Library), John D. Hales (Northeast Florida Library Information Network), Sandra M. Hughes-Hassell (CORS representative), Christopher Jowaisas (Texas Library Association), Charlie Parker (Tampa Bay Library Consortium), Rivkah K. Sass (Sacramento Public Library), and Mary Ann Stiefvater (Division of Library Development, New York State Library).

In addition, we very much appreciate the efforts of Kathryn (Kate) Sigler, now at the District of Columbia Public Library. Kate worked with iPAC over the last two years on the PLFTAS survey while completing her MLS degree at the University of Maryland's iSchool. Her work on the survey and the www.plinternetsurvey.org website were always outstanding. Additionally, thank you to Justin Grimes for his tireless commitment in ensuring thorough and accurate data collection and analysis.

Finally, Paragon New Media also deserves mention for their efforts in developing and maintaining the survey website.

John Carlo Bertot, Abigail McDermott, Ruth Lincoln, Brian Real, & Kaitlin Peterson.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	iv
Executive Summary.....	1
Extended Summary and Overview of Survey Findings	3
Digital Literacy and Inclusion.....	3
Moving into Web 2.0 Technologies.....	4
Connecting Communities through Public Access Technologies	4
Community Public Access.....	4
Public Access Technology Infrastructure Enhancements and Challenges.....	5
Indicators of Public Access Quality.....	6
Forward Progress in Connectivity and Public Access	8
Connecting Communities to Employment and E-Government	8
Employment and Job Seeking Support.....	9
E-government Support.....	9
Challenges and Divides	10
Survey Methodology	12
Outlet (Branch) Versus System.....	13
Data Analysis	14
National Branch Data Tables	15
Public Access and Availability	15
Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Availability, Support, & Use.....	16
Public Library Internet Connectivity Type, Speed, & Sufficiency	21
Internet-Enabled Services Provided by the Library	24
Importance of Public Internet Services.....	24
Technology Training Offered by Public Libraries.....	29
Public Access Services Available to Users and Community	32
Library E-government and Employment Services and Challenges	36
System (Administrative) Level Findings	46
Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Replacement and Use	46

Social Media and Mobile Technologies	55
E-rate Application Data	60
Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP).....	62
Public Library Operating Budget Details: Funding, Staffing, Hours, & Expenditures	63
Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures	73
 State Data Tables.....	 77
 About the Information Policy and Access Center	 162
 About the Authors.....	 163
 Appendix A: 2011-2012 Public Library Funding & Technology Access Survey	 164

Recommended report citation:

Bertot, J.C., McDermott, A., Lincoln, R., Real, B., & Peterson, K. (2012). *2011-2012 Public Library Funding & Technology Access Survey: Survey Findings & Report*. College Park, MD: Information Policy & Access Center, University of Maryland College Park. Available at <http://www.plinternetsurvey.org>.

List of Figures

Figure 1: Public Library Outlets Change in Hours Open, by Metropolitan Status	15
Figure 2: Public Library Outlets Offering Public Access to the Internet, by Metropolitan Status	15
Figure 3: Public Library Outlets as the Only Provider of Free Public Internet and Free Public Computer Access, by Metropolitan Status	16
Figure 4: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Average, Average Age, and Metropolitan Status	16
Figure 5: Public Library Outlets Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by Metropolitan Status	17
Figure 6: Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan status	18
Figure 7: Use of Public Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan status	19
Figure 8: Use of Wireless Internet Access in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status	19
Figure 9: Use of Patron Technology Classes in Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	20
Figure 10: Use of Electronic Resources in Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	20
Figure 11: Public Library Outlets Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by Metropolitan Status	21
Figure 12: Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status	22
Figure 13: Public Access Wireless (Wi-Fi) Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	22
Figure 14: Public Library Outlets Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by Metropolitan Status	23
Figure 15: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Overall	24
Figure 16: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Urban	26
Figure 17: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Suburban	27
Figure 18: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Rural	28
Figure 19: Public Library Outlets Offering Formal or Informal Technology Training, Availability, by Metropolitan Status	29
Figure 20: Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	30
Figure 21: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Overall	32
Figure 22: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Urban	33
Figure 23: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Suburban	34
Figure 24: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Rural	35
Figure 25: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	36
Figure 26: Challenges that Affect the Ability of Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E- Government Needs – Overall	37
Figure 27: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E- Government Needs – Urban	38
Figure 28: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E- Government Needs – Suburban	39
Figure 29: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E- Government Needs – Rural	40

Figure 30: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	41
Figure 31: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Overall	42
Figure 32: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Urban	43
Figure 33: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Suburban	44
Figure 34: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Rural	45
Figure 35: Public Access Workstation Replacement Procedure, by Metropolitan Status.....	46
Figure 36: Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status	47
Figure 37: Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstations Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status	48
Figure 38: Public Access Workstations Additions, by Metropolitan Status.....	49
Figure 39: Average Public Access Workstations Additions due to BTOP/BIP awards, by Metropolitan Status	49
Figure 40: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Overall	50
Figure 41: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Urban	51
Figure 42: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Suburban	52
Figure 43: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Rural	53
Figure 44: Sources of IT Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status	54
Figure 45: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies – Overall	55
Figure 46: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies – Urban	56
Figure 47: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies – Suburban	57
Figure 48: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies – Rural	58
Figure 49: Public Library Systems that Make Use of Mobile Technology.....	59
Figure 50: Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount.....	60
Figure 51: Reasons Public Library Systems Did Not Apply for E-Rate Discounts.....	61
Figure 52: Public Library systems Receiving an E-Rate Discount by Category	61
Figure 53: Public Library Systems Applying for a National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) award(s) in either Wave I or Wave II, by Metropolitan Status	62
Figure 54: BTOP and BIP Applications by Type.....	62
Figure 55: FY2012 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources	63
Figure 56: FY2013 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources	64
Figure 57: FY2012 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change.....	65
Figure 58: FY2013 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change.....	66
Figure 59: For Current Fiscal Year, Percentage of Public Library Systems that anticipate changes to its total operating budget	67
Figure 60: Public Library Systems Cumulative Budget Change Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status	68

Figure 61: Public Library systems Cumulative Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status.....	69
Figure 62: Public Library Systems Cumulative Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Years by Metropolitan Status	70
Figure 63: Public Library Systems Mean Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status	71
Figure 64: Public Library systems Mean Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status	71
Figure 65: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Expenditures, by Type	72
Figure 66: FY2013 Public Library Systems Average Total Expenditures, by Type	72
Figure 67: Public Library System Payment of Technology Expenditures, by Metropolitan Status	73
Figure 68: FY2012 Public Library Systems Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status	73
Figure 69: FY2013 Public Library systems Anticipated Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status	75
Figure 70: FY2012 Public Library systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type	76
Figure 71: Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State	78
Figure 72: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access and Free Public Computer Access, by State.....	81
Figure 73: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State.....	84
Figure 74: Public Library Outlet Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by State.....	89
Figure 75: Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State	92
Figure 76: Public Library Outlet Change in use of Public Access Technology, by State.....	95
Figure 77: Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State.....	99
Figure 78: Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State	103
Figure 79: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State	106
Figure 80: Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State.....	109
Figure 81: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State.....	112
Figure 82: Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State	117
Figure 83 (Part 1): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State	120
Figure 83 (Part 2): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State	123
Figure 84 (Part 1): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State	126
Figure 84 (Part 2): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State	130
Figure 85: Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State	136
Figure 86: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State.....	141
Figure 87: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State.....	148
Figure 88: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State.....	154
Figure 89: Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment.....	158

Executive Summary

With their nearly ubiquitous presence across the country, public libraries provide their communities with a wide array of essential public access technologies and Internet-enabled services. Through these services and technologies, public libraries help to build digitally inclusive communities by serving as gateways to broadband and computers, offering digital literacy instruction, providing critical information content, and facilitating e-government and employment services. More specifically, public libraries provide:

- **Public Access Computers.** Libraries reported an average of 16.4 public access computers, up slightly from 16.0 public access computers in 2010-2011 and 14.2 public access computers in 2009-2010.
- **Broadband Connectivity.** Libraries reported increased connectivity speeds, with 69.7 percent of libraries reporting connectivity speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps, up from 60.3 percent in 2010-2011 and 51.8 percent in 2009-2010. Over 31 percent (31.2 percent) of libraries report having connectivity speeds of 10Mbps or greater, up from 24.9 percent in 2010-2011.
- **Wireless (Wi-Fi) Access.** Libraries reported an increase in providing Wi-Fi access to the Internet, with 88.5 percent of public library branches offering wireless Internet access, as compared to 85.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 82.2 percent in 2009-2010.
- **Databases, E-Books, and Devices.** Libraries continued to offer access to a number of digital resources, including licensed databases (99.2 percent, nearly identical to the 99.8 percent reported in 2010-2011 and up from 95.0 percent in 2009-2010); e-books (76.1 percent, up from 67.2 percent in 2010-2011 and 65.9 percent in 2009-2010 and 55.4 percent in 2008-2009); and 39.1 percent provide access to e-readers for accessing e-books (new question for 2011-2012).
- **Technology training.** Most public libraries offer technology training, with 44.3 percent offering formal technology training classes (up from 38.0 percent in 2010-2011), 34.8 percent offering one-on-one technology training sessions by appointment (up from 28.1 percent in 2010-2011), and 82.7 percent offering informal point-of-use training assistance (up from 78.8 percent in 2010-2011).
- **Social media use.** A vast majority – 78.6 percent – of public libraries reported using social media (e.g., Facebook, hi5) to communicate with the public and for marketing purposes (new question for 2011-2012).
- **Employment support.** 92.2 percent of libraries reported providing access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources (up from 90.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 88.2 percent in 2009-2010), and 76.0 percent of libraries reported providing patrons with assistance in completing online job applications (up from 71.9 percent in 2010-2011 and 67.1 percent in 2009-2010). In addition, 77.5 percent of libraries reported offering software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials (up from 74.5 percent in 2010-2011 and 68.9 percent in 2009-2010).
- **E-government.** 96.6 percent of libraries reported providing assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services (up considerably from 80.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 78.7 percent in 2009-2010), and 70.7 percent of libraries reported that staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms (up from 67.8 percent in 2010-2011 and 63.3 percent in 2009-2010). Nearly all public libraries – 91.8 percent – reported providing assistance to the public for understanding how to access and use e-government websites (up from 89.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 88.8 percent reported in 2009-2010).

But while libraries have made gains in terms of public access technologies, broadband, and Internet-enabled services, libraries also continued to indicate that they face challenges in supporting their public access technology services and resources in important areas:

- **Sufficiency.** Though libraries reported increases in public access computers and bandwidth, 41.7 percent of libraries (down from 44.9 percent in 2010-2011 and 45.1 percent in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speeds are insufficient some or all of the time and 65.4 percent of libraries (down from 76.2 percent in 2010-2011 and 73.5 percent in 2009-2010) reported that they had fewer public access computers to meet demand some or all of the time.
- **Staff.** Libraries reported challenges with adequate staff for providing e-government and employment support, as well as with access to technology staff. 59.5 percent of rural libraries report that it is the library director that provides IT support, as compared to 58.3 percent of urban libraries that report IT support provided by system-level IT staff.¹
 - More significantly, 23.2 percent of public libraries reported a decrease in staff over the last three years, with 71.9 percent of libraries reporting reductions indicating that these staff decreases are permanent. Urban public libraries reported the largest average decrease in staff over the last three years, with a reduction from 149.0 average FTEs to 133.6.
- **Reduced hours.** Libraries also reported a reduction in hours open, with 21.5 percent reporting a reduction in hours over the last three years. Of the libraries reporting reduced hours, 78.5 percent indicated that the reductions were due to budget cuts and 42.7 percent indicated that the reductions were due to reductions in staff. Urban public libraries reported the largest average drop in hours open, from an average of 10,960.2 hours per year three years ago to an average of 10,894.4 today.
- **Costs.** Libraries reported cost factors (77.9 percent, about the same from the 78.8 percent reported in 2010-2011 and down slightly from 79.8 percent reported in 2009-2010) as a challenge in maintaining, sustaining, and enhancing their public access technology infrastructure.
- **Budgets.** A majority of libraries – 53.2 percent – reported an increase in operating budgets over the last three years, with a majority of those (21.2 percent) reporting increases of up to 2 percent. 30.3 percent of libraries, however, reported decreases in operating budgets over the last three years, while 12.5 percent reported that their operating budgets stayed the same. When one factors in inflation over the last three years, a majority of public libraries have witnessed reduced budgets over the last three years.

The results from the 2011-2012 survey continue to demonstrate that libraries provide and enhance their public access services where possible, but have experienced reductions in staff, hours, and budgets. Thus, public libraries are increasingly unable to fully meet demand as they are increasingly challenged to build digitally inclusive communities through digital literacy, employment, e-government, and Internet-enabled services and resources.

¹ The 2011-2012 survey modified the IT support question, thus direct comparisons to previous surveys are not possible.

² Mobile device questions were new to the 2011-2012 survey.

³ Direct comparisons to the 2010-2011 survey are difficult due to the change in broadband categories adopted for the 2011-2012 survey.

Extended Summary and Overview of Survey Findings

The national survey offers insights into the current state of public access technology and Internet-enabled services that public libraries provide to the communities that they serve. These data inform the discussion regarding the role of public libraries in building digitally inclusive literate communities. The following discussion is not exhaustive, but rather highlights a number of findings from the survey and discusses their implications. The complete set of data tables, as well as findings from previous surveys, are available at <http://www.plinternetsurvey.org>.

Digital Literacy and Inclusion

An increasing percentage of public libraries – 44.3 percent – offer formal technology training classes (see Figure 19). This rises to 63.2 percent for urban public libraries, followed by 54.5 percent for suburban libraries, and 31.8 percent for rural libraries. This represents an overall increase from the 38.0 percent reported in the 2010-2011 survey. Also, 34.8 percent of public libraries reported providing one-on-one technology training sessions by appointment (up from 28.1 percent in 2010-2011), and 82.7 percent offering informal point-of-use training assistance (up from 78.8 percent in 2010-2011). Of those libraries offering formal technology training classes:

- 87.0 percent offer general computer skill classes;
- 86.5 percent offer general Internet use classes;
- 75.6 percent offer general online and Web searching classes;
- 73.3 percent offer general software use (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation) classes;
- 49.2 percent offer accessing online job seeking and career-related information classes; and
- 39.4 percent offer social media (e.g., blogging, twitter, Facebook, YouTube) classes.

In all, 36.3 percent of public libraries reported that the use of patron technology training classes increased since last year (see Figure 9).

In addition, public libraries offer access to a wide range of online services and resources (see Figure 22), including:

- Licensed databases (99.2 percent, nearly identical to the 99.8 percent reported in 2010-2011 and up from 95.0 percent in 2009-2010);
- E-books (76.1 percent, up from 67.2 percent in 2010-2011 and 65.9 percent in 2009-2010 and 55.4 percent in 2008-2009);
- Homework resources (81.8 percent, down from 87.0 percent in 2010-2011 and 88.2 percent in 2009-2010);
- Audio content, such as podcasts and audiobooks (82.9 percent, versus 82.8 percent in 2010-2011 and 82.5 percent in 2009-2010);
- Access to mobile devices (e.g., netbooks/laptops) (49.0 percent); and

- Access to e-readers for accessing e-books (39.1 percent).²

Overall, 58.2 percent of libraries reported an increase in the use of their electronic resources over the last year (see Figure 10), indicating substantial demand.

Moving into Web 2.0 Technologies

While 61.8 percent of libraries (see Figure 21) indicate that they provide access to a range of social media services and resources, the 2011-2012 explored in depth the use of social media and other Web 2.0 technologies to reach the public (see Figures 45 and 49). In all:

- 70.7 percent of public libraries report using social networking tools (e.g., Facebook, Hi5) to connect with library users, the general public, and for marketing purposes;
- 45.6 percent of public libraries report using communication tools (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter) to reach the public;
- 37.3 percent report using photography sites (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr); and
- 27.5 percent use video sharing tools (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, and Openfilm).

In addition, libraries are starting to make use of mobile technologies, with 14.2 percent of libraries reporting that their Websites are optimized for mobile devices, 11.8 percent reporting that they use scanned codes (e.g., QR Codes) for access to library services and content, and 7.2 percent indicate that they developed smartphone apps for access to library services and content. Not surprisingly, adoption of these new technologies and resource/service development approaches is considerably higher in urban public libraries as opposed to suburban and rural libraries.

Connecting Communities through Public Access Technologies

Underlying innovative and leading edge services that public libraries offer their communities are their public access technology and Internet infrastructure. The survey findings show that public libraries provide a substantial variety and foundational public access technology and Internet-enabled services and resources across a range of key areas such as public access computers, broadband, and wireless (Wi-Fi). Libraries report progress in the average number of workstations, provision of Wi-Fi, and broadband capacity. Responding libraries, however, reported challenges in terms of the availability of computers and adequate broadband capacity. Though progress continues, therefore, public libraries do manifest challenges in meeting the demand for their services.

Community Public Access

Public libraries are key community-based providers of public access computing and Internet access:

- 100 percent of public library branches offer public Internet access (see Figure 2), consistent with the 99.3 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 99.0 percent reported in 2009-2010.
- 62.1 percent of library branches report that they are the only provider of free public computer and Internet access in their communities (see Figure 3), down slightly from the 64.5 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 66.6 percent reported in 2009-2010.

² Mobile device questions were new to the 2011-2012 survey.

- Overall, public library branches report an average of 16.4 public access computers (see Figure 4), up slightly from the 16.0 reported in 2010-2011 and 14.2 in 2009-2010. Rural libraries reported an average of 107 public access computers, up from the 9.6 computers reported in 2010-2011 and 9.2 reported in 2009-2010. Suburban libraries reported an average of 20.1, up from the 19.6 public access computers reported in 2010-2011 and 15.8 computers reported in 2009-2010. Urban libraries reported an average of 27.9 public access computers, essentially unchanged from the 28.0 reported in 2010-2011 and up from an average of 25.4 computers in 2009-2010.
- 88.5 percent of public libraries offer wireless Internet access, up from 85.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 82.2 percent reported in 2009-2010 (see Figure 13).
- 38.5 percent of libraries report public access connection speeds of 1.6Mbps-10Mbps (up from 33.4 percent reported in 2010-2011), followed by 16.5 percent reporting public access connection speeds of 1.5Mbps (down from 22.7 percent reported in 2010-2011), 15.8 percent reporting public access connection speeds of 10.1Mbps-30Mbps (up from 12.8 percent in 2010-2011), 15.4 percent reporting public access connection speeds of greater than 30Mbps (up from 12.1 percent reported in 2010-2011), and 6.9 percent reporting public access connection speeds of less than 1.5Mbps (down from 12.0 percent in 2010-2011) (see Figure 11). 31.1 percent of rural libraries report public access speeds of 1.5Mbps or less (down from 43.0 percent reported in 2010-2011), while 83.8 percent of urban libraries (down somewhat from the 86.3 percent reported in 2010-2011 and up from 77.2 percent in 2009-2010) and 72.7 percent of suburban libraries (up from 65.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 55.4 percent in 2009-2010) reported public access speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps.³

This infrastructure serves as the core public access technology upon which public libraries build their public access services and resources.

Public Access Technology Infrastructure Enhancements and Challenges

As with previous surveys, the 2011-2012 survey asked libraries to identify issues regarding the ability of public libraries to provide and maintain their public access Internet and technology services. Respondents reported a range of challenges in broad areas of costs; staff; maintaining and supporting their public access technology infrastructure; and keeping up with demand. Respondents also reported mixed results in terms of progress in the areas of public access computer and broadband sufficiency:

- **Cost and Space.** Respondents continued to indicate that funding workstation replacements, upgrades, bandwidth enhancements, and a range of other services related to public Internet access and technologies was a challenge. Just as with the 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 surveys, libraries reported cost factors highly (77.9 percent, about the same from the 78.8 percent reported in 2010-2011), followed by space limitations (62.2 percent, a reduction from 77.2 percent in 2010-2011). It is important to note, however, that space and costs converging as the two most significant factors affecting the ability of public libraries to augment their provision of public access computers,

³ Direct comparisons to the 2010-2011 survey are difficult due to the change in broadband categories adopted for the 2011-2012 survey.

with libraries rating those as the most important issues (4.2 out of 5 for cost factors and 4.1 out of 5 for availability of space, with 5 being most important) (see Figure 40).⁴

- **Technology Support Staff.** Public libraries in general rely on non-technical staff to support their public access computers and Internet access. This is especially true for rural public libraries, as urban public libraries are more likely to have access to technology staff (see Figure 44). As such, 59.5 percent of rural libraries report that it is the library director that provides IT support, as compared to 58.3 percent of urban libraries that report IT support provided by system-level IT staff.⁴
- **Keeping computers in service.** Nearly half of libraries (47.7 percent, down from 52.1 percent in 2010-2011) reported that it takes two or more days to get a public access computer back into service when it goes down (versus 52.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 47.2 percent in 2009-2010). A clear majority of urban libraries had a turn around time of two or less days (69.2 percent, but this is down from 78.5 percent reported in 2010-2011). 71.8 percent of suburban libraries report a turn around time of 71.8 percent, nearly unchanged from the 71.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 (see Figure 5).⁴
- **Increased Usage of Library Infrastructure and Services.** In all (see Figures 7-9), 60.2 percent of public libraries reported increased use of public access computers (on top of the 69.8 percent increase reported in 2010-2011 and 75.7 percent of libraries in 2009-2010); 74.1 percent reported an increased use of Wi-Fi, (on top of the 75.3 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 71.1 percent in 2009-2010); 36.3 percent reported an increased use of training services (on top of the 27.6 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 26.3 percent in 2009-2010); and 58.2 percent reported an increase in the use of electronic resources (on top of the 49.8 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 45.6 percent reported in 2009-2010).
- **Increased wireless (Wi-Fi) access.** Libraries reported an increase in providing Wi-Fi access to the Internet, with 88.5 percent of public library branches offering wireless Internet access, as compared to 85.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 82.2 percent in 2009-2010 (see Figure 13).
- **Increased Broadband.** 38.5 percent of libraries report public access connection speeds of 1.6Mbps-10Mbps (up from 33.4 percent reported in 2010-2011), followed by 16.5 percent reporting public access connection speeds of 1.5Mbps (down from 22.7 percent reported in 2010-2011), 15.8 percent reporting public access connection speeds of 10.1Mbps-30Mbps (up from 12.8 percent in 2010-2011), 15.4 percent reporting public access connection speeds of greater than 30Mbps (up from 12.1 percent reported in 2010-2011), and 6.9 percent reporting public access connection speeds of less than 1.5Mbps (down from 12.0 percent in 2010-2011) (see Figure 11). 31.1 percent of rural libraries report public access speeds of 1.5Mbps or less (down from 43.0 percent reported in 2010-2011), while 83.8 percent of urban libraries (down somewhat from the 86.3 percent reported in 2010-2011 and up from 77.2 percent in 2009-2010) and 72.7 percent of suburban libraries (up from 65.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 55.4 percent in 2009-2010) reported public access speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps.⁵

⁴ Direct comparisons to the 2010-2011 survey are difficult due to the change in how questions regarding challenges and technology support were asked in the 2011-2012 survey.

⁵ Direct comparisons to the 2010-2011 survey are difficult due to the change in broadband categories adopted for the 2011-2012 survey.

- **Broadband Congestion Remains.** Even with the increase in bandwidth, 41.4 percent of libraries (down from 44.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 45.1 percent reported in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speed is insufficient some or all of the time (see Figure 12).

These data support the trend reported since the 2007-2008 survey regarding the challenges that public libraries face in maintaining their public access technology and Internet access services. Though libraries continue to enhance their capacity through more public access computers, increased broadband, and the continued addition of Wi-Fi, the reported increased usage across key areas of computers, Wi-Fi, services, and resources suggest that added library capacity has not resolved the needs of communities that libraries serve.

Indicators of Public Access Quality

The survey provides indicators of the quality of the public access that libraries provide. Quality of access is multidimensional and can encompass the numbers of public access computers available, speed of connectivity, availability of Wi-Fi, and the number of simultaneous users and uses of resources and services, to name a few. Even though libraries added public access computers overall, they report an increase in their inability to meet demand; adding broadband capacity did decrease slightly the connectivity congestion reported. As with previous survey findings, libraries continue to report that their connection speeds and numbers of public access computers do not meet their needs – even with increases in connectivity speeds (as reported in the Libraries as Community Access Computing and Internet Access Points section previously and in Figures 20 and 36):

- 41.4 percent of libraries (down from 44.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 45.1 percent reported in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speed is insufficient some or all of the time (see Figure 12). Urban libraries (55.8 percent, versus 55.0 percent in 2010-2011 and 47.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) are less likely than suburban libraries (62.5 percent, up from 56.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 57.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) and rural libraries (43.1 percent, down from 53.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 54.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) to report that their connection speeds are sufficient to meet patron needs at all times.
- Nearly two-thirds of public libraries – 65.4 percent – reported insufficient numbers of workstations some or all of the time (down from 76.2 percent in 2010-2011, versus 73.5 percent in 2009-2010) (see Figure 6). This is in spite of a slight increase in the average number of public access computers reported by libraries.
- 82.3 percent of public libraries report that their wireless connections share the same bandwidth as their public desktop computers (up from the 79.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 79.3 percent reported in 2009-2010), though 25.2 percent (up slightly from the 23.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 23.2 percent reported in 2009-2010) indicate that they use bandwidth management techniques (see Figure 14).

These data indicate that although public libraries have improved their infrastructure by adding public access computers, increasing bandwidth, and continuing to provide Wi-Fi access, the quality of the public's experience is constrained due to inadequate computers and bandwidth at least at some times during the day. Though the provision of Wi-Fi has alleviated some congestion in terms of computer availability, Wi-Fi adds additional network traffic. Rural public libraries (67.9 percent, with only 17.9 percent reporting that

they use traffic management techniques) have particular constraints. The data also show that urban libraries in particular are struggling to meet demand with higher percentages of inadequate public access computer availability and inadequate bandwidth – though in terms of numbers of workstations and reported connectivity speeds, urban public libraries outpace their suburban and rural counterparts.

Forward Progress in Connectivity and Public Access

Public libraries plan to add, replace, or upgrade workstations and make other enhancements to their public access computing and Internet access services in the coming year:

- 35.5 percent of public libraries have a workstation/laptop replacement schedule.⁶ Of significance, however, is that 30.6 percent of libraries report that the replacement frequency is every 5 years, followed by 26.2 percent reporting a frequency of every 3 years, and 25.9% reporting a frequency of every 4 years (see Figure 36).
 - In all 31.2 percent of libraries reported that they are able to maintain their replacement schedule, while 49.9 percent indicated that they are able to maintain their schedule but do not know how many public access computers or laptops they will replace (see Figure 37).
 - On average, libraries reported that they will replace 19.5 public access computers or laptops in the coming year, with urban libraries reporting an average of 70.5 replacements, suburban libraries reporting an average of 21.6 replacements, and rural libraries reporting an average of 8.4 replacements (see Figure 37).
- 14.6 percent of public libraries plan to add more public access computers within the next year.⁶ Urban public libraries report a greater percentage of additions (22.3 percent), as compared to 14.6 percent of rural public libraries and 13.4 percent of suburban public libraries (see Figure 38). On average, libraries will add 9.0 computers, with urban libraries reporting an average of 41.8, suburban libraries an average of 7.3, and rural libraries an average of 5.1.
- 3.9 percent libraries plan to add wireless access within the next year. If they do so, by the end of 2012 92.4 percent of public libraries will offer wireless access (see Figure 13). Wireless access is rapidly approaching ubiquity within the public libraries, and has done so in a very short 4-year period.

These data demonstrate that public libraries consider the need for continual upgrades and replacements to their public access technology infrastructure. It also appears to be the case that upgrades and replacements are occurring over a longer period of time with 55.6 percent of libraries reporting a four or five year replacement time horizon.

Connecting Communities to Employment and E-government

Public libraries are critical providers of employment and e-government services, resources, and support. Libraries indicated that they provide a number of resources and services to assist individuals seek employment, apply for employment, and interact with government agencies. These service roles are growing as governments and employers increasingly require online interactions – and underlying these services are the essential digital inclusion and literacy services public libraries offer discussed earlier. Often, an applicant for social services requires a range of computer and Internet training and assistance,

⁶ Direct comparisons to the 2010-2011 survey are difficult due to the change in 2011-2012 survey regarding public access computer replacement and/or addition.

and the public library is the community's free provider of public access technologies, training, and assistance.

Employment and Job Seeking Support

Public libraries support job seekers in numerous ways (see Figures 30-34):

- 92.2 percent (up from the 90.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 88.2 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources;
- 77.1 percent (unchanged from the 77.0 percent reported in 2010-2011 survey and up from the 74.9 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide access to civil service examination materials;
- 74.5 percent (up from the 68.9 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide software and other resources to assist patrons create resumes and employment material, a figure that increases to 84.8 percent (up from the 81.2 percent in 2009-2010) in urban libraries;
- 77.5 percent (up slightly from the 76.0 percent reported in 2010-2011 and the 71.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide patrons with assistance in completing online job applications;

In providing these job-seeking services, nearly half of libraries – 49.8 percent – reported (down from the 55.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 58.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) of libraries reported that the library did not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs and 41.3 percent (down from the 43.4 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 46.0 percent reported in 2009-2010) reported that the library staff did not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs.

E-government Support

Public libraries support the public's interaction with digital government services and resources through a range of e-government services. These include (see Figures 25-29):

- 96.6 percent (up substantially from the 80.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and the 78.7 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing E-government services;
- 91.8 percent (up from the 89.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 88.8 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use E-government websites;
- 70.7 percent (up from the 67.8 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 63.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries indicate that staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms;
- 30.9 percent (up from 24.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 20.5 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries indicate that the library partnered with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services. This percentage increases to 43.1 percent for urban public libraries; and
- 31.4 (up from 29.4 percent reported in 2010-2011 and similar to the 31.5 percent reported in 2009-2010) of urban libraries indicate that at least one staff member has significant knowledge and skills in the provision of E-government services;

In providing these services, 47.9 percent (down from the 55.7 percent reported in 2010-2011 and the 58.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) of libraries reported that the library did not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs. In addition, 44.9 percent (down from the 50.5 percent reported in 2010-2011 and the 52.7 percent reported in 2009-2010) reported that the library staff did not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-government needs.

Challenges and Divides

Public libraries face a number of challenges as they enhance their public access technologies, services, and resources:

- 21.5 percent of libraries reported a reduction in hours over the last three years (see Figure 62). Of the libraries reporting reduced hours, 78.5 percent indicated that the reductions were due to budget cuts and 42.7 percent indicated that the reductions were due to reductions in staff. Urban public libraries reported the largest average drop in hours open, from an average of 10,960.2 hours per year three years ago to an average of 10,894.4 today.
- 23.2 percent of public libraries reported a decrease in staff over the last three years, with 71.9 percent of libraries reporting reductions indicating that these staff decreases are permanent (see Figure 61). Urban public libraries reported the largest average decrease in staff over the last three years, with a reduction from 149.0 average FTEs to 133.6.
- 30.3 percent of libraries reported decreases in operating budgets over the last three years, while 12.5 percent reported that their operating budgets stayed the same (see Figure 60). When one factors in inflation over the last three years, a majority of public libraries have witnessed reduced budgets over the last three years.
- Half of public libraries – 50.4 percent – rely on the library director to support their public access technology, a figure that rises to 59.5 percent for rural public libraries (see Figure 44).
- 58.1 percent (versus 68.4 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 62.5 percent in 2009-2010) of public library branches have no plans to add workstations in the next year (see Figure 38).
- 41.4 percent of libraries (down from 44.9 percent reported in 2010-2011 and 45.1 percent reported in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speed is insufficient some or all of the time (see Figure 12).
 - Urban libraries (55.8 percent, versus 55.0 percent in 2010-2011 and 47.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) are less likely than suburban libraries (62.5 percent, up from 56.7 percent in 2010-2011 and 57.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) and rural libraries (43.1 percent, down from 53.1 percent in 2010-2011 and 54.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) to report that their connection speeds are sufficient to meet patron needs at all times.

At the same time that all public libraries face a range of challenges regarding their public access technologies and services, there is a growing divide between libraries.

Although the survey data have consistently shown differences between urban and rural public libraries in the areas of budgets, hours open, public access technology infrastructure, staffing, and the range of public access services offered, these differences have existed primarily on a scale and capacity level, rather than quality issue – that is, urban public libraries are simply larger and have access to more resources. The current survey shows an emerging trend of rural libraries not keeping up with significant emerging

technologies, and this can affect the ability of rural public libraries to contribute to building digitally inclusive communities. For example:

- 73.6 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 37.0 percent of rural public libraries, report using communication tools (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter) to reach the public.
- 57.2 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 33.8 percent of rural public libraries, report using photography sites (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr).
- 49.0 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 21.2 percent of rural public libraries, report using video sharing tools (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, and Openfilm).
- 36.1 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 9.3 percent of rural public libraries, report that their websites are optimized for mobile devices.
- 31.9 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 6.5 percent of rural public libraries, report that the library uses scanned codes (e.g., QR Codes) for access to library services and content.
- 27.8 percent of urban public libraries, as compared to 3.7 percent of rural public libraries, report that the library has developed a smartphone app for access to library services and content.

Thus, although all public libraries face challenges in key areas of public access technologies, services, and resources, there is a growing disparity between rural and urban public libraries in terms of the use and adoption of emerging technologies and Internet-enabled service.

Decreases in several essential areas — funding; hours open; staff fully trained in the services users require; and ability to upgrade equipment, bandwidth speed and infrastructure — all contribute to the inability of libraries to keep up with demand, both current and future. The Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiative Program (BIP) grants/loans as administered by the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications Information Administration (NTIA) and Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service (RUS), will have an impact on the numbers of public access computers and broadband connectivity of selected libraries (see Figures 53 and 54), but the full impact of these grants are still emerging. Some public libraries — either as part of statewide, regional, or individual initiatives — were beneficiaries of these grants and loans that could include broadband enhancements as well as public access computers.

The results from the 2011-2012 survey continue to demonstrate that libraries provide and enhance their public access services where possible, but have experienced reductions in staff, hours, and budgets. This constrained environment has not kept public libraries from offering innovative public access services and resources — indeed, public libraries continue to serve as essential community access points that build digitally inclusive communities.

Survey Methodology

The 2011-2012 survey resides within a larger public library study regarding public access technology use and funding. In this context, the survey employed a multi-approached sampling strategy to meet the following objectives:

- Provide outlet (branch)-level national data regarding public library Internet connectivity and use;
- Provide outlet (branch)-level state data (including the District of Columbia) regarding public library Internet connectivity and use; and
- Provide system (administrative)-level data (including the District of Columbia) regarding social media and mobile technology use, e-rate use, and library operating and technology funding and expenditures.

The survey had the additional objectives of obtaining data to conduct analysis using the variables of metropolitan status⁷ (urban, suburban or rural).

The study team used the 2009 public library dataset available from the U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) as a sample frame, which was the most recent public release file available in June 2011. Bookmobile and Books by Mail service outlets were removed from the file, leaving 16,776 library outlets. From these totals, the researchers used SPSS Complex Samples software to draw the sample for the study. The sample needed to provide the study team with the ability to analyze survey data at the state and national levels along the poverty and metropolitan status strata discussed above. The study team drew a sample with replacement of 8,790 outlets stratified and proportionate by state and metropolitan status state.

The survey employed the team created a master state and national sampling frame that incorporated the grant libraries. From that sampling frame, the survey team drew a stratified “proportionate to size sample” that created an overall balanced sample within the grant library states, but also ensured a proportionate national sample. This sampling approach ensured high quality data that could be generalized within the states analyzed, nationally, and across and within the metropolitan status and poverty strata.

The study team developed the survey questions through an iterative and collaborative effort involving the researchers, representatives of the funding agencies and members of the Public Access Technology & Funding Study Advisory Committee. The study team pre-tested the initial surveys with the project’s advisory committee, public librarians and the state data coordinators of the state library agencies and revised the survey based on their comments and suggestions (see Appendix A for the final survey).

The survey asked respondents to answer questions about specific library outlets and about the library system to which each respondent outlet belonged. Respondents completed the survey between September 2011 and November 2011. After a number of follow-up reminders and other strategies, the survey received

⁷ Metropolitan status was determined using the official designations employed by the Census Bureau, the Office of Management and Budget, and other government agencies. These designations are used in the study because they are the official definition employed by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), which allows for the mapping of public library outlets in the study.

a total of 7,260 responses for a response rate of 82.5 percent. Together, the high survey response rate and representativeness of responses demonstrate the high quality of the survey data and the ability to generalize to the public library population.

The survey employed a parallel sampling approach regarding library systems and their administrative entities. About 15 percent of public libraries have multiple service outlets (or branches). The survey received 2,909 system/administrative responses out of a sample of 4,998 for a response rate of 58.2 percent. The response rate, combined with a representative response, indicate that the data are valid and reliable.

Outlet (Branch) Versus System

The survey deployed a two-stage approach that included questions regarding sampled outlets (branches) and questions regarding an entire library system (questions focusing on E-rate applications, BTOP/BIP grant applications, mobile technologies, and operating and technology budgets). For roughly 85 percent of public libraries, there is no distinction between outlet and system, as these are single facility systems (e.g., one outlet, one system). The remaining roughly 15 percent of public libraries, however, do have multiple outlets. There was a need to separate outlet- and system-level questions, as some of the survey questions were point-of-service delivery questions (e.g., number of workstations, bandwidth and training), whereas others were administrative in nature (e.g., E-rate applications, operating budgets and technology budgets).

Questions 1 through 20 of the survey explored outlet-level issues (e.g., Internet connectivity, speed of connection, workstations, employment and e-government services, etc.). Questions 21 through 44 posed questions regarding the entire library system (e.g., E-rate applications, funding for information technology, operating expenses and income, etc.). Upon completion of questions 1 through 20 for all sampled outlets, respondents were taken to the system-level questions. Given that the actual respondent for the system data might be different than for the outlet data, respondents were permitted to leave and re-enter the Web-based survey for completion. The analysis of system- and outlet-level data required different approaches, considerations and weighting schemes for national and state analysis.

Data Analysis

The survey used weighted analysis to generate national and state data estimates. As such, the analysis uses the responses from the 7,260 library outlets from which a completed survey was received to estimate to all public library outlets (minus bookmobiles and books by mail) in the aggregate as well as by metropolitan status designations. The same process is used for analyzing and estimating state level data. The key difference is that the weighting process is limited to the metropolitan status and aggregate library designations for the state. The data reported have a margin of error of plus or minus 2.0 percent.

Figure M-1: Public Library Outlets and Survey Responses by Metropolitan Status

	Responding Facilities as a Proportion of Survey Respondents	Facilities as a Proportion of National Population
Metropolitan Status		
Urban	21.5% (1,563 of 7,260)	17.3% (2,896 of 16,776)
Suburban	31.2% (2,264 of 7,260)	34.8% (5,836 of 16,776)
Rural	47.3% (3,433 of 7,260)	47.9% (8,044 of 16,776)
Overall	100.0% (7,260 of 7,260)	100.0% (16,776 of 16,776)
Overall Response Rate = 82.5%*		
*This response rate is calculated based on sampled library responses to the survey. Additional surveys from libraries that are Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grant recipients were also used in the data analysis; these libraries participated in the survey as a grant requirement.		

National Branch Data Tables

This report section provides the national branch (outlet) level data and descriptions. The presentation is divided into key areas of public access, technology infrastructure, Internet-enabled services, and employment and E-government.

Public Access and Availability

Figure 1: Public Library Outlets Change in Hours Open by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
Hours Open	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Hours increased since last fiscal year	8.8% (n=227)	6.3% (n=332)	6.9% (n=532)	7.0% (n=1,091)
Hours decreased since last fiscal year	16.5% (n=426)	10.8% (n=570)	5.5% (n=430)	9.1% (n=1,425)
Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year	74.6% (n=1,922)	82.9% (n=4,361)	87.6% (n=6,785)	83.9% (n=13,068)
Weighted missing values, n=1189				

Figure 1 shows the changes public library outlets saw in the hours they are open to the public. Fewer outlets saw the hours they are open to the public decrease (9.1 percent this year compared to 15.3 percent in 2010-2011). The overall percentage of libraries that saw an increase in hours increased slightly this year (7.0 percent this year compared to 5.9 percent last year). However, it is worth noting that urban libraries saw both the largest increases in hours open to the public (8.8 percent this year versus 4.2 percent in 2010-2011) and the largest decrease in hours open to the public (16.5 percent this year versus 31.7 percent in 2010-2011) when compared to suburban and rural libraries. Additionally, the percentage of public library outlets that reported hours open to the public had stayed the same increased from 78.8 percent to 83.9 percent.

Figure 2: Public Library Outlets Offering Public Access to the Internet, by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
	100.0% (n=2,874)	100.0% (n=5,421)	99.9% (n=7,884)	100.0% (n=16,179)
Weighted missing values, n=248				

Virtually all public library outlets (100.0 percent) provide public access to the Internet (Figure 2). This figure continues to increase slightly across-the-board; the 2010-2011 survey reported that 99.5% of libraries provided access.

Figure 3: Public Library Outlets as the Only Provider of Free Public Internet and Free Public Computer Access by Metropolitan Status

Free Public Access	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Yes	40.6% (n=950)	60.0% (n=2,923)	70.3% (n=5,220)	62.1% (n=9,093)
No	41.4% (n=969)	27.1% (n=1,319)	18.3% (n=1,359)	24.9% (n=3,647)
Do not know	15.6% (n=365)	9.5% (n=462)	7.4% (n=546)	9.4% (n=1,373)
Weighted missing values, n=1,547				

Figure 3 shows the percentage of public library outlets reporting that they are the only provider of free public Internet and computer access in the library's service era. The percentage of outlets claiming to be the sole provider of such free services decreased slightly from last year, from 64.5 percent to 62.1 percent. As with previous studies, rural libraries report that they are the only provider of free public access more frequently than urban and suburban public libraries (70.3 percent as compared to 40.6 percent and 60.0 percent, respectively), but this year, the gap between those numbers increased, indicating that there are other providers of free public Internet access in urban and suburban areas.

Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Availability, Support, & Use

Figure 4: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Average, Average Age, and Metropolitan Status

Average Age	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Less than 1 year old	15.7 (n=473)	10.1 (n=1,427)	5.4 (n=2,828)	7.8 (n=4,728)
1 year old	12.5 (n=503)	9.2 (n=1,267)	4.3 (n=2,507)	6.7 (n=4,277)
2 years old	15.9 (n=607)	8.3 (n=1,579)	4.7 (n=2,470)	7.4 (n=4,656)
3 years old	14.9 (n=669)	8.2 (n=1,717)	4.5 (n=2,515)	7.2 (n=4,901)
4 years old	13.0 (n=557)	9.3 (n=1,316)	4.4 (n=2,025)	7.3 (n=3,898)
5 years old	14.8 (n=523)	8.8 (n=1,504)	4.9 (n=3,018)	7.1 (n=5,045)
Overall	27.9 (n=1,998)	20.1 (n=4,438)	10.7 (n=6,957)	16.4 (n=13,393)

As in previous years, urban libraries have more workstations (27.9) than suburban (20.1) and rural (10.7) libraries, and few computers were added to rural and suburban libraries in the past year (the average was 9.6 and 19.6, respectively in 2010-2011) (Figure 4). While five of the average age categories saw decreases this year, it is encouraging to see that libraries reported more new computers this year (7.8 workstations less than 1 year old) than in 2010-2011 (6.5 workstations less than 1 year old).

Figure 5: Public Library Outlets Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by Metropolitan Status				
Length of Time	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Less than one day	12.4% (n=286)	23.5% (n=1,133)	18.8% (n=1,375)	19.3% (n=2,794)
One day	26.7% (n=616)	27.5% (n=1,329)	23.1% (n=1,689)	25.2% (n=3,634)
Two days	30.1% (n=694)	20.8% (n=1,006)	19.4% (n=1,415)	21.6% (n=3,115)
More than two days	28.3% (n=654)	21.8% (n=1,055)	28.3% (n=2,069)	26.2% (n=3,777)
Don't know	*	1.9% (n=90)	3.5% (n=254)	2.5% (n=362)
Other amount of time	1.6% (n=38)	4.5% (n=217)	6.9% (n=506)	5.3% (n=761)
Weighted missing values, n=914				
Key: *: Insufficient data to report				

Figure 5 presents the length of time it takes for public access computers to get back into service. This year, 44.5 percent of libraries reported taking one day or less to restore a public access computer, an improvement of 6.1 percentage points from 2010-2011. Suburban libraries showed the largest spike in response time with 23.5 percent of machines being repaired in less than one day compared to 16.7 percent last year. However, the 2011-2012 survey still found most libraries (47.8 percent) take two or more than two days to restore a public access computer. Urban libraries were more likely to require more than two days (28.3 percent) to repair a machine this year than last year (18.1 percent). Rural libraries and urban libraries are significantly more likely to require more than two days (28.3 and 28.3 percent, respectively) than suburban libraries (21.8 percent).

Figure 6: Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan Status

Sufficiency of Public Access Workstations	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them throughout a typical day	28.0% (n=664)	13.2% (n=637)	8.7% (n=637)	13.4% (n=1,938)
There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	59.0% (n=1,398)	53.3% (n=2,566)	49.0% (n=3,582)	52.1% (n=7,545)
There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day	12.9% (n=306)	33.5% (n=4,818)	42.3% (n=3,087)	34.6% (n=5,008)
Weighted missing values, n=40				

Figure 6 presents the sufficiency of number of public access Internet workstation. Libraries continue to face supply issues given that 65.4 percent of libraries report having insufficient public access Internet workstations to meet patrons' needs at least sometimes during a typical day. This figure was a decrease of 10.8 percentage points from the 2010-2011 survey. Urban libraries face the greatest challenge in providing a sufficient number of public access Internet workstations (87.0 percent report some insufficiency), while 42.3 percent of rural libraries indicate that they do have a sufficient number of workstations to meet patron demand. This year, 34.6 percent of libraries reported having sufficient workstations available during a typical day, an increase from 23.8 percent during the 2010-2011 survey.

Figure 7: Use of Public Internet Workstations by Metropolitan Status

Use of workstations	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Use of workstations have stayed the same since last fiscal year	33.0% (n=781)	27.2% (n=1,347)	28.1% (n=2,047)	28.6% (n=4,176)
Use of workstations increased since last fiscal year	57.0% (n=1,351)	60.2% (n=2,976)	61.3% (n=4,470)	60.2% (n=8,797)
Use of workstations decreased since last fiscal year	7.0% (n=165)	10.8% (n=532)	6.3% (n=461)	7.9% (n=1,159)
Not Applicable	*	*	3.4% (n=248)	2.0% (n=288)
Don't Know	2.3% (n=53)	1.4% (n=69)	*	1.3% (n=192)
Weighted missing values, n=1,568				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

As Figure 7 shows, most public library outlets still report an increase in use of public access workstations over the past year (60.2 percent compared to 69.8 percent in 2010-2011). Indeed, urban, suburban, and rural libraries all reported increases in the use of public access workstations over the past year.

Figure 8: Use of Wireless Internet Access in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status

Use of wireless Internet Access	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Use of wireless internet access has stayed the same since last fiscal year	11.0% (n=259)	12.4% (n=608)	16.1% (n=1,173)	14.0% (n=2,041)
Use of wireless internet access has increased since last fiscal year	79.6% (n=1,881)	74.7% (n=3,667)	71.9% (n=5,235)	74.1% (n=10,783)
Use of wireless internet access has decreased since last fiscal year	1.9% (n=45)	*	1.0% (n=73)	1.0% (n=143)
Not Applicable	2.6% (n=62)	6.0% (n=296)	8.9% (n=651)	6.9% (n=1,009)
Don't Know	4.9% (n=116)	6.4% (n=314)	2.0% (n=146)	4.0% (n=575)
Weighted missing values, n=1626				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

As Figure 8 demonstrates, libraries report a substantial increase in the usage of library-provided wireless Internet access (Wi-Fi) since last year. Overall, 74.1 percent of libraries report an increase in the usage of Wi-Fi, and the gap between rural, urban, and suburban libraries continues to be small when it comes to Wi-Fi usage.

Figure 9: Use of Patron Technology Training Classes in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status

Use of patron technology training classes	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Use of patron technology training classes has stayed the same since last fiscal year	23.8% (n=552)	22.6% (n=1,096)	23.8% (n=1,751)	23.4% (n=3,364)
Use of patron technology training classes has increased since last fiscal year	46.6% (n=1,084)	41.8% (n=2,035)	29.2% (n=2,105)	36.3% (n=5,223)
Use of patron technology training classes has decreased since last fiscal year	4.1% (n=95)	5.1% (n=246)	4.3% (n=311)	4.5% (n=653)
Not Applicable	19.4% (n=451)	26.9% (n=1,309)	39.0% (n=2,816)	31.8% (n=4,575)
Don't Know	6.2% (n=143)	3.7% (n=181)	3.7% (n=266)	4.1% (n=590)
Weighted missing values, n=1775				

Overall, 36.3 percent of libraries report an increase in the usage of patron technology training classes, but that is a significant increase over last year, when 27.4 percent reported an increase in usage (see Figure 9). While there is still a gap between urban libraries and suburban and rural libraries, this difference has declined significantly. 29.2 percent of rural libraries reported increases compared to 19.4 percent last year, while the number of suburban libraries reporting an increase in technology training classes has climbed from 32.7 percent last year to 41.8 percent this year.

Figure 10: Use of Electronic Resources in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status

Use of electronic resources	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Use of electronic resources have stayed the same since last fiscal year	15.5% (n=365)	16.2% (n=790)	23.4% (n=1,639)	19.7% (n=2,849)
Use of electronic resources increased since last fiscal year	73.0% (n=1,726)	68.5% (n=3,348)	46.3% (n=3,347)	58.2% (n=8,421)
Use of electronic resources decreased since last fiscal year	1.7% (n=39)	2.0% (n=97)	1.3% (n=93)	1.6% (n=232)
Not Applicable	3.1% (n=74)	5.7% (n=281)	20.9% (n=1,509)	12.9% (n=1,864)
Don't Know	6.7% (n=159)	7.7% (n=374)	8.0% (n=577)	7.7% (n=1,111)
Weighted missing values, n=1704				

More than half – 58.2 percent– of public libraries report an increase in usage of their electronic resources (see Figure 10). 73.0 percent of urban public libraries report an increase in the usage of electronic resources, as compared to 68.5 percent of suburban and 46.3 percent of rural libraries.

Public Library Internet Connectivity Type, Speed, & Sufficiency

Figure 11: Public Library Outlets Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
Maximum Speed	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
768 Kbps (kilobits/second) or less	*	1.1% (n=50)	4.8% (n=337)	2.8% (n=388)
769 Kbps - 1.4 Mbps (megabits/second) or less	1.6% (n=37)	3.6% (n=163)	5.1% (n=362)	4.1% (n=561)
1.5 Mbps (T1)	8.1% (n=181)	13.6% (n=615)	21.2% (n=1,493)	16.5% (n=2,289)
1.6 Mbps - 3.0 Mbps	4.4% (n=98)	11.1% (n=505)	16.7% (n=1,179)	12.9% (n=1,781)
3.1 Mbps - 4.0 Mbps	7.0% (n=157)	3.2% (n=145)	6.9% (n=485)	5.7% (n=786)
4.1 Mbps – 6.0 Mbps	4.4% (n=98)	6.7% (n=302)	9.5% (n=669)	7.7% (n=1068)
6.1 Mbps - 10 Mbps	10.6% (n=239)	15.0% (n=679)	10.9% (n=772)	12.2% (n=1,690)
10.1 Mbps - 20.0 Mbps	17.3% (n=388)	13.1% (n=594)	7.0% (n=494)	10.7% (n=1,477)
20.1 Mbps - 30.0 Mbps	8.9% (n=200)	6.5% (n=295)	3.1% (n=217)	5.1% (n=712)
30.1 Mbps - 40.0 Mbps	4.6% (n=104)	2.4% (n=107)	*	1.9% (n=263)
40.1 Mbps – 99.9 Mbps	8.4% (n=189)	3.6% (n=163)	2.0% (n=138)	4.4% (n=603)
100 Mbps or greater	18.2% (n=408)	11.1% (n=503)	4.9% (n=349)	9.1% (n=1,259)
Don't Know	6.6% (n=148)	6.6% (n=301)	7.2% (n=510)	6.9% (n=959)
Weighted missing values, n=2,342				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

Figure 11 shows the maximum speed of public Internet access offered by library outlets. The percentage of libraries offering speeds greater than 1.5 Mbps (T1) has increased from 61.0 percent last year to 69.7 during 2011-2012. There also is a reported drop in the percentage of libraries with connection speeds of less than 1.5 Mbps (6.9 percent in 2011-2012 versus 12.0 percent last year). In addition, the percentage of libraries reporting greater than 10 Mbps connection speeds is up to 31.2 percent over last year's report of 24.6 percent. The percentage of urban libraries reporting connection speeds greater than 40 Mbps grew from 20.7 percent in 2010-2011 to 26.6 percent this year. Suburban libraries reporting the same top connection speed grew from 12.6 percent to 14.7 percent. Only 6.9 percent of rural libraries report connection speeds greater than 40 Mbps. However, the percentage of rural libraries reporting connection speeds greater than 1.5 Mbps has grown from 49.4 percent last year to 61 percent in 2011-2012.

Figure 12: Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status

Adequacy of Public Access Internet Connection	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time	10.1% (n=223)	13.3% (n=627)	13.6% (n=977)	13.0% (n=1,827)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at some times	33.8% (n=747)	24.0% (n=1,129)	29.5% (n=2,117)	28.4% (n=3,993)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time	55.8% (n=1,234)	62.5% (n=2,938)	56.3% (n=4,038)	58.3% (n=8,210)
Don't know	*	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=2,096 Key: * Insufficient data to report				

Figure 12 illustrates the adequacy of public access connection speeds to the Internet in library outlets. Although libraries reported increases in their connection speeds (Figures 21 and 22), 41.4 percent of libraries indicated those connection speeds are insufficient to meet patron needs some or all of the time. This is consistent with the 2010-2011 report. Adequate connection speeds were reported by 58.3 percent of public libraries, with suburban libraries reporting the greatest increase, nearly 6 percent (up from 56.7 percent last year). Urban (55.8 percent) and rural (56.3 percent) libraries reported slight increases in the adequacy of connection speeds (up from 55.0 percent and 53.1 percent, respectively).

Figure 13: Public Access Wireless (Wi-Fi) Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status

Availability of Public Access Wireless Internet Services	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Currently available for public use when the library is open and closed	68.4% (n=1,629)	67.8% (n=3,306)	69.1% (n=4,994)	68.5% (n=9,926)
Currently available for public use only when library is open	28.3% (n=673)	26.0% (n=1,268)	17.2% (n=1,245)	22.0% (n=3,186)
Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	1.7% (n=40)	1.9% (n=92)	6.0% (n=434)	3.9% (n=566)
Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	1.6% (n=39)	4.3% (n=211)	7.7% (n=556)	5.6% (n=806)
Weighted missing values, n=1,696				

Figure 13 shows the availability of public access wireless connections (Wi-Fi) to the Internet in public libraries. Public libraries continue to increase wireless availability, as 90.5 percent of libraries offer Wi-Fi (up from 85.8 percent in 2010-2011). Urban and suburban libraries continue to provide wireless access at similar rates (96.7 percent and 93.8 percent respectively). Wireless access in rural libraries has increased 4.8 percentage points to 86.3 percent. The percentage of libraries that do not provide wireless access and have no plans to make it available decreased from 8.2 percent last year to 5.6 percent in the current survey.

Figure 14: Public Library Outlets Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by Metropolitan Status

Shared Bandwidth connection	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share bandwidth/connection; no management techniques	41.4% (n=905)	50.1% (n=2,179)	67.9% (n=4,095)	57.1% (n=7,179)
Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share bandwidth/connection; with management techniques	37.0% (n=808)	29.4% (n=1,279)	17.9% (n=1,077)	25.2% (n=3,164)
No, the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	20.9% (n=457)	18.6% (n=810)	11.0% (n=664)	15.4% (n=2,332)
Don't know	*	1.9% (n=84)	3.2% (n=194)	2.3% (n=293)
Weighted missing values, n=545				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

Figure 14 outlines the level of sharing between wireless and public access workstation connections. More urban libraries report sharing the wireless and public access workstations connections (up from 35.8 percent to 41.6 percent), with a correlated decrease in separate connections (down from 27.3 percent to 20.9 percent). Urban libraries did see a slight increase in shared connections with management techniques (up from 36.2 percent to 37.0 percent) in 2011-2012. Similarly to previous years, the percentage of rural libraries that share the wireless and public access workstation connection without management techniques to alleviate traffic congestion is the highest reported at 67.9 percent.

Internet-Enabled Services Provided by Public Libraries

This section of the report provides details regarding the range of Internet-enabled services such as databases, digital reference, technology training, and others that public libraries offer the communities they serve.

Importance of Public Internet Services

Figure 15: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community

Services	Overall						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library provides services to job seekers	2.2% (n=307)	2.9% (n=411)	10.0% (n=1,410)	20.0% (n=2,824)	64.1% (n=9,062)	*	4.4 (n=14,015)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	4.3% (n=604)	9.2% (n=1,297)	25.7% (n=3,629)	29.6% (n=4,181)	30.3% (n=4,280)	1.1% (n=152)	3.7 (n=13,991)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or traffic tickets	1.7% (n=241)	3.3% (n=469)	12.1% (n=1,716)	26.9% (n=3,799)	55.5% (n=7,847)	*	4.3 (n=14,072)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	3.5% (n=498)	7.0% (n=996)	19.3% (n=2,727)	26.3% (n=3,718)	39.8% (n=5,633)	4.1% (n=575)	4.0 (n=13,571)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	2.8% (n=402)	5.8% (n=819)	19.0% (n=2,687)	29.7% (n=4,206)	41.0% (n=5,804)	1.6% (n=229)	4.0 (n=13,918)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	3.6% (n=511)	8.3% (n=1,178)	23.1% (n=3,263)	29.3% (n=4,140)	33.7% (n=4,765)	2.0% (n=288)	3.8 (n=13,860)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	3.6% (n=505)	6.9% (n=971)	20.7% (n=2,922)	31.5% (n=4,459)	35.2% (n=4,973)	2.2% (n=315)	3.9 (n=13,833)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	3.7% (n=523)	8.4% (n=1,184)	20.7% (n=2,933)	32.8% (n=4,644)	33.0% (n=4,662)	1.4% (n=199)	3.8 (n=13,949)
The library provides information for college applicants	3.2% (n=450)	8.9% (n=1,259)	29.2% (n=4,134)	29.8% (n=4,211)	27.7% (n=3,918)	1.2% (n=170)	3.7 (n=13,973)
The library provides information about the library's community	3.2% (n=456)	7.2% (n=1,022)	19.4% (n=2,748)	28.5% (n=4,024)	40.5% (n=5,727)	1.2% (n=163)	4.0 (n=13,979)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	11.3% (n=1,602)	17.7% (n=2,505)	27.1% (n=3,836)	25.3% (n=3,580)	15.6% (n=2,202)	3.0% (n=418)	3.2 (n=13,725)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	14.3% (n=1,659)	16.7% (n=1,929)	21.7% (n=2,506)	21.6% (n=2,498)	25.1% (n=2,907)	*	3.3 (n=11,498)
Other	1.0% (n=137)	1.7% (n=237)	5.8% (n=792)	8.1% (n=1,108)	8.5% (n=1,157)	74.9% (n=10,245)	3.9 (n=3,431)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important
Key: * : Insufficient data to report

Services for job seekers and access to government information and services remain among the most important public Internet services provided to the community, followed by government information services, education resources and databases for K-12 students, and information about the library's community (Figure 15).

- 84.1 percent report that services to job-seekers are either important or most important.
- 82.4 percent report that access to government information and services is either important or most important.
- 70.7 percent report that providing education resources and databases for K-12 students is either important or most important.
- 69.0 percent report that providing information about the library's community is either important or most important.

Figures 16-18 detail the extent to which public Internet services are important to the community. 88.9 percent of urban public libraries report that services to job seekers are either important or most important, followed by 79.4 percent reporting that access to government information and services is either important or most important, 73.6 percent reporting that education resources and databases for K-12 students are either important or most important, and 70.7 percent reporting that providing information about the library's community is either important or most important.

Suburban libraries saw a dramatic increase in the percent of libraries reporting providing Internet and computer skills training to be important or most important (71.1 percent in 2011-2012 compared to 62.5 in 2010-2011). Suburban libraries also found the following services to be important or most important to the community: Providing services to job seekers (87.4 percent), providing access to government information (84.9 percent), providing education resources and databases for K-12 students (76.5 percent), and providing information about the library's community (73.0 percent).

Rural libraries also found the following services to be important or most important to the community: Providing services to job seekers (80.2 percent), providing access to government information (81.6 percent), providing education resources and databases for K-12 students (66.0 percent), and providing information about the library's community (65.6 percent).

Figure 16: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community

Services	Urban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library provides services to job seekers	1.6% (n=36)	2.1% (n=49)	6.8% (n=156)	18.0% (n=416)	70.9% (n=1,638)	*	4.6 (n=2,295)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	2.8% (n=65)	6.0% (n=140)	24.4% (n=565)	27.6% (n=639)	38.3% (n=885)	*	3.9 (n=2,294)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or traffic tickets	1.1% (n=25)	4.8% (n=111)	14.4% (n=333)	23.4% (n=542)	56.0% (n=1,294)	*	4.3 (n=2,305)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	1.8% (n=42)	3.9% (n=91)	15.8% (n=365)	32.1% (n=742)	44.1% (n=1,019)	2.3% (n=54)	4.2 (n=2,258)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	1.8% (n=42)	4.0% (n=92)	19.5% (n=452)	33.3% (n=769)	40.3% (n=932)	1.1% (n=25)	4.1 (n=2,288)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	2.7% (n=62)	7.1% (n=164)	27.2% (n=630)	29.5% (n=683)	32.8% (n=758)	*	3.8 (n=2,297)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	2.0% (n=47)	5.1% (n=119)	21.9% (n=506)	31.8% (n=736)	33.4% (n=773)	5.7% (n=133)	4.0 (n=2,180)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	3.6% (n=84)	6.0% (n=140)	21.8% (n=503)	35.4% (n=818)	31.8% (n=735)	1.4% (n=33)	3.9 (n=2,280)
The library provides information for college applicants	1.4% (n=32)	7.0% (n=162)	35.4% (n=819)	29.2% (n=676)	25.9% (n=599)	1.0% (n=24)	3.7 (n=2,288)
The library provides information about the library's community	1.4% (n=33)	4.7% (n=108)	22.2% (n=515)	26.8% (n=620)	44.1% (n=1,020)	*	4.1 (n=2,296)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	5.0% (n=115)	16.6% (n=383)	21.6% (n=500)	36.2% (n=838)	19.1% (n=441)	1.5% (n=35)	3.5 (n=2,277)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	5.5% (n=109)	13.2% (n=261)	16.7% (n=330)	29.6% (n=584)	34.8% (n=686)	*	3.8 (n=1,971)
Other	*	3.5% (n=77)	6.1% (n=136)	6.6% (n=148)	5.4% (n=121)	77.7% (n=1,739)	3.6 (n=500)

Key: - : No data to report; * : Insufficient data to report
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

Figure 17: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community

Services	Suburban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library provides services to job seekers	1.5% (n=73)	2.0% (n=95)	7.8% (n=367)	19.4% (n=920)	68.0% (n=3,218)	1.2% (n=58)	4.5 (n=4,673)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	3.3% (n=158)	7.5% (n=355)	23.0% (n=1,088)	34.2% (n=1,617)	31.1% (n=1,469)	*	3.8 (n=4,688)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or traffic tickets	1.1% (n=53)	2.6% (n=124)	10.9% (n=514)	29.3% (n=1,386)	55.6% (n=2,629)	*	4.4 (n=4,706)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	2.3% (n=107)	4.9% (n=230)	18.9% (n=892)	27.4% (n=1,297)	43.7% (n=2,068)	2.9% (n=135)	4.1 (n=4,594)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	1.5% (n=71)	4.3% (n=204)	16.6% (n=785)	30.9% (n=1,461)	45.6% (n=2,157)	1.1% (n=53)	4.2 (n=4,678)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	2.4% (n=115)	7.0% (n=333)	22.4% (n=1,058)	32.4% (n=1,534)	34.4% (n=1,626)	1.4% (n=66)	3.9 (n=4,665)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	2.7% (n=128)	5.8% (n=274)	18.4% (n=872)	34.5% (n=1,631)	37.9% (n=1,794)	*	4.0 (n=4,699)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	2.4% (n=112)	6.8% (n=323)	19.2% (n=908)	36.6% (n=1,731)	34.1% (n=1,613)	*	3.9 (n=4,687)
The library provides information for college applicants	2.6% (n=122)	7.4% (n=352)	30.0% (n=1,418)	31.5% (n=1,487)	27.5% (n=1,302)	1.0% (n=47)	3.8 (n=4,681)
The library provides information about the library's community	2.0% (n=92)	6.0% (n=283)	18.4% (n=872)	29.8% (n=1,408)	43.2% (n=2,043)	*	4.1 (n=4,698)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	7.8% (n=368)	14.0% (n=662)	28.9% (n=1,368)	30.8% (n=1,458)	16.9% (n=799)	1.6% (n=74)	3.4 (n=4,654)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	10.2% (n=413)	13.9% (n=559)	24.1% (n=969)	22.8% (n=917)	28.6% (n=1,150)	*	3.5 (n=4,008)
Other	*	1.4% (n=63)	4.3% (n=198)	9.2% (n=421)	6.9% (n=315)	77.4% (n=3,550)	3.9 (n=1,038)

Key: - : No data to report; * : Insufficient data to report
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

Figure 18: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community

Challenges	Rural Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library provides services to job seekers	2.8% (n=198)	3.8% (n=267)	12.5% (n=887)	21.0% (n=1,489)	59.2% (n=4,206)	*	4.3 (n=7,047)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	5.4% (n=381)	11.3% (n=802)	27.8% (n=1,975)	27.1% (n=1,925)	27.1% (n=1,926)	1.3% (n=90)	3.6 (n=7,009)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or traffic tickets	2.3% (n=162)	3.3% (n=235)	12.2% (n=869)	26.3% (n=1,871)	55.3% (n=3,924)	*	4.3 (n=7,062)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	4.9% (n=349)	9.5% (n=675)	20.7% (n=1,471)	23.6% (n=1,679)	35.8% (n=2,546)	5.4% (n=385)	3.8 (n=6,719)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	4.1% (n=288)	7.4% (n=522)	20.4% (n=1,450)	27.8% (n=1,976)	38.2% (n=2,715)	2.1% (n=151)	3.9 (n=6,953)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	4.7% (n=335)	9.6% (n=681)	22.2% (n=1,575)	27.1% (n=1,923)	33.5% (n=2,381)	2.9% (n=206)	3.8 (n=6,898)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	4.6% (n=330)	8.1% (n=579)	21.7% (n=1,544)	29.5% (n=2,092)	33.9% (n=2,407)	2.1% (n=150)	3.8 (n=6,954)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	4.6% (n=327)	10.2% (n=721)	21.4% (n=1,522)	29.5% (n=2,094)	32.6% (n=2,314)	1.7% (n=123)	3.8 (n=6,981)
The library provides information for college applicants	4.2% (n=297)	10.5% (n=745)	26.7% (n=1,897)	28.8% (n=2,047)	28.4% (n=2,017)	1.4% (n=98)	3.7 (n=7,003)
The library provides information about the library's community	4.7% (n=330)	8.9% (n=631)	19.2% (n=1,361)	28.1% (n=1,996)	37.5% (n=2,664)	1.6% (n=114)	3.9 (n=6,985)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	15.8% (n=1,119)	20.6% (n=1,460)	27.7% (n=1,968)	18.1% (n=1,284)	13.6% (n=963)	4.3% (n=308)	2.9 (n=6,793)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	20.4% (n=1,138)	19.9% (n=1,109)	21.7% (n=1,206)	17.9% (n=997)	19.2% (n=1,070)	*	3.0 (n=5,520)
Other	1.2% (n=79)	1.4% (n=97)	6.7% (n=458)	7.9% (n=538)	10.5% (n=721)	72.4% (n=4,956)	3.9 (n=1,894)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important; Key: * : Insufficient data to report							

Technology Training Offered by Public Libraries

Figure 19: Public Library Outlets Offering Formal or Informal Technology Training, Availability by Metropolitan Status

Training Availability	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Offers formal technology training classes	63.2% (n=1,387)	54.5% (n=2,482)	31.8% (n=2,236)	44.3% (n=6,105)
Offers one-on-one technology training sessions by appointment	43.4% (n=951)	37.9% (n=1,728)	30.1% (n=2,120)	34.8% (n=4,800)
Offers informal point-of-use assistance	85.2% (n=1,868)	85.9% (n=3,911)	79.9% (n=5,626)	82.7% (n=11,405)
Offers online training material	36.3% (n=796)	33.7% (n=1,535)	21.9% (n=1,540)	28.1% (n=3,871)
Does not offer any technology training	5.1% (n=112)	8.0% (n=363)	12.5% (n=879)	9.8% (n=1,354)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

The types of technology training offered to patrons are presented in Figure 19. The greatest percentage of outlets (82.7 percent) provide informal, point-of-use assistance, and 9.8 percent offer no technology training at all, down from 12.7 percent last year. Of the 44.3 percent of outlets that offer formal technology training classes, urban outlets (63.2 percent) comprise the majority; 54.5 percent of suburban outlets also provide formal training. Libraries offering one-on-one technology training sessions by appointment grew to 34.8 percent this year from 28.1 percent in 2010-2011 with urban librarians seeing the greatest growth (43.4 percent in 2011-2012, up from 29.2 in 2010-2011).

Figure 20: Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status

Technology Training Classes	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
General computer skills (e.g., how to use mouse, keyboard, printing)	85.5% (n=1,186)	87.0% (n=2,158)	88.0% (n=1,968)	87.0% (n=5,313)
General software use (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation)	74.0% (n=1,027)	73.7% (n=1,830)	72.3% (n=1,616)	73.3% (n=4,474)
General Internet use (e.g., set up e-mail, Web browsing)	83.0% (n=1,152)	87.9% (n=2,181)	87.2% (n=1,949)	86.5% (n=5,282)
General online/Web searching (e.g., using Google, Yahoo, others)	75.4% (n=1,045)	76.2% (n=1,891)	75.0% (n=1,676)	75.6% (n=4,612)
Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	45.2% (n=628)	51.2% (n=1,272)	42.3% (n=946)	46.6% (n=2,845)
Using online databases (e.g., commercial databases to search and find content)	51.4% (n=713)	58.0% (n=1,438)	49.1% (n=1,097)	53.2% (n=3,248)
Safe online practices (e.g., not divulging personal information)	36.7% (n=509)	38.4% (n=953)	35.7% (n=798)	37.0% (n=2,259)
Accessing online government information (e.g., Medicare, taxes, how to complete forms)	30.2% (n=419)	29.4% (n=730)	29.8% (n=666)	29.7% (n=1,814)
Accessing online job-seeking and career-related information	50.5% (n=700)	54.6% (n=1,356)	42.4% (n=949)	49.2% (n=3,005)
Accessing online health and wellness information (e.g., consumer health)	26.5% (n=368)	24.0% (n=597)	22.2% (n=496)	23.9% (n=1,461)
Accessing online investment information	21.4% (n=297)	19.7% (n=489)	11.5% (n=258)	17.1% (n=1,044)
Accessing genealogy information	39.0% (n=541)	48.0% (n=1,192)	40.6% (n=909)	46.3% (n=2,642)
Accessing consumer information (e.g., product value, safety, reliability, warranty information)	17.3% (n=241)	24.1% (n=597)	18.0% (n=401)	20.3% (n=1,239)
Digital photography, software and online applications (e.g., Photoshop, Flickr)	21.9% (n=303)	34.2% (n=849)	27.6% (n=616)	29.0% (n=1,769)
Social media (e.g., blogging, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube)	28.2% (n=391)	42.8% (n=1,062)	42.6% (n=953)	39.4% (n=2,407)
Other technology-based training classes	6.6% (n=92)	7.7% (n=192)	5.5% (n=122)	6.7% (n=406)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

The types of formal technology training classes offered by library outlets are identified in Figure 20. For libraries offering formal training, general computer skills classes are the most common (87.0 percent), followed by general Internet use classes (86.5 percent). About three-quarters of libraries (75.6 percent) report training patrons on general online/Web searching and general software use classes (73.3 percent). The percentage of libraries offering classes on accessing online job-seeking and career related information grew slightly to 49.2 percent from 48.1 percent in 2010-2011. The percentage of libraries offering classes on accessing genealogy information grew most dramatically at 46.3 percent, up from 40.8 percent in 2010-

2011. Relatively few outlets (17.1 percent) provide training on accessing online investment information, although this is up slightly from 14.5 percent in 2010-2011. Social networking training continued to grow for the second year in a row, with 39.2 percent of libraries now offering this training from 27.4 percent in 2009-2010. In urban libraries, training on safe online practices (36.7 percent) and accessing online investment information (21.4 percent) libraries grew, from 29.2 percent and 16.4 percent respectively. Genealogical research classes continue to be the most common in suburban libraries (48.0 percent) compared to rural (40.6 percent) libraries than in urban (39.0 percent) libraries.

Public Access Services Available to Users and Communities

Figure 21: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users

	Overall		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service Remotely (i.e., via the Web)
Resources			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	30.4% (n=4,183)	69.7% (n=9,577)	69.8% (n=9,584)
Licensed databases	*	99.1% (n=13,706)	99.1% (n=13,697)
E-books	23.7% (n=3,273)	76.3% (n=10,523)	76.1% (n=10,497)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	73.7% (n=9,887)	26.5% (n=3,561)	2.2% (n=289)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	45.6% (n=6,160)	54.2% (n=7,321)	40.0% (n=5,409)
Homework resources (e.g., tutor.com, databases)	17.7% (n=2,445)	81.9% (n=11,324)	62.7% (n=8,674)
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	16.8% (n=2,322)	82.9% (n=11,483)	61.9% (n=8,579)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	40.0% (n=5,421)	60.0% (n=8,128)	38.5% (n=5,216)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	46.6% (n=6,371)	53.3% (n=7,283)	40.6% (n=5,550)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	37.7% (n=5,142)	61.9% (n=8,440)	46.7% (n=6,371)
Online book clubs	61.8% (n=8,289)	30.8% (n=4,124)	30.7% (n=4,116)
Services			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	6.8% (n=927)	93.2% (n=12,656)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	35.6% (n=4,839)	64.4% (n=8,770)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	43.8% (n=6,025)	56.2% (n=7,725)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Websites	31.0% (n=4,268)	69.2% (n=9,524)	---
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., laptops, netbooks)	52.2% (n=6,738)	49.0% (n=6,328)	---
Provides access to e-readers for accessing e-books (e.g., Kindle, Nook)	60.9% (n=7,385)	39.1% (n=4,734)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

Figure 21 illustrates the range of Internet-based resources and services that public libraries provide to their patrons. Licensed databases continued to be the most commonly provided service. Libraries also offer substantial homework assistance, with 81.9 percent offering such services from within the library and 62.7 percent supporting external access. Audio content is quite popular, with 82.9 percent offering these

services within the library and 61.9 percent supporting external access. 76.1 percent of library outlets offer access to e-books from outside the library, up from 60.9 percent last year. 49.0 percent of libraries now provide access to mobile devices in their library — an increase from 27.8 percent last year. E-readers have become a growing fixture in public libraries, with 39.1 percent of outlets providing access to such devices. Figures 22-24 present the detail services that urban, suburban and rural libraries make available to users.

Figure 22: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users

	Urban Public Libraries		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service from Outside the Library (i.e., via the Web)
Resources			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	21.9% (n=491)	78.2% (n=1,754)	78.3% (n=1,756)
Licensed databases	*	99.6% (n=2,226)	99.6% (n=2,226)
E-books	7.8% (n=715)	92.2% (n=2,068)	92.0% (n=2,064)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	74.0% (n=1,568)	26.8% (n=567)	2.9% (n=56)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	45.8% (n=975)	54.3% (n=1,158)	46.1% (n=983)
Homework resources (e.g., tutor.com, databases)	13.3% (n=300)	86.7% (n=1,954)	73.9% (n=1,666)
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	10.3% (n=231)	89.9% (n=2,019)	81.2% (n=1,824)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	34.2% (n=755)	66.6% (n=1,474)	57.0% (n=1,261)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	24.1% (n=535)	75.9% (n=1,684)	65.8% (n=1,460)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	18.5% (n=409)	81.5% (n=1,798)	71.1% (n=1,570)
Online book clubs	43.9% (n=956)	44.1% (n=961)	51.9% (n=1,130)
Services			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	1.9% (n=42)	98.1% (n=2,168)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	45.6% (n=997)	54.4% (n=1,190)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	56.1% (n=1,226)	43.9% (n=960)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	21.8% (n=479)	78.2% (n=1,714)	---
Provides access to mobile computing devices (e.g., netbooks, laptops)	49.3% (n=1,006)	52.5% (n=1,071)	---
Provides access to e-readers for accessing e-books (e.g., Kindle, Nook)	62.5% (n=1,190)	37.5% (n=713)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

Figure 23: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users

	Suburban Public Libraries		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service from Outside the Library (i.e., via the Web)
Resources			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	25.5% (n=1,160)	74.6% (n=3,393)	74.7% (n=3,396)
Licensed databases	*	99.7% (n=4,6088)	99.7% (n=4,608)
E-books	14.3% (n=658)	85.7% (n=3,934)	85.5% (n=3,926)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	78.0% (n=3,464)	22.1% (n=982)	1.5% (n=68)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	38.4% (n=1,777)	60.2% (n=2,715)	48.6% (n=2,192)
Homework resources (e.g., tutor.com, databases)	14.0% (n=641)	85.5% (n=3,926)	72.2% (n=3,314)
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	12.8% (n=584)	87.0% (n=3,381)	71.4% (n=3,270)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	38.5% (n=1,721)	61.4% (n=2,744)	44.5% (n=1,992)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	46.0% (n=2,094)	54.1% (n=2,465)	43.6% (n=1,986)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	32.9% (n=1,487)	66.1% (n=2,988)	56.9% (n=2,572)
Online book clubs	60.3% (n=2,709)	31.4% (n=1,410)	33.3% (n=1,495)
Services			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	4.9% (n=219)	95.1% (n=4,279)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	38.3% (n=1,731)	61.7% (n=2,784)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	45.6% (n=2,084)	54.4% (n=2,490)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	27.8% (n=1,273)	72.4% (n=3,314)	---
Provides access to mobile computing devices (e.g., netbooks, laptops)	49.2% (n=2,138)	52.7% (n=2,289)	---
Provides access to e-readers for accessing e-books (e.g., Kindle, Nook)	63.6% (n=2,577)	36.4% (n=1,477)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			
Key: * : Insufficient data to report			

Figure 24: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users

	Rural Public Libraries		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service from Outside the Library (i.e., via the Web)
Resources			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	36.4% (n=2,532)	63.7% (n=4,430)	63.8% (n=4,432)
Licensed databases	1.9% (n=135)	98.0% (n=6,890)	97.9% (n=6,883)
E-books	35.0% (n=2,439)	64.9% (n=4,522)	64.7% (n=4,508)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	70.7% (n=4,855)	29.3% (n=2,011)	2.4% (n=165)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	49.6% (n=3,408)	50.2% (n=3,448)	32.5% (n=2,234)
Homework resources (e.g., tutor.com, databases)	21.6% (n=1,504)	77.8% (n=5,431)	52.9% (n=3,694)
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	21.4% (n=1,507)	78.0% (n=5,484)	49.6% (n=3,485)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	42.8% (n=2,945)	56.9% (n=3,911)	28.5% (n=1,963)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	54.3% (n=3,742)	45.4% (n=3,134)	30.5% (n=2,104)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	46.9% (n=3,245)	52.8% (n=3,650)	32.3% (n=2,230)
Online book clubs	68.6% (n=4,624)	26.0% (n=1,752)	22.1% (n=1,490)
Services			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	9.7% (n=666)	90.3% (n=6,209)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	30.6% (n=2,111)	69.4% (n=4,795)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	38.8% (n=2,715)	61.2% (n=4,275)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	35.7% (n=36.0)	64.3% (n=4,497)	---
Provides access to mobile computing devices (e.g., netbooks, laptops)	55.2% (n=3,594)	45.6% (n=2,968)	---
Provides access to e-readers for accessing e-books (e.g., Kindle, Nook)	58.7% (n=3,619)	41.3% (n=2,544)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

Library E-government and Employment Services and Challenges

Figure 25: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
E-Government roles and services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	97.3% (n=2,131)	96.6% (n=4,118)	96.4% (n=6,358)	96.6% (n=12,607)
Staff provide as needed assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use e-government Websites	93.6% (n=2,050)	91.9% (n=3,917)	91.1% (n=6,008)	91.8% (n=11,976)
Staff provide assistance to patrons for understanding government programs and services	57.8% (n=1,266)	52.9% (n=2,254)	45.6% (n=3,008)	50.0% (n=6,528)
Staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms	71.0% (n=1,555)	70.6% (n=3,010)	70.7% (n=4,667)	70.7% (n=9,230)
The library developed guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government Websites and services	33.6% (n=735)	22.2% (n=945)	15.3% (n=1,006)	20.6% (n=2,686)
The library offers training classes regarding the use of government Websites, understanding government programs, and completing electronic forms	24.5% (n=537)	11.9% (n=509)	6.2% (n=411)	11.2% (n=1,457)
The library offered translation services for forms and services in other languages	10.9% (n=238)	11.5% (n=492)	4.4% (n=290)	7.8% (n=1,020)
The library partnered with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	43.1% (n=941)	32.6% (n=1,386)	25.7% (n=1,690)	30.9% (n=4,017)
The library worked with government agencies (local, state, or federal) to help agencies improve their Websites and/or e-government services	12.3% (n=270)	13.1% (n=556)	9.3% (n=612)	11.0% (n=1,438)
The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in provision of e-government services	31.4% (n=687)	25.0% (n=1,067)	20.0% (n=1,324)	23.6% (n=3,078)
Other	2.9% (n=65)	2.8% (n=121)	3.2% (n=214)	3.0% (n=400)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

Figure 25 illustrates the e-government services public library outlets provide patrons. 96.6 percent of libraries report assisting patrons with applying for and accessing e-government services, an increase of 11.5 percentage points over the past year. Urban libraries have made the biggest strides in the provision of this basic e-government service, with 97.3 percent reporting they provide assistance applying for and accessing e-government services (up significantly from 77.7 percent last year). 91.8 percent of libraries help patrons understand how to access and use e-government Websites, and 70.7 percent assist patrons with completing government forms. The percentage of libraries that partner with government agencies and others to provide e-government services continues to increase (30.9 percent, up from 25.1 percent last year).

Figure 26: Challenges that Affect the Ability of Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

Challenges	Overall						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	24.0% (n=3,195)	17.4% (n=2,310)	24.1% (n=3,200)	16.7% (n=2,218)	17.7% (n=2,355)	*	2.9 (n=13,278)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	24.8% (n=3,263)	21.5% (n=2,830)	21.7% (n=2,854)	19.2% (n=2,526)	12.3% (n=1,615)	*	2.7 (n=13,088)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	34.8% (n=3,975)	22.8% (n=2,599)	17.8% (n=2,038)	11.9% (n=1,361)	11.8% (n=1,345)	*	2.4 (n=11,319)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	43.9% (n=5,717)	21.2% (n=2,764)	16.1% (n=2,093)	10.1% (n=1,309)	8.0% (n=1,043)	*	2.2 (n=12,925)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	14.0% (n=1,887)	15.4% (n=2,070)	22.2% (n=2,987)	19.5% (n=2,628)	28.4% (n=3,814)	*	3.3 (n=13,385)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	14.7% (n=1,996)	16.1% (n=2,185)	23.4% (n=3,169)	21.9% (n=2,965)	23.0% (n=3,121)	*	3.2 (n=13,436)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	25.5% (n=3,227)	22.2% (n=2,810)	21.8% (n=2,758)	14.7% (n=1,859)	15.5% (n=1,966)	*	2.7 (n=12,620)
Other	8.8% (n=1,171)	4.4% (n=581)	1.9% (n=257)	*	*	83.3% (n=11067)	1.8 (n=2,217)

Key: * : Insufficient data to report

Figure 26 indicates the degree to which certain challenges affect the ability of public library outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs. Overall, adequate staffing was the greatest challenge faced by libraries in meeting patron E-Government needs (44.9 percent reported this as important or most important). E-Government expertise was also a challenge, with 50.5 percent of libraries reporting that library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs, presenting an important (21.9 percent) or most important (23.0 percent) challenge. Although less significant, a growing number of libraries report that workstation time limits are a challenge; only 23.4 percent rated this issue as important or most important in 2010-2010, while 31.5 rated this issue as important or most important in the current survey. This may reflect increasing demand for public access workstations.

Figures 27 through 29 present the detail of challenges affecting urban, suburban and rural libraries in making E-Government services available to users. Urban libraries also reported that staffing issues present a significant challenge in meeting patrons' E-Government needs (43.2 percent reported this as important or most important). While last year 42.9 percent of urban libraries reported "too few workstations" as an important or most important challenge, the number increased to 47.4 this year. The lack of staff expertise (32.5 percent) also was a challenge in the meeting patron E-Government needs, but less of a challenge than last year (36.7 percent).

Responses from suburban outlets are similar, with 46.9 percent of libraries reporting that not having enough staff to effectively help patrons meet their E-Government needs presents an important (18.8 percent) or most important (28.1 percent) challenge and 43.4 percent of libraries reported that lack of staff expertise necessary to meet patron E-Government needs presents an important (22.4 percent) or most important (21.0 percent) challenge. As with urban libraries, although these challenges remain significant, they represent slight decreases from last year's numbers (55.6 percent reporting insufficient staff and 47.3 percent reporting lack of necessary expertise).

Responses from rural outlets are also similar, with 49.9 percent of libraries reporting that not having enough staff to effectively help patrons meet their E-Government needs presents an important (19.8 percent) or most important (30.1 percent) challenge, representing a decrease from last year's figure of 56.9. However, 49.6 percent of rural public libraries reported that lack of staff expertise necessary to meet patron E-Government needs presents an important (22.6 percent) or most important (27.0 percent) challenge, which is a decrease from last year's total of 57.3 percent.

Figure 27: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

Challenges	Urban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	19.4% (n=417)	9.7% (n=207)	23.5% (n=504)	17.7% (n=381)	29.7% (n=639)	---	3.3 (n=2,147)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	13.7% (n=281)	20.8% (n=428)	22.5% (n=463)	24.2% (n=498)	18.7% (n=385)	*	3.1 (n=2,056)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	33.6% (n=618)	26.6% (n=489)	17.2% (n=317)	9.2% (n=169)	12.5% (n=230)	*	2.4 (n=1,823)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	45.6% (n=981)	23.7% (n=510)	15.0% (n=323)	6.9% (n=149)	8.4% (n=180)	*	2.1 (n=2,143)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	11.0% (n=240)	16.4% (n=356)	29.0% (n=631)	20.0% (n=436)	23.2% (n=504)	*	3.3 (n=2,167)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	15.8% (n=344)	22.6% (n=492)	27.3% (n=594)	18.8% (n=410)	14.7% (n=321)	*	2.9 (n=2,161)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	27.6% (n=580)	22.2% (n=467)	19.3% (n=406)	16.6% (n=349)	14.1% (n=297)	*	2.7 (n=2,099)
Other	11.5% (n=244)	4.3% (n=91)	1.3% (n=27)	*	*	82.1% (n=1,739)	1.5 (n=379)

Key: - : No data to report; * : Insufficient data to report
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

Figure 28: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

Challenges	Suburban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	24.0% (n=1,048)	17.9% (n=780)	24.8% (n=1,082)	17.8% (n=774)	15.3% (n=665)	*	2.8 (n=4,350)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	23.2% (n=1,009)	23.6% (n=1,028)	21.7% (n=944)	20.2% (n=878)	11.2% (n=489)	*	2.7 (n=4,349)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	37.1% (n=1,436)	24.5% (n=949)	17.0% (n=658)	11.3% (n=439)	9.4% (n=363)	*	2.3 (n=3,845)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	46.7% (n=1,993)	23.2% (n=988)	13.6% (n=580)	9.1% (n=388)	6.7% (n=284)	*	2.1 (n=4,232)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	13.0% (n=574)	14.7% (n=651)	24.8% (n=1,098)	18.8% (n=833)	28.1% (n=1,246)	*	3.6 (n=4,403)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	14.2% (n=633)	16.5% (n=733)	24.9% (n=1,110)	22.4% (n=996)	21.0% (n=935)	1.0% (n=46)	3.2 (n=4,407)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	23.3% (n=963)	23.3% (n=966)	23.6% (n=979)	13.9% (n=576)	15.1% (n=627)	*	2.7 (n=4,111)
Other	7.5% (n=330)	3.1% (n=135)	1.4% (n=60)	*	*	86.7% (n=3,808)	1.8 (n=587)
Key: - : No data to report; * : Insufficient data to report 1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

Figure 29: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

Challenges	Rural Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	25.5% (n=1,731)	19.5% (n=1,322)	23.8% (n=1,614)	15.6% (n=1,062)	15.5% (n=1,051)	*	2.8 (n=6,781)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	29.3% (n=1,972)	20.4% (n=1,374)	21.5% (n=1,447)	17.1% (n=1,149)	11.0% (n=741)	*	2.6 (n=6,683)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	33.7% (n=1,921)	20.4% (n=1,162)	18.6% (n=1,063)	13.2% (n=754)	13.2% (n=752)	*	2.5 (n=5,652)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	41.6% (n=2,744)	19.2% (n=1,266)	18.0% (n=1,190)	11.7% (n=772)	8.8% (n=579)	*	2.3 (n=6,550)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	15.7% (n=1,072)	15.5% (n=1,062)	18.4% (n=1,258)	19.8% (n=1,359)	30.1% (n=2,063)	*	3.3 (n=6,815)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	14.7% (n=1,019)	13.9% (n=961)	21.2% (n=1,465)	22.6% (n=1,559)	27.0% (n=1,865)	*	3.3 (n=6,869)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	26.2% (n=1,685)	21.4% (n=1,377)	21.3% (n=1,373)	14.5% (n=934)	16.2% (n=1,042)	*	2.7 (n=6,411)
Other	8.8% (n=598)	5.2% (n=354)	2.5% (n=170)	1.3% (n=86)	*	81.5% (n=5,507)	1.9 (n=1,251)
Key: - : * : Insufficient data to report 1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

Figure 30: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status

Job seeking roles and services	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
The library provides access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources	97.5% (n=2,197)	94.5% (n=4,309)	88.9% (n=6,083)	92.2% (n=12,589)
The library provides access to civil service exam materials	85.9% (n=1,937)	83.5% (n=3,810)	70.0% (n=4,787)	77.1% (n=10,533)
The library helps patrons complete online job applications	78.2% (n=1,763)	74.0% (n=3,374)	76.6% (n=5,239)	76.0% (n=10,375)
The library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons seek or attain employment	47.3% (n=1,066)	34.6% (n=1,575)	29.8% (n=2,041)	34.3% (n=4,682)
The library helps patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses	35.1% (n=791)	18.7% (n=853)	12.1% (n=824)	18.1% (n=2,469)
The library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses	33.0% (n=744)	20.5% (n=935)	14.4% (n=985)	19.5% (n=2,663)
The library offers classes (either by librarians or others working with the library) on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.	48.2% (n=1,081)	39.4% (n=1,778)	20.3% (n=1,375)	31.3% (n=4,233)
The library offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials	83.7% (n=1,872)	80.7% (n=3,628)	73.2% (n=4,930)	77.5% (n=10,429)
Other	6.3% (n=143)	3.3% (n=151)	3.6% (n=246)	4.0% (n=540)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

Figure 30 shows the job seeking services provided by public libraries. Provision of these services has increased across the board since last year. A large majority of libraries: provide access to job databases and other online resources (92.2 percent) and to civil service exam materials (77.1 percent); offer software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials (77.5 percent); and help patrons complete online job applications (76.0 percent).

Figure 31: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Challenges	Overall						Average
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	22.1% (n=2,587)	16.5% (n=1,932)	23.6% (n=2,759)	18.2% (n=2,135)	19.0% (n=2,230)	*	3.0 (n=11,643)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	26.8% (n=3,086)	23.5% (n=2,708)	20.4% (n=2,352)	16.9% (n=1,947)	11.8% (n=1,361)	*	2.6 (n=11,454)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	33.3% (n=3,946)	23.1% (n=2,744)	19.3% (n=2,285)	11.7% (n=1,388)	12.1% (n=1,435)	*	2.5 (n=11,798)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	42.1% (n=4,909)	25.9% (n=3,018)	17.5% (n=2,036)	8.5% (n=991)	5.3% (n=615)	*	2.1 (n=11,569)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	11.0% (n=1,323)	14.9% (n=1,788)	23.7% (n=2,837)	20.4% (n=2,448)	29.4% (n=3,521)	*	3.4 (n=11,917)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.7% (n=1,162)	19.9% (n=1,976)	26.7% (n=2,657)	20.8% (n=2,074)	20.5% (n=2,038)	*	3.2 (n=9,908)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	31.1% (n=3,465)	20.4% (n=2,271)	24.4% (n=2,726)	12.6% (n=1,408)	10.9% (n=1,220)	*	2.5 (n=11,090)
Other	7.2% (n=957)	3.8% (n=509)	2.1% (n=277)	*	1.4% (n=181)	84.8% (n=11,206)	2.0 (n=2,012)
Key: *: insufficient data to report							

Figure 31 shows the challenges that affect the ability of public libraries overall to provide job-seeking services to patrons. Once again, the greatest challenges reported were not having enough staff to meet patron needs (49.8 percent somewhat agree or strongly agree), followed by a lack of staff with the necessary expertise (41.3 percent somewhat agree or strongly agree), and an insufficient number of workstations (37.2 percent agree or strongly agree). Survey respondents consistently report these as the primary challenges to provide job-seeking services to patrons from year to year.

Figure 32: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Challenges	Urban Public Libraries						Average
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	13.5% (n=260)	10.3% (n=198)	25.9% (n=498)	22.7% (n=437)	27.3% (n=525)	*	3.4 (n=1,918)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	16.2% (n=290)	26.1% (n=468)	18.2% (n=326)	20.3% (n=363)	18.9% (n=338)	*	3.0 (n=1,785)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	30.4% (n=580)	25.3% (n=483)	17.6% (n=334)	8.8% (n=168)	17.5% (n=334)	*	2.6 (n=1,899)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	40.4% (n=792)	27.4% (n=538)	19.2% (n=375)	5.2% (n=102)	7.7% (n=151)	*	2.1 (n=1,958)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	12.2% (n=237)	17.0% (n=328)	24.1% (n=466)	17.1% (n=331)	29.2% (n=565)	*	3.3 (n=1,928)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.9% (n=191)	31.2% (n=504)	29.0% (n=467)	15.1% (n=244)	12.8% (n=206)	-	2.9 (n=1,612)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	31.6% (n=590)	17.6% (n=329)	32.4% (n=604)	10.6% (n=198)	7.3% (n=137)	*	2.4 (n=1,858)
Other	10.1% (n=214)	2.2% (n=47)	2.0 (n=42)	*	5.5% (n=116)	79.9% (n=1,698)	2.4 (n=428)

Key: *: insufficient data to report, - : No data to report

As in previous years, urban libraries rank the challenges to helping patrons meet their employment needs differently than that of libraries overall (see Figure 32). 50.0 percent either strongly or somewhat agree that the library does not have enough workstations to meet patron needs, an increase of 6.0 percent over last year's survey. 46.3 percent of urban libraries report that they do not have enough staff to meet patron job-seeking needs, making insufficient staff secondary to insufficient workstations. Once again, the third most significant challenge in urban libraries is workstation time limits (39.2 percent somewhat agree or strongly agree), which is reportedly less of a hurdle in suburban and rural libraries.

Figure 33: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Challenges	Suburban Public Libraries						Average
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	21.8% (n=839)	17.6% (n=675)	26.0% (n=1,001)	17.5% (n=673)	16.7% (n=642)	*	2.9 (n=3,829)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	24.5% (n=939)	24.3% (n=932)	20.5% (n=786)	18.9% (n=723)	11.2% (n=430)	*	2.7 (n=3,809)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	34.8% (n=1,375)	24.3% (n=958)	20.9% (n=823)	11.1% (n=439)	8.3% (n=327)	*	2.3 (n=3,922)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	43.8% (n=1,664)	28.0% (n=1,065)	14.6% (n=556)	7.9% (n=301)	4.5% (n=171)	1.1% (n=40)	2.0 (n=3,758)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	9.6% (n=382)	15.8% (n=627)	25.8% (n=1,026)	20.8% (n=828)	27.5% (n=1,092)	*	3.4 (n=3,954)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.6% (n=407)	21.4% (n=748)	28.6% (n=1,001)	20.6% (n=721)	17.1% (n=600)	*	3.1 (n=3,476)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	30.8% (n=1,139)	20.8% (n=769)	23.7% (n=877)	11.5% (n=425)	11.9% (n=441)	1.2% (n=43)	2.5 (n=3,651)
Other	6.6% (n=288)	3.2% (n=143)	1.1% (n=50)	*	*	88.3% (n=3,877)	1.7 (n=515)

Key: *: insufficient data to report

Figure 33 illustrates the challenges affecting suburban public libraries' job-seeking services, which mirror the responses from library branches overall. 48.3 percent either somewhat or strongly agree that they do not have enough staff to meet patron needs, followed 37.7 percent reporting that the staff does not have the necessary expertise to assist patrons in their job seeking efforts. 34.2 percent report that they do not have enough workstations to meet patron demand.

Figure 34: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

Challenges	Rural Public Libraries						Average
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	25.0% (n=1,488)	17.8% (n=1,060)	21.2% (n=1,261)	17.2% (n=1,025)	17.9% (n=1,063)	*	2.8 (n=5,897)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	31.6% (n=1,858)	22.3% (n=1,309)	21.1% (n=1,240)	14.6% (n=861)	10.1% (n=593)	*	2.5 (n=5,860)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	33.2% (n=1,992)	21.7% (n=1,302)	18.8% (n=1,127)	13.0% (n=781)	12.9% (n=775)	*	2.5 (n=5,978)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	41.5% (n=2,453)	24.0% (n=1,416)	18.7% (n=1,104)	9.9% (n=588)	5.0% (n=293)	*	2.1 (n=5,854)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	11.6% (n=704)	13.7% (n=833)	22.1% (n=1,345)	21.2% (n=1,288)	30.7% (n=1,864)	*	3.5 (n=6,035)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.6% (n=564)	15.0% (n=725)	24.5% (n=1,189)	22.9% (n=1,110)	25.4% (n=1,233)	*	3.4 (n=4,820)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	31.0% (n=1,735)	21.0% (n=1,173)	22.2% (n=1,245)	14.0% (n=785)	11.5% (n=643)	*	2.5 (n=5,581)
Other	6.8% (n=455)	4.8% (n=319)	2.8% (n=185)	*	*	84.0% (n=5,630)	2.0 (n=1,069)

Key: *: insufficient data to report

Figure 34 presents the challenges that affect the job-seeking services of rural public libraries. 51.9 percent report that they do not have enough staff to meet patron needs, followed by 48.3 percent who indicate that the staff does not have the necessary expertise to assist patrons with their employment-seeking needs, while 35.1 percent report that they have too few workstations. Rural and suburban libraries reported the same top three challenges during the 2010-2011 survey cycle.

System (Administrative) Level Findings

Participating libraries provided data regarding their applications for E-rate, operating budgets, and information technology budgets. This section of the report presents the analysis of these system (administrative) level data.

Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Replacement and Use

Figure 35: Public Access Workstation Replacement Procedure, by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
Replacement Procedure	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes, library has a replacement schedule	66.4% (n=335)	41.9% (n=1,244)	29.0% (n=1,552)	35.5% (n=3,132)
No (As Needed)	31.4% (n=159)	57.3% (n=1,702)	69.5% (n=3,718)	63.2% (n=5,578)
Don't Know	2.2% (n=11)	*	1.5% (n=78)	1.3% (n=114)
Weighted missing values, n=205				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

Overall, a majority of public libraries (63.2 percent) do not have replacement schedules and replace their workstations as needed (Figure 35). There is a stark difference between the replacement policy schedules between urban when compared by metropolitan status. The majority of urban libraries (57.3 percent) have an established replacement policy whereas a majority of rural libraries (69.5 percent) do not. The majority of suburban libraries (53.4 percent) had a replacement schedule in 2010-2011, but this decreased to 41.9 percent in 2011-2012.

Figure 36: Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status				
	Metropolitan Status			
Schedule	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Every year	1.4% (n=23)	1.2% (n=14)	4.1% (n=63)	2.6% (n=82)
Every 2 years	1.4% (n=5)	3.2% (n=39)	6.0% (n=93)	4.4% (n=137)
Every 3 years	25.9% (n=86)	22.8% (n=282)	29.1% (n=449)	26.2% (n=817)
Every 4 years	34.7% (n=116)	28.8% (n=357)	21.7% (n=335)	25.9% (n=808)
Every 5 years	29.9% (n=100)	34.0% (n=422)	28.1% (n=434)	30.6% (n=955)
Other	6.8% (n=23)	8.9% (n=252)	11.0% (n=170)	10.2% (n=318)
Weighted missing values, n=15				
Key: *: Insufficient data to report				

A majority of public libraries (82.7 percent) replace workstations every 3 to 5 years (Figure 36). This represents a slight decrease from last year, when 86.9 percent of public libraries replaced their computers every 3 to 5 years.

Figure 37: Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstations Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
Schedule	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
No, not able to maintain schedule	16.1% (n=52)	11.4% (n=136)	13.4% (n=200)	12.9% (n=388)
Yes, able to maintain schedule	28.0% (n=91)	32.8% (n=390)	30.7% (n=458)	31.2% (n=938)
Yes, but the library branch does not know how many workstations/laptops they will replace	53.1% (n=172)	52.1% (n=618)	47.5% (n=709)	49.9% (n=1,499)
Don't Know	2.8% (n=9)	3.6% (n=43)	8.4% (n=126)	5.9% (n=178)
The average number of workstations that the library plans to replace within the next year	70.5 (n=59)	21.6 (n=304)	8.4 (n=329)	19.5 (n=692)
Weighted missing values, n=128				

Of the 35.5 percent of public libraries with a replacement schedule (Figure 35), 12.9 percent do not have the ability to maintain their replacement schedule (Figure 37). An average of 19.5 public access workstations are scheduled to be replaced within the next year, substantial increase from the average number of scheduled replacements reported in the 2009-2010 survey (7.9).

Figure 38: Public Access Workstations Additions, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
Plans to add workstations	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes	22.3% (n=111)	13.4% (n=393)	14.6% (n=763)	14.6% (n=1,267)
No	53.2% (n=265)	58.2% (n=1,712)	58.4% (n=4,642)	58.1% (n=5,031)
Unsure at this time if adding workstations	22.7% (n=113)	23.8% (n=701)	21.5% (n=1,122)	22.3% (n=1,936)
Don't Know	-	*	1.3% (n=66)	1.0% (n=84)
Other	1.8% (n=9)	4.0% (n=118)	4.2% (n=221)	4.0% (n=348)
The average number of workstations that the library plans to add within the next year	41.8 (n=84)	7.3 (n=307)	5.1 (n=546)	9.0 (n=948)
Weighted missing values, n=363 Key: - : No data to report, *: Insufficient data to report				

The majority of public libraries (58.1 percent) do not plan to add public access workstations in the next year (Figure 38). The percentage of libraries that do plan to add workstations decreased from 22.7 percent in 2010-2011 to 14.6 percent this year, an even further decrease from 28.7 percent in 2009-2010. In a change from last year when more rural libraries reported plans to add workstations (24.4 percent) than urban (22.8 percent) and suburban (20.3 percent) libraries, 22.3 percent of urban libraries reported plans to add workstations this year, followed by 14.6 percent of rural libraries and 13.4 percent of suburban libraries.

Figure 39: Average Public Access Workstations Additions due to BTOP/BIP awards, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
Schedule	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Workstations added/replaced LAST year due to BTOP/BIP awards	84.3 (n=82)	13.8 (n=397)	7.1 (n=984)	13.1 (n=1,462)
Workstations added/replaced in the NEXT year due to BTOP/BIP awards	88.1 (n=50)	7.6 (n=154)	5.3 (n=455)	12.1 (n=658)

In a new question for this year's survey, 13.1 percent of libraries added or replaced computers with funding provided by the Broadband Initiative Program or Broadband Technologies Opportunities Program last year, while 12.1 percent plan to add or replace systems with such funds next year. While urban areas have the highest percentage of libraries participating in these programs, the majority of computer replacements or additions last year and next year are for suburban or rural areas.

Figure 40: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops

	Overall						
Factors	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	Average
Availability of Space	6.7% (n=594)	3.9% (n=346)	9.9% (n=874)	17.0% (n=1,508)	45.2% (n=4,003)	17.3% (n=1,534)	4.1 (n=7,325)
Cost Factors	4.5% (n=396)	4.1% (n=364)	11.1% (n=1,046)	21.1% (n=1,868)	56.8% (n=5,034)	1.7% (n=151)	4.2 (n=8,708)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	11.8% (n=1,006)	14.6% (n=1,248)	26.7% (n=2,285)	25.5% (n=2,177)	21.0% (n=1,798)	*	3.3 (n=8,514)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	15.2% (n=1,350)	16.9% (n=1,493)	26.8% (n=2,374)	20.2% (n=1,791)	17.4% (n=1,546)	3.4% (n=304)	3.1 (n=8,555)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	14.9% (n=1,317)	14.5% (n=1,287)	23.8% (n=2,108)	21.6% (n=1,917)	21.1% (n=1,866)	4.1% (n=365)	3.2 (n=8,494)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	18.2% (n=1,610)	14.4% (n=1,275)	21.2% (n=1,878)	19.3% (n=1,707)	21.9% (n=1,943)	5.0% (n=447)	3.1 (n=8,412)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	11.8% (n=1,048)	9.7% (n=861)	15.4% (n=1,366)	23.1% (n=2,047)	36.8% (n=3,265)	3.1% (n=273)	3.7 (n=8,587)
Other	6.1% (n=96)	4.6% (n=72)	11.6% (n=183)	23.1% (n=364)	50.4% (n=796)	67.7% (n=832)	4.1 (n=1,512)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

The three most important factors influencing the addition of public library workstations continue to be cost (77.9 percent when factoring important and most important), space (62.2 percent when factoring important and most important), and availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure (55.9 percent when factoring important and most important) (Figure 40).

Figure 41: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops

Factors	Urban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
Availability of Space	5.4% (n=27)	2.7% (n=14)	13.5% (n=68)	21.2% (n=106)	38.7% (n=195)	18.5% (n=93)	4.0 (n=410)
Cost Factors	1.8% (n=9)	6.3% (n=32)	17.1% (n=86)	21.6% (n=109)	51.4% (n=258)	1.8% (n=9)	4.2 (n=494)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	11.0% (n=54)	20.1% (n=100)	25.1% (n=125)	22.4% (n=111)	20.1% (n=100)	1.4% (n=7)	3.2 (n=489)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	15.8% (n=79)	21.2% (n=106)	26.6% (n=134)	22.5% (n=113)	11.7% (n=59)	2.3% (n=11)	2.9 (n=492)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	14.0% (n=70)	18.5% (n=93)	24.3% (n=122)	24.8% (n=125)	16.2% (n=82)	2.3% (n=11)	3.1 (n=492)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	21.6% (n=109)	15.3% (n=77)	17.1% (n=86)	24.3% (n=122)	16.7% (n=84)	5.0% (n=25)	3.0 (n=478)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	7.2% (n=36)	14.9% (n=75)	17.1% (n=86)	25.2% (n=127)	34.2% (n=172)	1.4% (n=7)	3.7 (n=496)
Other	7.3% (n=7)	2.4% (n=2)	19.5% (n=18)	17.1% (n=16)	51.2% (n=48)	2.4% (n=2)	4.1 (n=91)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

Figure 42: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops

	Suburban Public Libraries						
Factors	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	Average
Availability of Space	6.4% (n=193)	4.9% (n=147)	9.5% (n=286)	18.1% (n=543)	49.6% (n=1,487)	11.4% (n=343)	4.1 (n=2,656)
Cost Factors	4.5% (n=136)	4.3% (n=129)	11.0% (n=329)	22.8% (n=683)	55.9% (n=1,677)	1.5% (n=46)	4.2 (n=2,953)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	12.9% (n=368)	15.3% (n=436)	27.2% (n=776)	25.0% (n=711)	19.1% (n=543)	*	3.2 (n=2,835)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	15.9% (n=475)	17.5% (n=526)	27.5% (n=826)	19.0% (n=568)	16.6% (n=497)	3.6% (n=107)	3.0 (n=2,892)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	15.1% (n=454)	14.8% (n=443)	23.1% (n=694)	21.5% (n=644)	19.3% (n=579)	6.2% (n=186)	3.2 (n=2,814)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	19.5% (n=586)	15.5% (n=465)	21.3% (n=640)	16.9% (n=508)	19.9% (n=597)	6.8% (n=204)	3.0 (n=2,796)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	10.0% (n=300)	10.8% (n=325)	15.1% (n=454)	23.2% (n=697)	37.2% (n=1,115)	3.6% (n=107)	3.7 (n=2,892)
Other	4.6% (n=18)	6.5% (n=25)	10.2% (n=39)	25.9% (n=100)	44.4% (n=172)	8.3% (n=32)	4.1 (n=354)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important Key: *: Insufficient data to report							

Figure 43: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops

	Rural Public Libraries						
Factors	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	Average
Availability of Space	7.0% (n=374)	3.5% (n=185)	9.7% (n=520)	16.0% (n=858)	43.3% (n=2,321)	20.5% (n=1,098)	4.1 (n=4,259)
Cost Factors	4.7% (n=251)	3.8% (n=203)	11.8% (n=631)	20.1% (n=1,077)	57.8% (n=3,099)	1.8% (n=96)	4.3 (n=5,261)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	11.2% (n=583)	13.7% (n=712)	26.6% (n=1,385)	26.0% (n=1,355)	22.2% (n=1,155)	*	3.3 (n=5,189)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	14.9% (n=796)	16.1% (n=861)	26.4% (n=1,415)	20.7% (n=1,110)	18.5% (n=990)	3.5% (n=185)	3.1 (n=5,171)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	14.8% (n=793)	14.0% (n=751)	24.1% (n=1,292)	21.4% (n=1,149)	22.5% (n=1,205)	3.1% (n=167)	3.2 (n=5,139)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	17.1% (n=915)	13.7% (n=733)	21.5% (n=1,152)	20.1% (n=1,077)	23.6% (n=1,262)	4.1% (n=218)	3.6 (n=5,198)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	13.3% (n=712)	8.6% (n=461)	15.4% (n=826)	22.8% (n=1,223)	36.9% (n=1,977)	3.0% (n=159)	3.6 (n=5,198)
Other	6.5% (n=72)	4.1% (n=45)	11.4% (n=126)	22.6% (n=248)	52.4% (n=577)	3.0% (n=33)	4.1 (n=1,068)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important Key: *: Insufficient data to report							

Figure 44: Sources of IT Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status

Source of IT Support	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Public service staff	41.7% (n=211)	45.5% (n=1,366)	32.8% (n=1,759)	37.6% (n=3,335)
Library director	10.8% (n=54)	40.8% (n=1,223)	59.5% (n=3,194)	50.4% (n=4,471)
Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	36.3% (n=183)	25.1% (n=754)	10.9% (n=586)	17.2% (n=1,524)
System-level IT staff	58.3% (n=294)	28.6% (n=858)	18.2% (n=975)	24.0% (n=2,128)
Library consortia or other library organization	13.0% (n=66)	24.8% (n=744)	17.3% (n=930)	19.6% (n=1,739)
County/City IT staff	34.5% (n=174)	19.5% (n=586)	9.9% (n=529)	14.5% (n=1,290)
State telecommunications network staff	2.7% (n=14)	2.7% (n=82)	3.0% (n=159)	2.9% (n=254)
State library IT staff	4.0% (n=20)	6.9% (n=207)	9.9% (n=532)	8.6% (n=760)
Outside vendor/contractor	19.3% (n=97)	34.2% (n=1,026)	42.8% (n=2,297)	38.5% (n=3,421)
Volunteer(s)	2.7% (n=14)	7.0% (n=211)	16.3% (n=876)	12.4% (n=1,101)
Other source	1.3% (n=7)	6.0% (n=179)	6.1% (n=329)	5.8% (n=515)
Key: *: Insufficient data to report				

Sources of information technology (IT) support used by public library outlets (Figure 44) continue to indicate that non-IT specialists are providing the majority of support services (88.0 percent), a large increase from the 70.7 percent reported in the 2010-2011 survey. In urban (41.7 percent) and suburban (45.5 percent) libraries, public service staffs are providing most of this type of support, while rural libraries depend more on library directors (59.5 percent). The metropolitan variation has as much to do with overall staffing in rural libraries compared with larger suburban and urban libraries. There are large metropolitan discrepancies for system-level IT staff as a source of IT support: urban (58.3 percent), suburban (40.8 percent), and rural (18.2 percent). Outside vendors/contractors are another important source (38.5 percent), particularly for rural libraries (42.8 percent).

Social Media and Mobile Technologies

Figure 45: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies

	Overall Public Libraries	
	Internal Library Use (e.g., staff training, development, communication)	External Library Use (e.g., communicating with library users, general publics, marketing)
Social Media Technologies		
Communication (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter)	21.6% (n=1,546)	45.6% (n=3,256)
Social networking (e.g., Facebook, hi5)	25.4% (n=1,816)	70.7% (n=5,052)
Collaboration (e.g., PBWorks, Wetpaint)	12.3% (n=878)	8.2% (n=585)
Bookmarking (e.g., CiteULike, Delicious, GoogleReader)	14.9% (n=1,067)	8.1% (n=577)
News (e.g., Digg, Mixx, Newsvine)	6.4% (n=455)	6.0% (n=428)
Video Sharing (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Openfilm)	16.1% (n=1,149)	27.5% (n=1,966)
Photography (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr)	20.6% (n=1,475)	37.3% (n=2,665)
Location (e.g., Foursquare, Facebook places)	10.6% (n=757)	19.0% (n=1,360)
Events (e.g., Meetup.com, Eventful)	13.0% (n=930)	14.9% (n=1,068)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive		

Figure 45 shows that the majority of public libraries now use some form of social media to connect with external publics. The most prevalent of these technologies is social media sites such as Facebook, which are used by 70.7 percent of public libraries in general, 78.4 percent of urban libraries, 78.6 of suburban libraries, and 64.9 percent of rural libraries. However, social media has not been embraced as much for internal communication, with only 25.4 percent of libraries using social networking services for this form of communication.

Figure 46: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies

	Urban Public Libraries	
	Internal Library Use (e.g., staff training, development, communication)	External Library Use (e.g., communicating with library users, general publics, marketing)
Social Media Technologies		
Communication (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter)	38.9% (n=183)	73.6% (n=347)
Social networking (e.g., Facebook, hi5)	26.4% (n=125)	78.4% (n=369)
Collaboration (e.g., PBWorks, Wetpaint)	22.6% (n=106)	14.4% (n=68)
Bookmarking (e.g., CiteULike, Delicious, GoogleReader)	19.7% (n=93)	11.1% (n=52)
News (e.g., Digg, Mixx, Newsvine)	8.2% (n=39)	8.7% (n=41)
Video Sharing (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Openfilm)	26.4% (n=125)	49.0% (n=231)
Photography (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr)	29.8% (n=140)	57.2% (n=270)
Location (e.g., Foursquare, Facebook places)	12.0% (n=57)	27.9% (n=131)
Events (e.g., Meetup.com, Eventful)	13.9% (n=66)	18.8% (n=88)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive		

Figure 47: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies

	Suburban Public Libraries	
	Internal Library Use (e.g., staff training, development, communication)	External Library Use (e.g., communicating with library users, general publics, marketing)
Social Media Technologies		
Communication (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter)	23.9% (n=611)	54.3% (n=1,387)
Social networking (e.g., Facebook, hi5)	23.9% (n=611)	78.6% (n=2,009)
Collaboration (e.g., PBWorks, Wetpaint)	15.7% (n=400)	7.1% (n=182)
Bookmarking (e.g., CiteULike, Delicious, GoogleReader)	15.5% (n=397)	7.6% (n=193)
News (e.g., Digg, Mixx, Newsvine)	5.2% (n=132)	3.9% (n=100)
Video Sharing (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Openfilm)	16.1% (n=411)	33.7% (n=862)
Photography (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr)	21.0% (n=536)	39.3% (n=1,005)
Location (e.g., Foursquare, Facebook places)	8.7% (n=222)	19.9% (n=508)
Events (e.g., Meetup.com, Eventful)	15.0% (n=383)	17.6% (n=450)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive		

Figure 48: Public Library Systems Use of Social Media Technologies

	Rural Public Libraries	
	Internal Library Use (e.g., staff training, development, communication)	External Library Use (e.g., communicating with library users, general publics, marketing)
Social Media Technologies		
Communication (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter)	18.2% (n=751)	37.0% (n=1,522)
Social networking (e.g., Facebook, hi5)	26.2% (n=1,080)	64.9% (n=2,674)
Collaboration (e.g., PBWorks, Wetpaint)	14.0% (n=577)	8.1% (n=335)
Bookmarking (e.g., CiteULike, Delicious, GoogleReader)	6.9% (n=284)	8.1% (n=332)
News (e.g., Digg, Mixx, Newsvine)	38.4% (n=1,777)	7.0% (n=287)
Video Sharing (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Openfilm)	14.9% (n=613)	21.2% (n=873)
Photography (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr)	19.4% (n=799)	33.8% (n=1,391)
Location (e.g., Foursquare, Facebook places)	11.6% (n=479)	17.5% (n=721)
Events (e.g., Meetup.com, Eventful)	11.7% (n=482)	12.9% (n=529)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive		

Figure 49: Public Library Systems that Make Use of Mobile Technology

Mobile Technologies	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The library's website is optimized for mobile device access	36.1% (n=177)	19.3% (n=526)	9.3% (n=464)	14.2% (n=1,166)
The library has developed smartphone apps for access to library services and content	27.8% (n=136)	9.7% (n=265)	3.7% (n=185)	7.2% (n=586)
The library uses scanned codes for access to library services and content	31.9% (n=156)	17.8% (n=486)	6.5% (n=323)	11.8% (n=966)
Library does not make use of mobile technologies	35.2% (n=172)	61.9% (n=1,687)	82.3% (n=4,089)	72.7% (n=5,948)
Other	8.3% (n=41)	6.7% (n=182)	2.8% (n=138)	4.4% (n=361)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

Public libraries are slowly beginning to adopt mobile web services. The majority of public libraries (72.7 percent) do not make use of such technologies, but urban libraries have shown greater progress than suburban and rural libraries. 36.1 percent of urban libraries have optimized their websites for mobile device access, while only 19.3 percent of suburban libraries and 9.3 percent of rural libraries have done so.

E-Rate Application Data

Figure 50: Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount				
	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes, applied	58.9% (n=299)	32.4% (n=972)	44.6% (n=2,396)	41.3% (n=3,667)
Yes, another organization applied on the library's behalf	11.2% (n=57)	22.8% (n=683)	14.5% (n=781)	17.1% (n=1,520)
No, did not apply	27.2% (n=138)	40.6% (n=1,219)	36.5% (n=1,959)	37.4% (n=3,316)
Unsure	2.7% (n=14)	4.2% (n=125)	4.4% (n=236)	4.2% (n=375)
Weighted missing values, n=150				

Figure 50 shows that 58.4 percent of libraries report applying for an E-rate discount, whether directly (41.3 percent) or as part of another organization's application (17.1 percent), an increase from 2010-2011 (54.4 percent). As with last year, the highest percentage libraries applied that for E-rate discounts were in urban areas (70.1 percent), followed by rural (59.1 percent) and suburban (55.2 percent) libraries.

Figure 51: Reasons Public Library Systems Did Not Apply for E-Rate Discounts

Reasons	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The E-rate application process is too complicated	39.3% (n=54)	32.9% (n=390)	35.0% (n=673)	34.5% (n=1,117)
The library staff did not feel that the library would qualify	14.8% (n=20)	16.6% (n=197)	14.8% (n=284)	15.5% (n=501)
Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate in the program	37.7% (n=52)	32.0% (n=379)	31.9% (n=613)	32.2% (n=1,044)
The library receives E-rate discounts as part of a consortium, so therefore does not apply individually	8.2% (n=11)	10.6% (n=125)	4.0% (n=78)	6.6% (n=214)
The library was denied funding in the past and thus is discouraged from applying in subsequent years	1.6% (n=2)	2.1% (n=25)	2.2% (n=42)	2.1% (n=69)
The library did not apply because of the need to comply with CIPA's (Children's Internet Protection Act) filtering requirements	44.3% (n=61)	29.6% (n=350)	27.7% (n=532)	29.1% (n=944)
The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	8.2% (n=11)	6.6% (n=79)	8.6% (n=165)	7.9% (n=254)
Other	18.0% (n=25)	18.7% (n=222)	27.4% (n=526)	23.8% (n=773)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

Figure 51 shows the reasons that 41.6 percent (Figure 50) of public library systems did not apply for E-rate discounts. The top three reasons reported were that the E-rate application process is too complicated (34.5 percent), the E-rate discount is low and not worth the time needed to participate (32.2 percent), and the library did not comply with CIPA filtering requirements (29.1 percent). In urban libraries the ranking is slightly differing, with CIPA compliance (44.3 percent) being reported above the complicated application process (39.3 percent) and the low discount amount (37.7 percent).

Figure 52: Public Library Systems Receiving an E-Rate Discount by Category

E-Rate Categories	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Internet Connectivity	75.0% (n=258)	57.9% (n=944)	61.5% (n=1,899)	61.3% (n=3,101)
Telecommunications services	85.4% (n=304)	82.2% (n=1,341)	85.7% (n=2,644)	84.7% (n=4,288)
Internal connections cost	18.5% (n=66)	8.8% (n=143)	8.5% (n=263)	9.3% (n=472)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

The percentage of public library systems receiving E-rate discounts by category are shown in Figure 52. The highest percentage of discounts were received in the telecommunications category, both overall (84.7 percent) and in urban (85.4 percent), suburban (82.2 percent), and rural (85.7 percent) libraries, which is consistent with the findings from 2010-2011. The biggest change was seen in discounts for Internet

connectivity in suburban libraries, which increased to 61.3 percent this year from 57.3 percent last year and 49.8 the year before.

Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP)

Figure 53: Public Library Systems Applying for a National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) award(s) in either Wave I or Wave II, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Did not apply	46.6% (n=236)	50.1% (n=1,498)	44.5% (n=2,372)	46.5% (n=4,105)
Yes, applied directly	25.1% (n=127)	15.4% (n=461)	19.2% (n=1,026)	18.3% (n=1,614)
Yes, library was included in an application submitted by another entity	21.1% (n=106)	22.1% (n=661)	21.3% (n=1,137)	21.6% (n=1,904)
Don't Know	7.1% (n=36)	12.4% (n=371)	15.0% (n=799)	13.7% (n=1,207)

Weighted missing values, n=198

This was the second year that the survey asked libraries about application for BTOP and BIP programs (Figure 53), but with the addition of asking libraries about the successful receipt of BTOP and BIP grants. 38.9 percent of libraries reported applying this year (18.3 percent directly, 21.6 percent included in another entity's application), which is a decrease from 45 percent last year. Application was highest in urban libraries (46.2 percent), followed by rural (40.5 percent) and suburban (47.5 percent) libraries.

Figure 54: BTOP and BIP Applications by Type

Application Type	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Public computer center	68.4% (n=88)	36.9% (n=222)	38.2% (n=488)	39.7% (n=798)
Sustainable broadband	10.5% (n=14)	10.1% (n=61)	13.1% (n=167)	12.1% (n=242)
Broadband infrastructure (e.g., middle mile)	12.3% (n=16)	11.3% (n=68)	9.4% (n=120)	10.1% (n=203)
State Broadband and Data Development (SBDD)	3.5% (n=5)	8.3% (n=50)	2.8% (n=36)	4.5% (n=90)
Don't know	21.1% (n=27)	48.8% (n=293)	48.9% (n=625)	47.1% (n=945)
Other	16.1% (n=23)	16.2% (n=114)	10.4% (n=147)	12.6% (n=284)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

The types of BTOP and BIP applications submitted and received by public library systems are shown in Figure 54. The highest percentage of applications were submitted for public computer centers (39.7

percent), which is a notable increase from 29.6 percent last year. This is followed by sustainable broadband (12.1 percent), Sustainable Broadband (12.1 percent), and middle mile (10.1 percent). Urban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for public computer centers (68.4 percent) and middle mile (12.3 percent), while rural libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for sustainable broadband (13.1 percent) and suburban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for SBDD (8.3 percent).

Public Library Operating Budget Details: Funding, Staffing, Hours, & Expenditures

Figure 55: FY2012 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources				
Sources of Funding	FY2012 by Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	97.3% (n=487)	94.8% (n=2,803)	93.6% (n=4,974)	94.2% (n=8,264)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	83.7% (n=419)	72.9% (n=2,156)	72.5% (n=3,849)	73.3% (n=6,424)
Federal (e.g., LSTA, E-rate discounts)	76.5% (n=383)	52.6% (n=1,555)	58.2% (n=3,093)	57.4% (n=5,031)
Fees/fines	82.8% (n=414)	78.4% (n=2,317)	70.3% (n=3,733)	73.7% (n=6,464)
Donations/local fundraising	88.2% (n=442)	87.9% (n=2,599)	82.8% (n=4,397)	84.8% (n=7,437)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	59.7% (n=299)	39.5% (n=1,169)	40.1% (n=2,133)	41.1% (n=3,601)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	60.2% (n=301)	37.6% (n=1,112)	42.7% (n=2,270)	42.0% (n=3,683)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				

Figure 56: FY2013 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources

Sources of Funding	FY2013 by Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	94.6% (n=473)	87.7% (n=2,592)	83.8% (n=4,451)	85.7% (n=7,516)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	76.0% (n=381)	65.4% (n=1,934)	64.6% (n=3,431)	65.5% (n=5,745)
Federal (e.g., LSTA, E-rate discounts)	75.6% (n=378)	46.8% (n=1,384)	53.4% (n=2,838)	52.5% (n=4,600)
Fees/fines	76.9% (n=385)	68.7% (n=2,031)	59.9% (n=3,182)	63.8% (n=5,598)
Donations/local fundraising	84.6% (n=424)	79.8% (n=2,360)	72.9% (n=3,873)	75.9% (n=6,656)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	52.5% (n=263)	35.9% (n=1,062)	34.3% (n=1,822)	35.9% (n=3,146)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	53.8% (n=270)	33.4% (n=987)	38.5% (n=2,046)	37.7% (n=3,302)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				

Local and county government funds represent the most common source of funding for public libraries in all geographic areas (94.2 percent), followed by donations and local fundraising (84.8 percent). Urban libraries receive funding from more varied sources than public libraries in other geographic areas. This is particularly noticeable in measures of federal funds, with 75.6 percent of urban libraries receiving such funding versus 53.4 percent of rural libraries and 46.8 percent of suburban libraries.

Figure 57: FY2012 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	1.9% (n=9)	1.6% (n=46)	2.5% (n=132)	2.2% (n=187)
Increased 6.1-10%	*	3.3% (n=97)	2.3% (n=120)	2.6% (n=221)
Increased 4.1-6%	3.8% (n=18)	3.6% (n=104)	4.5% (n=236)	4.1% (n=358)
Increased 2.1-4%	8.1% (n=39)	7.1% (n=207)	13.7% (n=718)	13.7% (n=1,185)
Increased up to 2%	14.2% (n=68)	21.3% (n=622)	20.8% (n=1,089)	20.6% (n=1,799)
Stayed the same	25.6% (n=122)	23.3% (n=679)	33.7% (n=1,765)	29.7% (n=2,566)
Decreased up to 2%	13.3% (n=63)	8.7% (n=254)	7.9% (n=413)	8.5% (n=730)
Decreased 2.1-4%	11.4% (n=54)	7.1% (n=207)	5.0% (n=260)	6.0% (n=522)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.2% (n=29)	6.1% (n=179)	3.0% (n=159)	4.2% (n=367)
Decreased 6.1-10%	10.9% (n=52)	5.2% (n=150)	3.5% (n=185)	4.5% (n=388)
Decreased more than 10%	3.8% (n=18)	5.0% (n=147)	3.2% (n=167)	3.8% (n=332)

Weighted missing values, n=394
Key: * : Insufficient data to report

Figure 57 shows the changes to public library system's operating budgets in 2012. In the 2010-2011 survey, libraries anticipated that 35.1 percent of budgets would increase, 39.6 percent would stay the same and 20.1 percent would decrease in 2012. In fact, 43.2 percent of library system's 2012 operating budgets increased, 29.7 percent stayed the same and 27.0 percent decreased. Rural libraries saw the largest increase in their 2012 budgets (43.8 percent), while urban libraries saw the largest decrease (45.6 percent).

Figure 58: FY2013 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	1.0% (n=5)	*	1.1% (n=54)	1.0% (n=80)
Increased 6.1-10%	*	1.1% (n=29)	1.6% (n=78)	1.4% (n=109)
Increased 4.1-6%	1.0% (n=5)	2.7% (n=72)	4.3% (n=206)	3.6% (n=282)
Increased 2.1-4%	11.1% (n=50)	12.0% (n=318)	11.6% (n=559)	11.7% (n=927)
Increased up to 2%	11.6% (n=52)	20.9% (n=554)	20.2% (n=975)	19.9% (n=1,581)
Stayed the same	40.7% (n=183)	33.5% (n=887)	43.8% (n=2,121)	40.2% (n=3,191)
Decreased up to 2%	8.5% (n=39)	8.4% (n=222)	5.7% (n=275)	6.7% (n=535)
Decreased 2.1-4%	7.5% (n=34)	6.9% (n=182)	3.8% (n=182)	5.0% (n=399)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.0% (n=27)	7.0% (n=186)	2.5% (n=120)	4.2% (n=333)
Decreased 6.1-10%	9.5% (n=43)	3.8% (n=100)	3.3% (n=162)	3.8% (n=305)
Decreased more than 10%	2.5% (n=11)	2.8% (n=75)	2.2% (n=105)	2.4% (n=191)
Weighted missing values, n=1,096				
Key: *: Insufficient data to report				

The anticipated changes to public library system's 2013 operating budgets are presented in Figure 58. Overall, 37.6 percent of libraries anticipate an increased budget in 2013, while 40.2 percent anticipate no change, and 22.1 percent anticipate decreases.

Figure 59: For Current Fiscal Year, Percentage of Public Library Systems that anticipate changes to its total operating budget

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Remain unchanged	60.2% (n=294)	64.1% (n=1,952)	61.4% (n=3,350)	64.4% (n=5,596)
Decrease	22.7% (n=111)	17.0% (n=518)	14.5% (n=790)	16.3% (n=1,419)
Increase	8.8% (n=43)	9.9% (n=300)	13.9% (n=760)	12.7% (n=1,103)
Don't Know	8.3% (n=41)	4.6% (n=139)	7.1% (n=386)	6.5% (n=566)
Weighted missing values, n=344				

Figure 59 shows the changes to public library systems' current fiscal year budget, anticipated or already experienced. Fewer systems reported decreases this year (16.3 percent) than last year (20.9 percent), but the percentage reporting increases changed only slightly between this year (12.7 percent) and last year (11.3 percent). This year all types of libraries anticipated less decreases in funding, with 22.7 percent of urban libraries, 17.0 percent of suburban libraries, and 14.5 percent of rural libraries expecting funding cuts. This is compared to 27.5 percent of urban libraries, 23.2 percent of suburban libraries, and 19.0 percent of rural libraries expecting budget decreases last year.

Figure 60: Public Library Systems Cumulative Budget Change Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 40%	*	1.0% (n=29)	*	*
Increased 35.1-40%	1.4% (n=7)	*	*	*
Increased 30.1-35%	*	*	*	*
Increased 25.1-30%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Increased 20.1-25%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Increased 15.1-20%	3.4% (n=16)	1.5% (n=43)	1.6% (n=84)	1.7% (n=143)
Increased 10.1-15%	4.3% (n=20)	3.4% (n=97)	3.5% (n=179)	3.5% (n=296)
Increased 6.1-10%	5.8% (n=27)	5.4% (n=150)	5.3% (n=269)	5.3% (n=447)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.3% (n=20)	7.7% (n=214)	7.1% (n=362)	7.1% (n=597)
Increased 2.1-4%	6.7% (n=32)	15.2% (n=425)	14.7% (n=751)	14.4% (n=1,208)
Increased up to 2%	10.6% (n=50)	17.9% (n=500)	24.0% (n=1,223)	21.2% (n=1,774)
Stayed the same	7.2% (n=34)	8.6% (n=240)	15.2% (n=775)	12.5% (n=1,048)
Decreased up to 2%	13.9% (n=66)	8.4% (n=236)	9.5% (n=482)	9.4% (n=783)
Decreased 2.1-4%	9.6% (n=45)	7.3% (n=204)	5.2% (n=266)	6.2% (n=515)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.7% (n=32)	5.6% (n=157)	2.8% (n=144)	4.0% (n=333)
Decreased 6.1-10%	6.7% (n=32)	5.1% (n=143)	2.9% (n=147)	3.8% (n=321)
Decreased 10.1-15%	5.3% (n=25)	4.7% (n=132)	2.4% (n=123)	3.3% (n=280)
Decreased 15.1-20%	3.4% (n=16)	1.9% (n=54)	*	1.3% (n=111)
Decreased 20.1-25%	3.4% (n=16)	1.8% (n=50)	*	1.3% (n=105)
Decreased 25.1-30%	1.4% (n=7)	1.3% (n=36)	*	1.0% (n=81)
Decreased 30.1-35%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Decreased 35.1-40%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Decreased more than 40%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*

Weighted missing values, n=667

Key: *: Insufficient data to report

The majority of public library budgets were stable in over the last three years, with 63.7 percent either staying the same or changing by no more than 4 percent (Figure 60). However, urban libraries faced the highest number of budget decreases, with 53.4 percent having budget reductions. By comparison, only 37.5 percent of suburban libraries and 26.2 percent of rural libraries faced budget cuts in the same fiscal year.

Figure 61: Public Library Systems Cumulative Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Remained unchanged	10.7% (n=29)	46.5% (n=672)	65.3% (n=1,612)	55.2% (n=2,314)
Decreased	60.7% (n=168)	28.0% (n=404)	16.2% (n=401)	23.2% (n=972)
Increased	10.7% (n=29)	12.9% (n=186)	6.9% (n=170)	9.2% (n=386)
Unable to report	18.0% (n=50)	12.6% (n=182)	11.5% (n=284)	12.3% (n=516)
Out of Libraries that Reported an Increase or Decrease				
Decrease due to permanent FTE reductions	75.7% (n=120)	75.0% (n=290)	67.2% (n=251)	71.9% (n=661)
Increase due to new permanent FTE positions	80.0% (n=18)	76.7% (n=118)	72.9% (n=105)	75.3% (n=241)
Other	8.3% (n=32)	14.8% (n=225)	20.1% (n=371)	16.7% (n=628)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				
Weighted missing values, n=4,840				

More than half (55.2 percent) of public libraries remained at the same level of staffing over the last three years as evidenced by Figure 61. However, this situation varied greatly by geographic region. 60.7 percent of urban libraries dealt with decreases in Full Time Equivalent staff, and 75.7 percent of these libraries reported staffing reductions due to permanent eliminations of these positions. By comparison, only 28.0 percent of suburban libraries and 16.2 percent of rural libraries faced FTE staff reductions.

Figure 62: Public Library Systems Cumulative Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
Hours Open	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Remain unchanged	32.0% (n=111)	58.7% (n=1,308)	62.2% (n=2,471)	59.4% (n=3,890)
Decreased	40.5% (n=140)	26.2% (n=583)	17.2% (n=682)	21.5% (n=1,405)
Increased	20.3% (n=70)	13.0% (n=290)	17.2% (n=682)	15.9% (n=1,042)
Unable to report	7.2% (n=25)	2.1% (n=46)	3.5% (n=141)	3.2% (n=212)
Out of Libraries that Reported an Increase or Decrease				
Decrease due to closure of branches	8.6% (n=11)	*	*	1.2% (n=14)
Decrease due to reduction in staff	58.6% (n=77)	45.1% (n=229)	36.9% (n=206)	42.7% (n=512)
Decrease due to budget reduction	82.8% (n=109)	80.3% (n=408)	75.9% (n=425)	78.5% (n=941)
Increase due to increase in staff	26.9% (n=16)	36.0% (n=64)	24.1% (n=96)	27.7% (n=176)
Increase due to new branches opening	69.2% (n=41)	22.0% (n=39)	18.0% (n=72)	23.9% (n=152)
Increase due to budget increase	15.4% (n=9)	48.0% (n=86)	39.1% (n=156)	39.4% (n=250)
Other	13.8% (n=36)	19.2% (n=182)	24.8% (n=359)	21.7% (n=577)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				
Weighted missing values, n=2480				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

While the majority of public libraries (59.4 percent) did not increase or decrease the number of hours they were open over the last three years, slightly more decreased their hours (21.5 percent) than increased (15.9 percent) as shown in Figure 62. Reductions in hours were most noticeable in urban libraries, with 40.5 percent decreasing their hours versus 26.2 percent of suburban and 17.2 percent of rural libraries reducing their operational hours. For all libraries, the majority of these reductions (78.5 percent) were due to budget cuts.

Figure 63: Public Library Systems Mean Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Three Years Ago (mean)	149.0 (n=254)	21.7 (n=1,358)	6.1 (n=2,318)	20.7 (n=3,930)
Today (mean)	133.6 (n=249)	21.0 (n=1,348)	6.0 (n=2,333)	19.2 (n=3,930)

Weighted missing values, n=5,098
Note: FTEs are reported across all branches, if applicable, for a library system.

Figure 63 shows the mean changes in Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) in libraries over the last three years. Libraries overall reported a slight decrease in FTEs, with an average of 20.7 three years ago as compared to an average of 19.2 today (reported as of November 2011). The largest reported decrease in FTEs over the three year period is in urban libraries, which reported an average of 149.0 FTEs three years ago as compared to an average of 133.6 as of November 2011. Rural and suburban libraries reported nearly the same average number of FTEs in November 2011 as compared to three years prior to that.

Figure 64: Public Library Systems Mean Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Three Years Ago (mean)	10,960.2 (n=328)	1,969.2 (n=2,199)	1,121.2 (n=3,912)	1,912.5 (n=6,439)
Today (mean)	10,894.4 (n=340)	1,914.5 (n=2,209)	1,107.9 (n=3,897)	1,900.2 (n=6,439)

Weighted missing values, n=2,589
Note: Hours are reported across all branches, if applicable, for a library system on an annual basis.

As shown in Figure 64, the average number of hours open by libraries decreased slightly in the three years prior to November 2011. In November 2011, libraries reported an overall average number of hours open per year of 1,900.2, as compared to 1,912.5 three years ago. The largest drop in hours open occurred in Urban libraries with a reported average drop of 65.8 hours. This was followed by Suburban libraries with a reported average drop of 54.7 hours, Rural libraries with a reported average drop of 13.3 hours.

Figure 65: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$7,136,475.28 (n=408)	\$1,264,236.49 (n=2,460)	\$270,670.18 (n=4,247)	\$1,007,608.78 (n=7,115)
Collections	\$1,263,487.25 (n=410)	\$224,049.88 (n=2,392)	\$50,915.45 (n=4,092)	\$183,100.26 (n=6,893)
Other expenditures (including contractual services)	\$2,571,809.27 (n=396)	\$405,092.65 (n=2,317)	\$104,602.77 (n=3,987)	\$354,462.38 (n=6,700)

Expenditures for libraries varied significantly by geographic classification, with the average urban library system spending more than twenty-five times as much in FY2011-FY2012 than its rural counterpart (see Figure 65). However, in all cases salaries and benefits accounted for most of these expenditures, with these costs being 65.1 percent for urban libraries, 66.7 percent for suburban libraries, and 63.5 percent for rural libraries.

Figure 66: FY2013 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$7,198,951.34 (n=285)	\$1,230,278.13 (n=1,634)	\$250,763.86 (n=3,254)	\$943,396.91 (n=5,173)
Collections	\$1,284,130.77 (n=283)	\$225,902.71 (n=1,605)	\$48,434.00 (n=3,141)	\$174,650.72 (n=5,029)
Other expenditures (including contractual services)	\$2,634,389.06 (n=274)	\$427,041.73 (n=1,544)	\$98,757.61 (n=3,045)	\$345,900.31 (n=4,863)

When compared to actual expenditures in FY2011-2012 (Figure 66), libraries in all three geographic classifications anticipated expenditure decreases for FY2012-2013. However, the highest of these anticipated decreases is 6.4 percent for urban libraries, followed by 4.6 percent for suburban libraries and 2.4 percent for rural libraries.

Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures

Figure 67: Public Library System Payment of Technology Expenditures, by Metropolitan Status

Financial Support	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The library pays directly for ALL of its technology costs	59.0% (n=267)	54.5% (n=1,484)	55.0% (n=2,713)	55.1% (n=4,464)
The library pays directly for SOME of its technology costs	36.5% (n=165)	35.9% (n=976)	38.3% (n=1,890)	37.4% (n=3,032)
The library does not pay directly for any of its technology costs	4.5% (n=20)	9.6% (n=261)	6.7% (n=329)	7.5% (n=610)
Weighted missing values, n=923				

Figure 67 shows that the majority of public library systems (54.6 percent) pay for all of their own technology costs, which is consistent with last year's findings. 37.4 percent of libraries either receive some assistance paying their technology costs or have all of these expenditures paid by another government agency or outside entity (7.5 percent). The highest percentage of libraries paying for all of their own technology costs are in urban areas (59.0 percent).

Figure 68: FY2012 Public Library Systems Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 10%	5.9% (n=25)	6.6% (n=164)	5.4% (n=245)	5.8% (n=435)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.8% (n=20)	3.1% (n=79)	1.8% (n=81)	2.4% (n=180)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.8% (n=20)	4.0% (n=100)	3.3% (n=153)	3.6% (n=273)
Increased 2.1-4%	9.7% (n=41)	7.7% (n=193)	7.9% (n=362)	7.9% (n=596)
Increased up to 2%	8.1% (n=34)	16.7% (n=418)	16.4% (n=751)	16.1% (n=1,203)
Stayed the same	43.0% (n=181)	48.0% (n=1,205)	55.6% (n=2,539)	52.4% (n=3,925)
Decreased up to 2%	6.5% (n=27)	4.4% (n=111)	3.1% (n=144)	3.8% (n=282)
Decreased 2.1-4%	2.7% (n=11)	2.3% (n=57)	1.2% (n=54)	1.6% (n=122)
Decreased 4.1-6%	4.8% (n=20)	2.1% (n=54)	1.2% (n=54)	1.7% (n=128)
Decreased 6.1-10%	3.2% (n=14)	1.1% (n=29)	*	1.0% (n=78)
Decreased more than 10%	6.5% (n=27)	4.0% (n=100)	3.2% (n=147)	3.7% (n=274)
Weighted missing values, n=1,533				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

The changes to public library systems' technology budgets for FY2012 are reported in Figure 68. 35.8 percent of libraries reported an increase in their technology budgets, including 5.8 percent reporting an increase of more than 10 percent. This represents virtually no change from 35.9 percent reporting an increase last year. Libraries reporting a decrease in technology budgets also declined from 14.2 percent for FY2011 to 11.8 percent in FY2012. The highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase were in suburban areas (38.1 percent), while the highest percentage reporting decreases were in urban areas (23.7 percent). Suburban libraries (6.6 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase of over 10 percent for their FY2012 technology budgets.

Figure 69: FY2013 Public Library Systems Anticipated Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 10%	3.4% (n=15)	3.7% (n=86)	5.2% (n=233)	4.7% (n=339)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.6% (n=18)	3.0% (n=72)	2.1% (n=96)	2.6% (n=185)
Increased 4.1-6%	7.5% (n=29)	4.4% (n=104)	4.0% (n=179)	4.3% (n=313)
Increased 2.1-4%	9.8% (n=39)	8.5% (n=200)	9.5% (n=425)	9.2% (n=663)
Increased up to 2%	11.6% (n=45)	17.2% (n=404)	17.5% (n=781)	17.1% (n=1,230)
Stayed the same	45.1% (n=177)	49.2% (n=1,155)	53.7% (n=2,396)	51.7% (n=3,727)
Decreased up to 2%	5.8% (n=23)	4.9% (n=114)	1.9% (n=84)	3.1% (n=221)
Decreased 2.1-4%	1.2% (n=5)	2.1% (n=50)	1.1% (n=51)	1.5% (n=105)
Decreased 4.1-6%	2.9% (n=11)	1.5% (n=36)	1.1% (n=48)	1.3% (n=95)
Decreased 6.1-10%	1.7% (n=7)	1.4% (n=32)	*	1.0% (69)
Decreased more than 10%	4.6% (n=18)	4.1% (n=97)	3.2% (n=141)	3.5% (n=255)
Weighted missing values, n=1,825				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

The majority of public library systems (51.7 percent) anticipate no change in their FY2013 technology budget (see Figure 69). Overall, 37.9 percent anticipate an increase and 10.4 percent anticipate decreases. 16.2 percent of libraries in urban areas and 14.0 percent of library in suburban areas anticipate decreases, followed by 8.0 percent in rural library systems.

Figure 70: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$433,317.02 (n=86)	\$150,406.30 (n=154)	\$36,687.37 (n=290)	\$134,097.72 (n=530)
Outside Vendors	\$182,046.65 (n=70)	\$24,191.48 (n=254)	\$6,372.22 (n=583)	\$24,953.80 (n=907)
Computer Hardware/Software	\$194,701.82 (n=100)	\$54,296.94 (n=307)	\$8,851.12 (n=820)	\$35,341.37 (n=1,227)
Telecommunications	\$128,849.18 (n=88)	\$31,211.28 (n=250)	\$5,212.98 (n=691)	\$22,141.98 (n=1,030)

While technology-based salaries were the highest technology cost for all libraries, this figure declined with the size of each population served (see Figure 70). Salaries were the most significant technology cost for rural (64.2 percent), suburban (57.8 percent), and urban (46.1 percent) libraries.

State Data Tables

This next section presents state-based branch (outlet) level findings. The survey received adequate responses from 48 states plus the District of Columbia. The state data analyzed in the report include:

Alabama	Montana
Alaska	Nebraska
Arizona	Nevada
Arkansas	New Hampshire
California	New Jersey
Colorado	New Mexico
Delaware	New York
Florida	North Carolina
Georgia	North Dakota
Hawaii	Ohio
Idaho	Oklahoma
Illinois	Pennsylvania
Indiana	Rhode Island
Iowa	South Carolina
Kansas	South Dakota
Kentucky	Tennessee
Louisiana	Texas
Maine	Utah
Maryland	Vermont
Massachusetts	Virginia
Michigan	Washington
Minnesota	Washington, DC
Mississippi	West Virginia
Missouri	Wisconsin
	Wyoming

The report does not contain state-based data for Connecticut and Oregon due to insufficient response rates from public libraries within those states.

Figure 71: Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State

State	Hours increased since last fiscal year	Hours decreased since last fiscal year	Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year
Alabama (n=239)	5.0% (n=12)	2.9% (n=7)	92.1% (n=220)
Alaska (n=104)	19.2% (n=20)	--	80.8% (n=84)
Arizona (n=183)	4.4% (n= 8)	10.9% (n=20)	84.7% (n=155)
Arkansas (n=206)	2.9% (n=6)	1.0% (n=2)	96.1% (n=198)
California (n=847)	3.8% (n=32)	18.1% (n=153)	78.2% (n=662)
Colorado (n= 226)	5.8% (n=13)	12.4% (n=28)	81.9% (n=185)
Delaware (n=33)	9.1% (n=3)	3.0% (n=1)	87.9% (n=29)
Florida (n=483)	*	19.3% (n=93)	80.3% (n=388)
Georgia (n=383)	1.0% (n=4)	30.3% (n=116)	68.7% (n=263)
Hawaii (n= 37)	5.4% (n=2)	--	94.6% (n=35)
Idaho (n=139)	8.6% (n=12)	3.6% (n=5)	87.8% (n=122)
Illinois (n=760)	6.6% (n=50)	3.2% (n=24)	90.3% (n=686)
Indiana (n=413)	9.2% (n=38)	5.8% (n=24)	85.0% (n=351)
Iowa (n=547)	7.3% (n=40)	5.7% (n=31)	87.0% (n=476)
Kansas (n= 370)	7.3% (n=27)	--	92.7% (n=343)
Kentucky (n=192)	3.1% (n=6)	--	96.9% (n=186)
Louisiana (n=285)	4.2% (n=12)	*	95.1% (n=271)
Maine (n=274)	10.6% (n=29)	4.4% (n=12)	85.0% (n=233)
Maryland (n=154)	*	2.6% (n=4)	96.8% (n=149)
Massachusetts (n=456)	11.0% (n=50)	7.9% (n=36)	81.1% (n=370)
Michigan (n =648)	8.5% (n=55)	26.1% (n=169)	65.4% (n=424)
Minnesota (n=284)	2.1% (n=6)	5.6% (n=16)	92.3% (n=262)
Mississippi (n=233)	1.7% (n=4)	6.0% (n=14)	92.3% (n=215)

Figure 71 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State

State	Hours increased since last fiscal year	Hours decreased since last fiscal year	Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year
Missouri (n=329)	2.7% (n=9)	*	96.4% (n=317)
Montana (n=104)	6.7% (n=7)	4.8% (n=5)	88.5% (n=92)
Nebraska (n=282)	5.3% (n=15)	2.5% (n=7)	92.2% (n=260)
Nevada (n=83)	2.4% (n=2)	54.2% (n=45)	43.4% (n=36)
New Hampshire (n=234)	9.8% (n=23)	3.4% (n=8)	86.8% (n=203)
New Jersey (n=415)	--	14.7% (n=61)	85.3% (n=354)
New Mexico (n=123)	13.0% (n=16)	8.9% (n=11)	78.0% (n=96)
New York (n=1,046)	18.0% (n=188)	11.4% (n=119)	70.7% (n=739)
North Carolina (n=368)	4.6% (n=17)	6.3% (n=23)	89.1% (n=328)
North Dakota (n=87)	16.1% (n=14)	--	83.9% (n=73)
Ohio (n=662)	24.2% (n=160)	8.3% (n=55)	67.5% (n=447)
Oklahoma (n=166)	3.0% (n=5)	3.0% (n=5)	94.0% (n=156)
Pennsylvania (n=539)	3.7% (n=20)	19.5% (n=105)	76.8% (n=414)
Rhode Island (n=72)	4.2% (n=3)	8.3% (n=6)	87.5% (n=63)
South Carolina (n=181)	12.7% (n=23)	3.9% (n=7)	83.4% (n=151)
South Dakota (n= 159)	3.8% (n=6)	4.4% (n=7)	91.8% (n=146)
Tennessee (n=263)	5.7% (n=15)	11.0% (n=29)	83.3% (n=219)
Texas (n=783)	4.2% (n=33)	6.9% (n=54)	88.9% (n=696)
Utah (n=111)	2.7% (n=3)	1.8% (n=2)	95.5% (n=106)
Vermont (n= 180)	5.6% (n=10)	3.3% (n=6)	91.1% (n=164)
Virginia (n= 343)	4.4% (n=15)	16.0% (n=55)	79.6% (n=273)
Washington (n=319)	2.5% (n=8)	2.5% (n=8)	95.0% (n=303)
Washington, DC (n=27)	--	--	100% (n=27)
West Virginia (n=156)	5.1% (n=8)	8.3% (n=13)	86.5% (n=135)

Figure 71 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State			
Wisconsin (n=417)	6.5% (n=27)	1.0% (n=4)	86.5% (n=135)
Wyoming (n=74)	2.6% (n=2)	--	97.4% (n=74)
<i>National</i>	7.1% (n=1,061)	9.3% (n=1,395)	83.7% (n=12,569)
Key: * : Insufficient data to report; -- = No data to report			

Figure 71 shows public library changes in hours open. A significant majority of libraries (83.7 percent) report that their hours remained the same in almost every state. Nevada is the one exception, where more than half (54.2 percent) of libraries reported a decrease in hours over the past year. While Ohio reported that nearly half (49.9 percent) of their libraries decreased hours last year, 24.2 percent increased their hours this year, showing a reversal of fortune. Ohio's also had the highest percentage of libraries increasing their hours, with only 7.1 percent of total libraries reporting open hours increases.

Figure 72: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access and Free Public Computer Access, by State

State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other
Alabama (n=261)	59.8% (n=156)	24.5% (n=64)	10.0% (n=26)	5.7% (n=15)
Alaska (n=105)	61.0% (n=64)	25.7% (n=27)	5.7% (n=6)	7.6% (n=8)
Arizona (n=196)	63.8% (n=125)	33.2% (n=65)	1.5% (n=3)	1.5% (n=3)
Arkansas (n=205)	58.0% (n=119)	11.7% (n=24)	17.1% (n=35)	13.2% (n=27)
California (n=862)	55.7% (n=480)	31.1% (n=268)	7.4% (n=64)	5.8% (n=50)
Colorado (n= 227)	56.4% (n=128)	37.4% (n=85)	3.5% (n=8)	2.6% (n=6)
Delaware (n=30)	73.3% (n=22)	13.3% (n=4)	10.0% (n=3)	3.3% (n=1)
Florida (n=468)	41.9% (n=196)	46.4% (n=217)	11.8% (n=55)	-
Georgia (n=278)	57.9% (n=161)	30.6% (n=85)	10.8% (n=30)	-
Hawaii (n= 39)	56.4% (n=22)	28.2% (n=11)	7.7% (n=3)	7.7% (n=3)
Idaho (n=130)	70.8% (n=92)	18.5% (n=24)	9.2% (n=12)	1.5% (n=2)
Illinois (n=737)	59.6% (n=439)	30.1% (n=222)	8.3% (n=61)	2.0% (n=15)
Indiana (n=383)	58.0% (n=222)	22.7% (n=87)	14.6% (n=56)	4.7% (n=18)
Iowa (n=539)	79.0% (n=426)	12.6% (n=68)	5.9% (n=32)	2.4% (n=13)
Kansas (n= 370)	84.1% (n=311)	7.6% (n=28)	5.4% (n=20)	3.0% (n=11)
Kentucky (n=189)	74.1% (n=140)	13.8% (n=26)	10.1% (n=19)	2.1% (n=4)
Louisiana (n=298)	60.4% (n=180)	21.8% (n=65)	17.1% (n=51)	*
Maine (n=278)	76.6% (n=213)	16.9% (n=47)	2.2% (n=6)	4.3% (n=12)
Maryland (n=175)	72.0% (n=126)	13.7% (n=24)	11.4% (n=20)	2.9% (n=5)
Massachusetts (n=399)	57.9% (n=231)	26.3% (n=105)	9.5% (n=38)	6.3% (n=25)
Michigan (n=609)	66.3% (n=404)	22.0% (n=134)	6.6% (n=40)	5.1% (n=31)
Minnesota (n=303)	59.7% (n=181)	30.4% (n=92)	6.3% (n=19)	3.6% (n=11)
Mississippi (n=216)	81.5% (n=176)	11.1% (n=24)	5.6% (n=12)	1.9% (n=4)

Figure 72 (continued): Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access and Free Public Computer Access, by State

State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other
Missouri (n=295)	56.6% (n=167)	26.1% (n=77)	15.3% (n=45)	2.0% (n=6)
Montana (n=95)	66.3% (n=63)	24.2% (n=23)	4.2% (n=4)	5.3% (n=5)
Nebraska (n=264)	82.2% (n=217)	11.0% (n=29)	2.3% (n=6)	4.5% (n=12)
Nevada (n=84)	34.5% (n=29)	65.5% (n=55)	-	-
New Hampshire (n=225)	73.8% (n=166)	17.3% (n=39)	6.2% (n=14)	2.7% (n=6)
New Jersey (n=413)	56.4% (n=233)	28.3% (n=117)	13.6% (n=56)	1.7% (n=1)
New Mexico (n=123)	48.8% (n=60)	42.3% (n=52)	4.1% (n=5)	4.9% (n=6)
New York (n=1,009)	63.5% (n=641)	15.1% (n=152)	18.3% (n=185)	3.1% (n=31)
North Carolina (n=335)	69.9% (n=234)	17.0% (n=57)	8.4% (n=28)	4.8% (n=16)
North Dakota (n=83)	49.4% (n=41)	33.7% (n=28)	12.0% (n=10)	4.8% (n=4)
Ohio (n=615)	61.1% (n=376)	27.5% (n=169)	7.3% (n=45)	4.1% (n=25)
Oklahoma (n=166)	56.0% (n=93)	36.7% (n=61)	6.0% (n=10)	1.2% (n=2)
Pennsylvania (n=462)	68.2% (n=315)	18.4% (n=85)	11.0% (n=51)	2.4% (n=11)
Rhode Island (n=69)	55.1% (n=38)	21.7% (n=15)	10.1% (n=7)	13.0% (n=9)
South Carolina (n=131)	64.9% (n=85)	17.6% (n=23)	15.3% (n=20)	2.3% (n=3)
South Dakota (n=157)	65.6% (n=103)	18.5% (n=29)	10.8% (n=17)	5.1% (n=8)
Tennessee (n=246)	68.7% (n=169)	19.1% (n=47)	7.7% (n=19)	4.5% (n=11)
Texas (n=769)	63.8% (n=491)	21.2% (n=163)	10.7% (n=82)	4.3% (n=33)
Utah (n=117)	55.6% (n=65)	21.4% (n=25)	21.4% (n=25)	1.7% (n=2)
Vermont (n=180)	75.0% (n=135)	19.4% (n=35)	1.1% (n=2)	4.4% (n=8)
Virginia (n=300)	54.7% (n=164)	39.7% (n=119)	5.0% (n=15)	*
Washington (n=254)	48.8% (n=124)	44.9% (n=114)	3.1% (n=8)	3.1% (n=8)
Washington, DC (n=18)	88.9% (n=16)	11.1% (n=2)	--	--
West Virginia (n=164)	60.4% (n=99)	23.8% (n=39)	7.9% (n=13)	7.9% (n=13)

Figure 72: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access and Free Public Computer Access, by State

State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other
Wisconsin (n=426)	65.7% (n=280)	22.3% (n=95)	6.6% (n=28)	5.4% (n=23)
Wyoming (n=74)	62.2% (n=46)	20.3% (n=15)	16.2% (n=12)	1.4% (n=1)
<i>National</i>	63.1% (n=9,068)	24.1% (n=3,461)	9.2% (n=1,326)	3.6% (n=520)
Key *=Insufficient data to report --=No data to report				

Figure 72 shows public libraries that are the only providers of free public Internet and computer access in their area. State responses to the question are from libraries indicating that there is free public access Internet available. The majority of libraries reported yes in most states, with Mississippi (81.5 percent), Nebraska (82.2 percent), and Washington, DC (88.9 percent) being the highest. Florida (46.4 percent) and Nevada (66.5 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries reporting that they were not the only source of free public access.

Figure 73: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State

<i>State</i>	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one year old	Public Internet Workstations two years old	Public Internet Workstations three years old	Public Internet Workstations four years old	Public Internet Workstations five years old
Alabama (n=241)	17.3 (n=241)	7.9 (n=117)	5.3 (n=81)	12.1 (n=90)	4.9 (n=107)	8.8 (n=69)	6.5 (n=90)
Alaska (n=99)	7.7 (n=102)	4.4 (n=23)	3.3 (n=34)	3.9 (n=49)	4.5 (n=32)	5.8 (n=21)	3.7 (n=34)
Arizona (n=189)	25.4 (n=189)	10.1 (n=72)	9.0 (n=71)	18.0 (n=78)	15.9 (n=55)	13.4 (n=50)	8.17 (n=37)
Arkansas (n=127)	13.9 (n=127)	10.5 (n=31)	4.1 (n=84)	4.7 (n=56)	11.3 (n=50)	2.0 (n=15)	4.5 (n=48)
California (n=698)	20.8 (n=698)	12.5 (n=80)	10.4 (n=102)	11.9 (n=139)	10.4 (n=218)	10.2 (n=184)	15.2 (n=332)
Colorado (n= 210)	18.7 (n=210)	15.5 (n=102)	7.1 (n=57)	6.6 (n=63)	6.4 (n=77)	6.6 (n=41)	6.8 (n=47)
Delaware (n=31)	19.2 (n=31)	8.3 (n=7)	7.3 (n=19)	14.3 (n=12)	5.8 (n=14)	10.4 (n=12)	4.5 (n=3)
Florida (n=374)	28.1 (n=374)	21.0 (n=80)	24.1 (n=119)	14.0 (n=80)	9.7 (n=75)	11.9 (n=136)	16.1 (n=140)
Georgia (n=216)	21.7 (n=216)	13.6 (n=44)	13.7 (n=35)	20.7 (n=42)	8.9 (n=75)	10.6 (n=78)	13.0 (n=88)
Hawaii (n= 39)	6.7 (n=39)	5.8 (n=36)	6.6 (n=7)	1.0 (n=1)	--	2.0 (n=1)	1.3 (n=4)
Idaho (n=131)	11.6 (n=131)	9.1 (n=60)	9.6 (n=11)	4.8 (n=15)	7.6 (n=45)	4.0 (n=49)	4.11 (n=60)
Illinois (n=731)	18.4 (n=731)	6.7 (n=399)	5.5 (n=335)	6.6 (n=312)	5.9 (n=285)	10.8 (n=224)	6.5 (n=326)

Figure 73 (continued): Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State

State	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one year old	Public Internet Workstations two years old	Public Internet Workstations three years old	Public Internet Workstations four years old	Public Internet Workstations five years old
Indiana (n=313)	18.3 (n=313)	8.7 (n=162)	6.9 (n=148)	8.0 (n=134)	7.5 (n=122)	4.0 (n=120)	5.4 (n=139)
Iowa (n=518)	8.9 (n=539)	3.5 (n=190)	4.1 (n=119)	3.45 (n=225)	5.1 (n=231)	3.2 (n=153)	4.2 (n=283)
Kansas (n= 365)	7.7 (n=365)	2.2 (n=93)	3.6 (n=121)	3.6 (n=139)	2.8 (n=136)	3.8 (n=107)	3.6 (n=197)
Kentucky (n=157)	23.91 (n=157)	13.0 (n=94)	7.88 (n=52)	10.5 (n=67)	10.4 (n=72)	8.0 (n=44)	6.7 (n=45)
Louisiana (n=268)	14.9 (n=268)	16.4 (n=67)	6.6 (n=46)	6.2 (n=83)	7.5 (n=123)	7.8 (n=43)	9.9 (n=80)
Maine (n=275)	8.9 (n=275)	3.1 (n=154)	3.0 (n=104)	2.6 (n=89)	5.1 (n=89)	3.3 (n=74)	5.7 (n=126)
Maryland (n=149)	21.35 (n=149)	19.1 (n=25)	9.5 (n=34)	13.5 (n=85)	7.3 (n=47)	12.0 (n=41)	9.6 (n=39)
Massachusetts (n=395)	12.9 (n=395)	5.8 (n=87)	5.2 (n=96)	6.8 (n=179)	5.9 (n=175)	4.6 (n=154)	6.1 (n=168)
Michigan (n=504)	18.6 (n=504)	10.2 (n=231)	8.6 (n=159)	6.1 (n=246)	5.1 (n=210)	9.6 (n=175)	7.6 (n=156)
Minnesota (n=302)	13.7 (n=302)	3.2 (n=116)	4.1 (n=110)	6.2 (n=73)	5.5 (n=175)	5.5 (n=88)	4.9 (n=93)
Mississippi (n=184)	11.9 (n=184)	8.9 (n=43)	3.4 (n=50)	4.5 (n=42)	5.4 (n=58)	7.9 (n=54)	6.8 (n=90)
Missouri (n=291)	24.4 (n=291)	4.3 (n=185)	3.7 (n=159)	6.2 (n=112)	5.7 (n=88)	4.0 (n=74)	3.8 (n=99)
Montana (n=94)	11.03 (n=94)	8.1 (n=48)	4.4 (n=25)	3.1 (n=49)	2.5 (n=41)	3.1 (n=40)	4.4 (n=34)

Figure 73 (continued): Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State

State	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one year old	Public Internet Workstations two years old	Public Internet Workstations three years old	Public Internet Workstations four years old	Public Internet Workstations five years old
Nebraska (n=266)	8.7 (n=266)	5.4 (n=170)	3.1 (n=123)	2.2 (n=90)	2.2 (n=89)	2.4 (n=56)	3.0 (n=132)
Nevada (n=62)	18.6 (n=62)	7.1 (n=25)	12.0 (n=14)	7.2 (n=20)	5.2 (n=20)	6.9 (n=16)	15.2 (n=26)
New Hampshire (n=230)	7.2 (n=230)	3.7 (n=63)	3.0 (n=76)	2.8 (n=91)	2.9 (n=91)	3.4 (n=78)	3.7 (n=104)
New Jersey (n=353)	17.1 (n=353)	7.0 (n=129)	4.6 (n=100)	8.4 (n=197)	7.9 (n=165)	5.9 (n=105)	6.4 (n=106)
New Mexico (n=120)	12.2 (n=120)	6.2 (n=33)	3.9 (n=26)	6.1 (n=26)	9.0 (n=43)	3.2 (n=29)	8.2 (n=62)
New York (n=1,001)	15.8 (n=1,001)	6.8 (n=195)	9.2 (n=260)	7.4 (n=377)	9.4 (n=589)	8.2 (n=284)	5.3 (n=251)
North Carolina (n=297)	17.3 (n=297)	9.3 (n=62)	4.7 (n=86)	8.3 (n=157)	7.9 (n=138)	7.9 (n=86)	8.4 (n=109)
North Dakota (n=84)	9.4 (n=84)	4.6 (n=55)	4.3 (n=35)	8.5 (n=30)	3.9 (n=16)	2.0 (n=16)	2.0 (n=20)
Ohio (n=568)	16.0 (n=568)	10.4 (n=263)	7.5 (n=216)	7.7 (n=164)	5.6 (n=136)	6.5 (n=117)	5.9 (n=222)
Oklahoma (n=165)	17.3 (n=165)	6.6 (n=69)	8.4 (n=54)	6.5 (n=61)	8.5 (n=94)	7.8 (n=69)	3.7 (n=50)
Pennsylvania (n=470)	15.2 (n=470)	8.7 (n=114)	4.9 (n=82)	5.8 (n=180)	8.4 (n=199)	6.1 (n=141)	10.6 (n=183)
Rhode Island (n=64)	18.9 (n=64)	6.2 (n=48)	4.9 (n=32)	6.3 (n=36)	12.6 (n=28)	5.7 (n=18)	6.4 (n=11)
South Carolina (n=106)	15.8 (n=106)	8.5 (n=13)	22.6 (n=16)	8.5 (n=27)	7.9 (n=24)	6.5 (n=30)	5.9 (n=45)

Figure 73 (continued): Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State

State	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one year old	Public Internet Workstations two years old	Public Internet Workstations three years old	Public Internet Workstations four years old	Public Internet Workstations five years old
South Dakota (n= 155)	7.9 (n=155)	3.3 (n=52)	3.9 (n=61)	3.5 (n=47)	4.4 (n=55)	3.7 (n=52)	3.3 (n=54)
Tennessee (n=212)	17.6 (n=212)	8.0 (n=100)	3.9 (n=79)	5.9 (n=67)	7.2 (n=83)	7.0 (n=92)	7.3 (n=125)
Texas (n=717)	24.6 (n=717)	9.4 (n=237)	6.8 (n=184)	9.6 (n=254)	10.7 (n=246)	9.53 (n=202)	9.2 (n=293)
Utah (n=90)	22.7 (n=90)	3.8 (n=14)	5.4 (n=27)	10.6 (n=34)	15.4 (n=41)	15.5 (n=28)	10.0 (n=41)
Vermont (n= 176)	6.8 (n=176)	2.2 (n=77)	2.6 (n=63)	2.2 (n=45)	3.0 (n=81)	3.1 (n=62)	3.2 (n=100)
Virginia (n= 176)	6.8 (n=176)	2.2 (n=77)	2.6 (n=63)	2.2 (n=45)	3.0 (n=81)	3.1 (n=62)	3.3 (n=100)
Washington (n= 179)	11.9 (n=179)	3.0 (n=45)	3.4 (n=57)	8.4 (n=56)	9.1 (n=75)	8.2 (n=59)	4.2 (n=37)
Washington, DC (n=26)	25.7 (n=26)	25.0 (n=2)	--	34.0 (n=1)	13.4 (n=19)	13.9 (n=23)	--
West Virginia (n=147)	7.9 (n=147)	4.6 (n=15)	4.5 (n=17)	3.3 (n=33)	3.7 (n=48)	3.3 (n=51)	6.0 (n=86)
Wisconsin (n=411)	11.5 (n=411)	4.4 (n=243)	4.7 (n=258)	4.8 (n=161)	3.6 (n=147)	3.8 (n=135)	4.1 (n=113)
Wyoming (n=67)	10.93 (n=67)	5.5 (n=21)	3.8 (n=17)	4.0 (n=35)	4.5 (n=24)	7.6 (n=22)	3.6 (n=29)
National	16.4 (n=13,397)	7.8 (n=4,728)	6.7 (n=4,277)	7.3 (n=4,656)	7.2 (n=4,901)	7.3 (n=3,898)	7.1 (n=5,045)
Key -- = No data to report							

Figure 73 shows the average number of public Internet workstations libraries have by age as well as the average total number of workstations. State responses to the question are by libraries indicating that there is free public access Internet available. Libraries in Florida (21.0) and Washington, DC (25.0) report the highest average number of workstations less than one year old. Libraries in California (15.2), Nevada (15.2), and Florida (16.1) reported the highest number of five-year-old workstations.

Figure 74: Public Library Outlet Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by State

State	Less than one day	One day	Two days	More than two days	Don't know	Other amount of time
Alabama (n=226)	24.8% (n=56)	22.6% (n=51)	7.1% (n=16)	37.6% (n=85)	5.9% (n=6)	13.7% (n=14)
Alaska (n=102)	25.5% (n=26)	13.7% (n=14)	18.6% (n=19)	22.5% (n=23)	5.9% (n=6)	13.7% (n=14)
Arizona (n=196)	16.8% (n=33)	11.2% (n=22)	7.1% (n=14)	49.5% (n=97)	1.5% (n=3)	13.8% (n=27)
Arkansas (n=174)	6.9% (n=12)	44.8% (n=78)	28.7% (n=50)	14.4% (n=25)	*	5.2% (n=9)
California (n=845)	17.4% (n=147)	27.7% (n=234)	30.8% (n=260)	22.4% (n=189)	*	1.8% (n=15)
Colorado (n=229)	24.5% (n=56)	42.8% (n=98)	10.0% (n=23)	20.1% (n=46)	*	2.6% (n=6)
Delaware (n=32)	21.9% (n=7)	40.6% (n=13)	9.4% (n=3)	25.0% (n=8)	--	3.1% (n=1)
Florida (n=464)	6.7% (n=31)	31.7% (n=147)	26.7% (n=124)	33.2% (n=154)	*	1.7% (n=8)
Georgia (n=273)	11.7% (n=32)	42.9% (n=117)	21.6% (n=59)	22.0% (n=60)	*	1.8% (n=5)
Hawaii (n=38)	47.4% (n=18)	31.6% (n=12)	7.9% (n=3)	5.3% (n=2)	*	7.9% (n=3)
Idaho (n=132)	34.8% (n=46)	12.9% (n=17)	20.5% (n=27)	29.5% (n=39)	2.3% (n=3)	*
Illinois (n=736)	14.1% (n=140)	30.6% (n=225)	27.2% (n=200)	19.8% (n=146)	2.4% (n=18)	5.8% (n=43)
Indiana (n=383)	26.6% (n=102)	37.1% (n=142)	13.3% (n=51)	14.1% (n=54)	1.6% (n=6)	7.3% (n=28)
Iowa (n=540)	27.8% (n=150)	13.9% (n=75)	19.1% (n=103)	29.6% (n=160)	3.3% (n=18)	6.3% (n=34)
Kansas (n=372)	23.7% (n=88)	15.6% (n=58)	15.9% (n=59)	25.0% (n=93)	8.9% (n=33)	11.0% (n=41)
Kentucky (n=185)	21.1% (n=39)	35.7% (n=66)	22.2% (n=41)	11.9% (n=22)	--	9.2% (n=17)
Louisiana (n=290)	9.0% (n=26)	34.8% (n=101)	29.3% (n=85)	22.4% (n=65)	4.5% (n=13)	*
Maine (n=277)	17.3% (n=48)	14.4% (n=40)	14.1% (n=39)	35.4% (n=98)	8.3% (n=23)	10.5% (n=29)
Maryland (n=177)	5.1% (n=9)	32.8% (n=58)	39.0% (n=69)	23.2% (n=41)	--	*
Massachusetts (n=430)	24.4% (n=105)	21.2% (n=91)	12.8% (n=55)	35.6% (n=153)	1.4% (n=6)	4.7% (n=20)
Michigan (n=513)	21.4% (n=110)	21.2% (n=109)	30.6% (n=157)	16.6% (n=85)	4.9% (n=25)	5.3% (n=27)
Minnesota (n=303)	32.0% (n=97)	25.4% (n=77)	7.6% (n=23)	24.1% (n=73)	8.9% (n=27)	2.0% (n=6)

Figure 74 (continued): Public Library Outlet Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by State

State	Less than one day	One day	Two days	More than two days	Don't know	Other amount of time
Mississippi (n=207)	6.8% (n=14)	24.2% (n=50)	35.3% (n=73)	30.4% (n=63)	*	3.4% (n=7)
Missouri (n=296)	26.0% (n=77)	14.2% (n=42)	23.3% (n=69)	28.0% (n=83)	5.1% (n=15)	3.4% (n=10)
Montana (n=97)	35.1% (n=34)	13.4% (n=13)	18.6% (n=18)	23.7% (n=23)	4.1% (n=4)	5.2% (n=5)
Nebraska (N=266)	15.4% (n=41)	17.3% (n=46)	16.2% (n=43)	36.1% (n=96)	5.3% (n=14)	9.8% (n=26)
Nevada (n=63)	27.0% (n=17)	17.5% (n=11)	7.9% (n=5)	25.4% (n=16)	22.2% (n=14)	*
New Hampshire (n=227)	24.7% (n=56)	21.6% (n=49)	14.1% (n=32)	28.6% (n=65)	3.5% (n=8)	7.5% (n=17)
New Jersey (n=402)	34.3% (n=138)	20.9% (n=84)	16.9% (n=68)	24.4% (n=98)	--	2.7% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=120)	20.8% (n=25)	14.2% (n=17)	9.2% (n=11)	42.5% (n=51)	--	13.3% (n=16)
New York (n=1,011)	24.7% (n=250)	21.2% (n=214)	21.9% (n=221)	26.5% (n=268)	*	5.2% (n=53)
North Carolina (n=318)	11.3% (n=36)	41.8% (n=133)	17.9% (n=57)	22.3% (n=71)	3.8% (n=12)	2.8% (n=9)
North Dakota (n=85)	14.1% (n=12)	18.8% (n=16)	18.8% (n=16)	30.6% (n=26)	12.9% (n=11)	4.7% (n=4)
Ohio (n=597)	20.6% (n=123)	16.6% (n=99)	36.7% (n=219)	21.9% (n=131)	*	3.5% (n=21)
Oklahoma (n=163)	17.2% (n=28)	30.1% (n=49)	14.1% (n=23)	30.7% (n=50)	4.3% (n=7)	3.7% (n=6)
Pennsylvania (n=473)	10.8% (n=51)	23.0% (n=109)	24.9% (n=118)	28.5% (n=135)	3.2% (n=15)	9.5% (n=45)
Rhode Island (n=68)	29.4% (n=20)	55.9% (n=38)	8.8% (n=6)	2.9% (n=2)	*	2.9% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=149)	24.2% (n=36)	38.9% (n=58)	19.5% (n=29)	6.7% (n=10)	2.7% (n=4)	8.1% (n=12)
South Dakota (n=158)	13.3% (n=21)	29.1% (n=46)	19.0% (n=30)	22.2% (n=35)	10.8% (n=17)	5.7% (n=9)
Tennessee (n=246)	17.1% (n=42)	28.0% (n=69)	20.3% (n=50)	26.8% (n=66)	*	6.9% (n=17)
Texas (n=754)	11.3% (n=85)	15.3% (n=115)	16.4% (n=124)	46.4% (n=350)	1.2% (n=9)	9.4% (n=71)
Utah (n=117)	17.1% (n=20)	20.5% (n=24)	30.8% (n=36)	31.6% (n=37)	--	--
Vermont (n=178)	18.0% (n=32)	27.0% (n=48)	18.5% (n=33)	21.3% (n=38)	3.4% (n=6)	11.8% (n=21)
Virginia (n=296)	26.7% (n=79)	24.0% (n=71)	26.0% (n=77)	22.0% (n=65)	*	*

Figure 74 (continued): Public Library Outlet Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Less than one day</i>	<i>One day</i>	<i>Two days</i>	<i>More than two days</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Other amount of time</i>
Washington (n=246)	25.2% (n=62)	28.9% (n=71)	34.1% (n=84)	8.5% (n=21)	*	8.0% (n=8)
Washington, DC (n=26)	*	58.3% (n=15)	41.7% (n=11)	*	*	*
West Virginia (n=164)	20.1% (n=33)	17.1% (n=28)	11.0% (n=18)	26.8% (n=44)	*	24.4% (n=40)
Wisconsin (n=411)	25.1% (n=103)	26.3% (n=108)	15.8% (n=65)	23.4% (n=96)	2.9% (n=12)	6.6% (n=27)
Wyoming (n=75)	21.3% (n=16)	22.7% (n=17)	14.7% (n=11)	37.3% (n=28)	1.3% (n=1)	2.7% (n=2)
<i>National</i>	19.8% (n=2,797)	24.6% (n=3,471)	21.4% (n=3,071)	26.1% (n=3,686)	2.5% (n=357)	5.5% (n=782)
Key * = Insufficient data to report; -- = No data to report						

Figure 74 displays the length of time it takes to get public library computers back in service by state. Nationwide, the majority of library outlets required one days (24.6 percent) or more than two days (26.1 percent) to get workstations back in service. Hawaii (47.4 percent) and Montana (35.1 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes less than one day to restore workstations to working order. Arkansas (44.8 percent) and Georgia (42.9 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes one day. Maryland (39.0 percent) and Ohio (36.7 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes two days, while Arizona (49.5 percent) and Texas (46.4 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes more than two days.

Figure 75: Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State

<i>State</i>	There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them	There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day
Alabama (n=253)	19.0% (n=48)	42.7% (n=108)	38.3% (n=97)
Alaska (n=103)	21.4% (n=22)	35.0% (n=36)	43.7% (n=45)
Arizona (n=197)	16.8% (n=33)	52.8% (n=104)	30.5% (n=60)
Arkansas (n=173)	13.3% (n=23)	79.8% (n=138)	6.9% (n=12)
California (n=819)	25.5% (n=209)	61.7% (n=505)	12.8% (n=105)
Colorado (n=221)	5.9% (n=13)	43.4% (n=96)	50.7% (n=112)
Delaware (n=32)	9.4% (n=3)	56.3% (n=18)	34.4% (n=11)
Florida (n=456)	20.8% (n=95)	58.3% (n=266)	20.8% (n=95)
Georgia (n=280)	15.0% (n=42)	54.3% (n=152)	30.7% (n=86)
Hawaii (n=39)	20.5% (n=8)	59.0% (n=23)	20.5% (n=8)
Idaho (n=137)	8.8% (n=12)	48.2% (n=66)	43.1% (n=59)
Illinois (n=745)	6.8% (n=51)	51.3% (n=382)	41.9% (n=312)
Indiana (n=364)	3.3% (n=12)	49.2% (n=179)	47.5% (n=173)
Iowa (n=535)	3.4% (n=18)	44.9% (n=240)	51.8% (n=277)
Kansas (n=370)	4.1% (n=15)	43.5% (n=161)	52.4% (n=194)
Kentucky (n=180)	7.2% (n=13)	50.6% (n=91)	42.2% (n=76)
Louisiana (n=290)	10.3% (n=30)	55.5% (n=161)	34.1% (n=99)
Maine (n=278)	16.5% (n=46)	45.3% (n=126)	38.1% (n=106)
Maryland (n=176)	15.3% (n=27)	64.2% (n=113)	20.5% (n=36)
Massachusetts (n=431)	6.0% (n=26)	45.9% (n=198)	48.0% (n=207)
Michigan (n=547)	9.3% (n=51)	59.4% (n=325)	31.3% (n=171)
Minnesota (n=303)	7.3% (n=22)	56.4% (n=171)	36.3% (n=110)

Figure 75 (continued): Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State

<i>State</i>	There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them	There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day
Mississippi (n=209)	25.8% (n=54)	59.3% (n=124)	14.8% (n=31)
Missouri (n=299)	5.7% (n=17)	51.2% (n=153)	43.1% (n=129)
Montana (n=95)	2.1% (n=2)	43.2% (n=41)	54.7% (n=52)
Nebraska (n=264)	1.5% (n=4)	36.4% (n=96)	62.1% (n=164)
Nevada (n=84)	50.0% (n=42)	22.6% (n=19)	27.4% (n=23)
New Hampshire (n=226)	6.2% (n=14)	35.0% (n=79)	58.8% (n=133)
New Jersey (n=391)	17.9% (n=70)	51.7% (n=202)	30.4% (n=119)
New Mexico (n=120)	6.7% (n=8)	50.8% (n=61)	42.5% (n=51)
New York (n=1,001)	17.3% (n=173)	46.1% (n=461)	36.7% (n=367)
North Carolina (n=318)	12.9% (n=41)	58.5% (n=186)	28.6% (n=91)
North Dakota (n=85)	2.4% (n=2)	30.6% (n=26)	67.1% (n=57)
Ohio (n=649)	23.9% (n=155)	51.3% (n=333)	24.8% (n=161)
Oklahoma (n=164)	17.1% (n=28)	62.8% (n=103)	20.1% (n=33)
Pennsylvania (n=467)	11.8% (n=55)	37.0% (n=173)	51.2% (n=239)
Rhode Island (n=69)	11.6% (n=8)	43.5% (n=30)	44.9% (n=31)
South Carolina (n=138)	39.1% (n=54)	48.6% (n=67)	12.3% (n=17)
South Dakota (n=157)	1.9% (n=3)	35.0% (n=55)	63.1% (n=99)
Tennessee (n=245)	11.4% (n=28)	55.9% (n=137)	32.7% (n=80)
Texas (n=725)	10.5% (n=76)	54.3% (n=394)	35.2% (n=255)
Utah (n=118)	4.2% (n=5)	66.9% (n=79)	28.8% (n=34)
Vermont (n=178)	5.6% (n=10)	43.3% (n=77)	51.1% (n=91)

Figure 75 (continued): Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State

<i>State</i>	There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them	There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day
Virginia (n=299)	9.0% (n=27)	61.2% (n=183)	29.8% (n=89)
Washington (n=252)	6.0% (n=15)	77.8% (n=196)	16.3% (n=41)
Washington, DC (n=19)	94.7% (n=18)	5.3% (n=1)	--
West Virginia (n=147)	10.2% (n=15)	56.5% (n=83)	33.3% (n=49)
Wisconsin (n=417)	7.4% (n=31)	51.8% (n=216)	40.8% (n=170)
Wyoming (n=70)	2.9% (n=2)	60.0% (n=42)	37.1% (n=26)
National	12.6% (n=1,776)	51.5% (n=7,280)	36.0% (n=5,083)
Key -- = No data to report			

Figure 75 reports the public libraries responses to the sufficiency of public access Internet workstation availability. New Hampshire has the highest percentage of outlets reporting there are always a sufficient number of workstations for patrons who wish to use them (58.8 percent) whereas Washington, DC has the highest percentage of outlets reporting there are consistently fewer workstations (94.7 percent) than patrons who wish to use them. This is a significant decrease for Washington, DC, with last year's figure being 79.2 percent of libraries believing they consistently have less computers than they need to meet patron demands. Nationally, 64.1 percent of libraries report having insufficient workstations to meet patron needs consistently or at different times of the day.

Figure 76: Public Library Outlet Change in Use of Public Access Technology, by State

State	Use of public Internet workstations			Use of wireless Internet access			Use of patron technology training classes			Use of library electronic resources		
	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
Alabama (n=264)	70.8% (n=187)	5.7% (n=15)	23.5% (n=62)	69.9% (n=181)	--	12.7% (n=33)	34.9% (n=88)	2.0% (n=5)	19.8% (n=50)	49.2% (n=122)	1.2% (n=3)	27.8% (n=69)
Alaska (n=104)	46.2% (n=48)	5.8% (n=6)	46.2% (n=48)	60.8% (n=62)	--	20.6% (n=21)	7.0% (n=7)	6.0% (n=6)	25.0% (n=25)	39.6% (n=40)	3.0% (n=3)	27.8% (n=69)
Arizona (n=198)	72.7% (n=125)	6.1% (n=12)	13.6% (n=27)	93.5% (n=186)	--	4.0% (n=8)	50.0% (n=99)	8.6% (n=17)	10.1% (n=20)	73.6% (n=148)	--	10.0% (n=20)
Arkansas (n=172)	72.7% (n=125)	2.9% (n=5)	24.4% (n=42)	51.7% (n=89)	--	11.6% (n=20)	15.9% (n=27)	1.2% (n=2)	14.1% (n=24)	51.4% (n=89)	--	10.4% (n=18)
California (n=919)	43.0% (n=395)	3.5% (n=32)	52.8% (n=485)	57.6% (n=530)	--	11.0% (n=101)	21.7% (n=192)	1.9% (n=17)	18.2% (n=161)	54.4% (n=503)	2.1% (n=19)	29.3% (n=271)
Colorado (n=220)	60.0% (n=132)	9.5% (n=21)	30.5% (n=67)	76.2% (n=170)	--	17.0% (n=38)	37.1% (n=82)	5.9% (n=13)	25.3% (n=56)	60.8% (n=135)	1.8% (n=4)	19.8% (n=44)
Delaware (n=33)	72.7% (n=24)	-	27.3% (n=9)	90.9% (n=30)	--	--	51.5% (n=17)	9.1% (n=3)	18.2% (n=6)	63.6% (n=21)	--	9.1% (n=3)
Florida (n=448)	78.6% (n=352)	9.4% (n=42)	10.9% (n=49)	92.2% (n=413)	--	2.7% (n=12)	37.5% (n=168)	14.7% (n=66)	35.0% (n=157)	75.9% (n=341)	2.4% (n=11)	11.8% (n=53)
Georgia (n=326)	66.3% (n=216)	8.3% (n=27)	25.5% (n=83)	82.3% (n=270)	1.2% (n=4)	8.2% (n=27)	35.5% (n=116)	2.1% (n=7)	21.7% (n=71)	60.9% (n=199)	*	18.3% (n=60)
Hawaii (n=51)	60.8% (n=31)	--	3.9% (n=2)	76.5% (n=39)	--	21.6% (n=11)	74.5% (n=27)	--	11.8% (n=6)	3.9% (n=2)	2.0% (n=1)	31.4% (n=16)
Idaho (n=136)	64.7% (n=88)	14.0% (n=19)	21.3% (n=29)	79.9% (n=107)	--	10.4% (n=14)	26.0% (n=34)	--	19.1% (n=25)	33.6% (n=44)	1.5% (n=2)	29.0% (n=38)
Illinois (n=763)	66.9% (n=486)	5.1% (n=37)	19.7% (n=143)	68.6% (n=511)	3.4% (n=25)	20.4% (n=152)	45.1% (n=328)	1.4% (n=10)	25.2% (n=183)	43.4% (n=314)	*	24.0% (n=174)
Indiana (n=384)	54.4% (n=209)	7.6% (n=29)	34.6% (n=133)	79.5% (n=303)	2.4% (n=9)	10.5% (n=40)	40.1% (n=152)	6.1% (n=23)	25.1% (n=95)	54.2% (n=198)	--	21.1% (n=77)
Iowa (n=527)	43.5% (n=229)	12.9% (n=68)	43.6% (n=230)	68.8% (n=368)	2.8% (n=15)	13.1% (n=70)	17.5% (n=92)	9.1% (n=48)	22.1% (n=116)	50.8% (n=266)	2.1% (n=11)	14.7% (n=77)

Figure 76 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Use of Public Access Technology, by State

State	Use of public Internet workstations			Use of wireless Internet access			Use of patron technology training classes			Use of library electronic resources		
	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
Kansas (n=372)	58.1% (n=216)	4.6% (n=17)	34.9% (n= 130)	65.7% (n=236)	*	22.8% (n=82)	10.5% (n=38)	3.6% (n=13)	37.2% (n=135)	23.0% (n=84)	*	32.3% (n=118)
Kentucky (n=174)	66.1% (n=115)	6.9% (n=12)	27.0% (n=47)	87.5% (n=154)	--	9.7% (n=17)	41.8% (n=74)	10.7% (n=19)	17.5% (n=31)	90.8% (n=158)	--	9.2% (n=16)
Louisiana (n=289)	82.0% (n=237)	*	14.2% (n=41)	79.8% (n=225)	--	9.6% (n=27)	61.6% (n=173)	*	22.1% (n=62)	76.8% (n=219)	--	17.9% (n=51)
Maine (n=272)	48.2% (n=131)	12.9% (n=35)	38.2% (n=104)	83.4% (n=231)	2.2% (n=6)	6.1% (n=17)	14.1% (n=39)	4.3% (n=12)	33.2% (n=92)	46.0% (n=125)	--	25.0% (n=44)
Maryland (n=175)	41.7% (n=73)	24.6% (n=43)	33.7% (n=59)	77.8% (n=137)	--	20.5% (n=36)	54.1% (n=80)	6.1% (n=9)	33.1% (n=49)	70.5% (n=124)	*	25.0% (n=44)
Massachusetts (n=431)	49.0% (n=211)	7.4% (n=32)	33.7% (n= 59)	80.8% (n=340)	--	13.1% (n=55)	27.8% (n=118)	5.6% (n=24)	20.5% (n=87)	76.0% (n=323)	2.1% (n=9)	14.8% (n=63)
Michigan (n=609)	71.8% (n=437)	10.8% (n=66)	16.6% (n= 101)	88.4% (n=535)	--	7.4% (n=45)	28.0% (n=161)	3.3% (n=19)	40.9% (n=235)	78.3% (n=451)	--	10.2% (n=59)
Minnesota (n=303)	71.8% (n=437)	10.8% (n=66)	24.8% (n=75)	58.9% (n=178)	6.3% (n=19)	18.2% (n=55)	26.0% (n=78)	5.7% (n=17)	12.0% (n=36)	29.2% (n=88)	2.3% (n=7)	11.0% (n=33)
Mississippi (n=205)	72.7% (n=149)	1.0% (n=2)	25.9% (n=53)	62.0% (n=127)	1.5% (n=3)	8.3% (n=17)	27.3% (n=56)	6.8% (n=14)	15.1% (n=31)	42.0% (n=86)	2.4% (n=5)	44.9% (n=92)
Missouri (n=294)	60.9% (n=179)	4.8% (n=14)	10.9% (n=32)	67.2% (n=199)	3.7% (n=11)	23.0% (n=68)	32.9% (n=97)	4.1% (n=12)	32.5% (n=96)	32.3% (n=95)	4.4% (n=13)	19.4% (n=57)
Montana (n=100)	57.0% (n=57)	5.0% (n=5)	36.0% (n=36)	79.4% (n=77)	--	14.4% (n=14)	22.2% (n=22)	18.2% (n=18)	25.3% (n=25)	65.7% (n=65)	--	20.2% (n=20)
Nebraska (n=262)	67.2% (n=176)	4.6% (n=12)	24.8% (n=65)	68.8% (n=179)	*	24.2% (n=63)	23.2% (n=59)	2.4% (n=6)	31.5% (n=80)	29.6% (n=73)	--	27.1% (n=67)
Nevada (n=84)	28.6% (n=24)	10.7% (n=9)	60.7% (n=51)	79.8% (n=67)	--	8.3% (n=7)	14.3% (n=12)	41.7% (n=35)	8.3% (n=7)	28.6% (n=24)	6.0% (n=5)	56.0% (n=47)
New Hampshire (n=227)	47.1% (n=107)	15.9% (n=36)	34.4% (n=78)	73.0% (n=165)	--	11.9% (n=27)	20.8% (n=46)	3.6% (n=8)	16.3% (n=36)	80.8% (n=177)	--	10.5% (n=23)
New Jersey (n=413)	58.6% (n=242)	5.1% (n=21)	35.6% (n=147)	59.6% (n=245)	*	20.4% (n=84)	65.2% (n=264)	2.0% (n=8)	9.4% (n=38)	79.6% (n=328)	*	11.9% (n=49)

Figure 76 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Use of Public Access Technology, by State

State	Use of public Internet workstations			Use of wireless Internet access			Use of patron technology training classes			Use of library electronic resources		
	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
New Mexico (n=121)	57.9% (n=70)	14.9% (n=18)	24.8% (n=30)	55.1% (n=65)	2.5% (n=3)	23.7% (n=28)	29.8% (n=34)	4.4% (n=5)	24.6% (n=28)	56.5% (n=65)	2.6% (n=3)	22.6% (n=26)
New York (n=1,012)	61.4% (n=621)	8.5% (n=86)	29.6% (n= 300)	90.2% (n=914)	*	5.6% (n=57)	47.6% (n=482)	2.6% (n=26)	31.5% (n=319)	81.0% (n=819)	*	7.3% (n=74)
North Carolina (n=326)	65.0% (n=212)	9.2% (n=30)	25.8% (n=84)	74.1% (n=240)	*	9.9% (n=32)	28.5% (n=89)	3.5% (n=11)	18.3% (n=57)	63.6% (n=196)	3.6% (n=11)	18.2% (n=56)
North Dakota (n=84)	64.3% (n=54)	2.4% (n=2)	16.7% (n=14)	69.0% (n=58)	2.4% (n=2)	11.9% (n=10)	28.2% (n=24)	7.1% (n=6)	23.5% (n=20)	28.2% (n=24)	4.7% (n=4)	23.5% (n=20)
Ohio (n=633)	69.7% (n=441)	2.1% (n=13)	21.0% (n= 133)	71.9% (n=452)	*	24.2% (n=152)	72.5% (n=457)	1.3% (n=8)	10.6% (n=67)	68.1% (n=430)	2.2% (n=14)	14.9% (n=94)
Oklahoma (n=165)	58.8% (n=97)	--	40.0% (n=66)	87.8% (n=144)	--	7.9% (n=13)	22.8% (n=37)	4.9% (n=8)	22.2% (n=36)	48.2% (n=79)	1.2% (n=2)	20.7% (n=34)
Pennsylvania (n=463)	59.0% (n=273)	6.5% (n=30)	34.6% (n=160)	77.3% (n=357)	*	14.3% (n=66)	21.8% (n=101)	7.1% (n=33)	26.3% (n=122)	55.5% (n=254)	*	22.1% (n=101)
Rhode Island (n=69)	68.1% (n=47)	5.8% (n=4)	26.1% (n=18)	60.9% (n=42)	--	34.8% (n=24)	31.8% (n=21)	--	31.8% (n=21)	68.1% (n=47)	7.2% (n=5)	24.6% (n=17)
South Carolina (n=140)	73.6% (n=103)	1.4% (n=2)	26.1% (n=18)	84.8% (n=106)	--	3.2% (n=4)	50.4% (n=70)	--	8.6% (n=12)	67.1% (n=94)	--	22.1% (n=31)
South Dakota (n=155)	43.9% (n=68)	11.0% (n=17)	38.7% (n=60)	46.5% (n=72)	1.3% (n=2)	22.6% (n=35)	16.8% (n=26)	5.2% (n=8)	31.0% (n=48)	36.4% (n=56)	--	26.0% (n=40)
Tennessee (n=244)	48.8% (n=119)	6.1% (n=15)	44.3% (n=108)	76.6% (n=187)	*	16.8% (n=41)	32.7% (n=81)	2.0% (n=5)	35.5% (n=88)	71.1% (n=175)	--	22.0% (n=54)
Texas (n=750)	64.4% (n=483)	7.2% (n=54)	28.1% (n= 211)	80.7% (n=602)	*	7.1% (n=53)	35.6% (n=263)	1.5% (n=11)	22.6% (n=167)	59.0% (n=438)	1.6% (n=12)	19.7% (n=146)
Utah (n=101)	64.4% (n=65)	7.9% (n=8)	25.7% (n=26)	89.2% (n=91)	--	5.9% (n=6)	31.6% (n=31)	6.1% (n=6)	19.4% (n=19)	79.4% (n=81)	--	8.8% (n=9)
Vermont (n=177)	57.1% (n=101)	4.5% (n=8)	35.0% (n=62)	75.1% (n=136)	--	22.1% (n=40)	28.7% (n=50)	5.7% (n=10)	26.4% (n=46)	43.9% (n=79)	1.1% (n=2)	24.4% (n=44)
Virginia (n=287)	44.6% (n=128)	32.1% (n=92)	22.6% (n=65)	69.6% (n=199)	--	7.7% (n=22)	28.2% (n=81)	6.6% (n=19)	23.3% (n=67)	76.2% (n=221)	6.6% (n=19)	12.4% (n=36)

Figure 76 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Use of Public Access Technology, by State

State	Use of public Internet workstations			Use of wireless Internet access			Use of patron technology training classes			Use of library electronic resources		
	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
Washington (n=243)	44.0% (n=107)	37.4% (n=91)	16.9% (n=41)	91.6% (n=219)	--	*	52.7% (n=128)	2.5% (n=6)	11.1% (n=27)	--	81.2% (n=194)	--
Washington, DC (n=18)	100% (n=18)	--	--	100% (n=19)	--	--	100% (n=19)	--	--	94.4% (n=17)	--	--
West Virginia (n=156)	64.7% (n=101)	1.9% (n=3)	33.3% (n=52)	67.5% (n=104)	1.9% (n=3)	21.4% (n=33)	17.2% (n=27)	3.2% (n=5)	28.0% (n=44)	56.1% (n=87)	--	26.5% (n=41)
Wisconsin (n=405)	76.5% (n=310)	4.2% (n=17)	17.3% (n=70)	78.1% (n=321)	3.6% (n=15)	16.5% (n=68)	49.0% (n=203)	1.0% (n=4)	20.5% (n=85)	47.8% (n=196)	2.0% (n=8)	22.0% (n=90)
Wyoming (n=76)	48.7% (n=37)	3.9% (n=3)	47.4% (n=36)	53.9% (n=41)	--	39.5% (n=30)	11.8% (n=9)	1.3% (n=1)	56.6% (n=43)	31.1% (n=23)	2.7% (n=2)	55.4% (n=41)
National	60.1% (n=8,620)	8.1% (n=1,159)	29.2% (n=4,191)	74.9% (n=10,716)	1.0% (n=138)	13.1% (n=1,877)	35.4% (n=4,999)	4.3% (n=603)	23.7% (n=3,345)	59.3% (n=8,421)	1.4% (n=196)	18.9% (n=2,689)
Key * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report												

Figure 76 lists changes in the use of public access technology in public library outlets by state. The majority of states reported an increase in the use of public Internet workstations at library outlets. Washington, DC (100 percent), South Carolina (88.3 percent) and North Carolina (88.2 percent) had the highest reported percentage of increase. Some three quarters of states, 76.1 percent, reported an increase in the use of wireless Internet access at library outlets. Maryland (94.0 percent) had the highest reported percentage of increase in wireless Internet access. With regards to changes in the use of patron technology training classes, Louisiana (49.5 percent) and Florida (48.6 percent) had the highest reported percentage of increase, while Florida (12.7 percent) also had the highest reported percentage of decrease. In terms of change in use of library electronic resources, Utah (72.4 percent) and Rhode Island (70.8 percent) had the highest reported percentage of increase while California (8.1 percent) and Maryland (8.0 percent) had highest reported percentage of decrease.

Figure 77: Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	768Kbps or less	769Kbps – 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6 – 3.0Mbps	3.1 – 4.0Mbps	4.1 – 6.0Mbps	6.1 – 10Mbps	10.1 – 20Mbps	20.1 – 30Mbps	30.1 – 40Mbps	40.1 – 99.9Mbps	100Mbps or greater
Alabama (n=227)	2.2% (n=5)	4.4% (n=10)	42.7% (n=97)	8.8% (n=20)	2.2% (n=5)	12.8% (n=29)	5.7% (n=13)	3.5% (n=8)	--	--	--	11.0% (n=25)
Alaska (n=101)	16.8% (n=17)	10.9% (n=11)	26.7% (n=27)	14.9% (n=15)	8.9% (n=9)	1.0% (n=1)	5.0% (n=5)	2.0% (n=2)	--	2.0% (n=2)	2.0% (n=2)	2.0% (n=2)
Arizona (n=193)	4.1% (n=8)	1.6% (n=3)	16.6% (n=32)	7.3% (n=14)	--	11.4% (n=22)	11.4% (n=22)	26.4% (n=51)	9.8% (n=19)	8.3% (n=16)	1.0% (n=2)	2.1% (n=4)
Arkansas (n=174)	4.6% (n=8)	--	27.6% (n=48)	36.2% (n=63)	1.7% (n=3)	12.6% (n=22)	7.5% (n=13)	--	1.1% (n=2)	--	1.1% (n=2)	--
California (n=862)	2.8% (n=24)	14.2% (n=122)	21.2% (n=183)	3.5% (n=30)	1.5% (n=13)	5.8% (n=50)	7.9% (n=68)	22.7% (n=196)	2.8% (n=24)	1.6% (n=14)	2.3% (n=20)	12.9% (n=111)
Colorado (n=212)	3.8% (n=8)	7.5% (n=16)	6.6% (n=14)	5.7% (n=12)	1.9% (n=4)	8.5% (n=18)	15.1% (n=32)	10.4% (n=22)	9.0% (n=19)	12.3% (n=26)	2.4% (n=5)	3.3% (n=7)
Delaware (n=32)	--	3.1% (n=1)	3.1% (n=1)	--	--	--	21.9% (n=7)	21.9% (n=7)	15.6% (n=5)	--	--	28.1% (n=9)
Florida (n=388)	--	1.5% (n=6)	9.0% (n=35)	5.9% (n=23)	4.9% (n=19)	7.0% (n=27)	22.4% (n=87)	14.9% (n=58)	2.3% (n=9)	4.9% (n=19)	5.9% (n=23)	14.7% (n=57)
Georgia (n=304)	--	--	17.8% (n=54)	20.1% (n=61)	1.6% (n=5)	10.2% (n=31)	5.3% (n=16)	--	--	--	*	14.5% (n=44)
Hawaii (n=50)	--	--	2.0% (n=1)	10.0% (n=5)	20.0% (n=10)	2.0% (n=1)	--	8.0% (n=4)	52.0% (n=26)	--	--	6.0% (n=3)
Idaho (n=127)	2.4% (n=3)	5.5% (n=7)	3.9% (n=5)	21.3% (n=27)	15.0% (n=19)	15.0% (n=19)	7.9% (n=10)	19.7% (n=25)	--	3.9% (n=5)	1.6% (n=2)	1.6% (n=2)
Illinois (n=725)	*	3.7% (n=27)	16.4% (n=119)	19.6% (n=142)	5.9% (n=43)	5.1% (n=37)	8.7% (n=63)	11.3% (n=82)	10.2% (n=74)	3.4% (n=25)	7.7% (n=56)	2.9% (n=21)
Indiana (n=385)	*	1.2% (n=4)	16.0% (n=55)	14.0% (n=48)	15.2% (n=52)	8.7% (n=30)	7.9% (n=27)	12.8% (n=44)	6.7% (n=23)	*	7.6% (n=26)	5.2% (n=18)
Iowa (n=496)	8.5% (n=42)	7.7% (n=38)	12.9% (n=64)	10.1% (n=50)	3.6% (n=18)	6.3% (n=31)	10.7% (n=53)	7.1% (n=35)	--	2.4% (n=12)	1.8% (n=9)	14.7% (n=73)
Kansas (n=335)	9.3% (n=31)	11.6% (n=39)	31.0% (n=104)	11.9% (n=40)	5.4% (n=18)	7.2% (n=24)	5.1% (n=17)	3.3% (n=11)	1.2% (n=4)	--	2.1% (n=7)	3.9% (n=13)

Figure 77 (continued): Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	768Kbps or less	769Kbps – 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6 – 3.0Mbps	3.1 – 4.0Mbps	4.1 – 6.0Mbps	6.1 – 10Mbps	10.1 – 20Mbps	20.1 – 30Mbps	30.1 – 40Mbps	40.1 – 99.9Mbps	100Mbps or greater
Kentucky (n=171)	--	2.3% (n=4)	6.4% (n=11)	10.5% (n=18)	2.9% (n=5)	17.5% (n=30)	28.1% (n=48)	6.4% (n=11)	8.8% (n=15)	--	14.0% (n=24)	2.9% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=259)	--	--	5.8% (n=15)	8.1% (n=21)	5.0% (n=13)	6.9% (n=18)	22.0% (n=57)	20.5% (n=53)	11.2% (n=29)	*	6.2% (n=16)	8.5% (n=22)
Maine (n=250)	2.4% (n=6)	--	29.6% (n=74)	11.6% (n=29)	--	2.0% (n=5)	14.8% (n=37)	14.0% (n=35)	2.4% (n=6)	--	4.8% (n=12)	9.2% (n=23)
Maryland (n=172)	*	--	5.8% (n=10)	2.3% (n=4)	2.9% (n=5)	--	28.5% (n=49)	18.0% (n=31)	2.3% (n=4)	2.9% (n=5)	--	35.5% (n=61)
Massachusetts (n=388)	--	5.4% (n=21)	5.4% (n=21)	4.6% (n=18)	1.8% (n=7)	10.6% (n=41)	8.8% (n=34)	20.4% (n=79)	10.6% (n=41)	2.3% (n=9)	10.6% (n=41)	16.2% (n=63)
Michigan (n=545)	1.8% (n=10)	3.7% (n=20)	14.5% (n=79)	4.6% (n=25)	6.4% (n=35)	11.7% (n=64)	13.8% (n=75)	26.2% (n=143)	4.6% (n=25)	*	6.2% (n=34)	3.7% (n=20)
Minnesota (n=304)	--	1.6% (n=5)	10.2% (n=31)	35.5% (n=108)	4.3% (n=13)	1.6% (n=5)	18.1% (n=55)	10.9% (n=33)	10.5% (n=32)	--	--	2.0% (n=6)
Mississippi (n=226)	13.3% (n=30)	*	60.6% (n=137)	13.7% (n=31)	*	*	1.8% (n=4)	4.0% (n=9)	--	--	1.3% (n=3)	*
Missouri (n=291)	--	2.4% (n=7)	11.7% (n=34)	50.5% (n=172)	10.3% (n=35)	11.3% (n=39)	*	14.4% (n=49)	*	--	4.4% (n=15)	2.2% (n=8)
Montana (n=97)	5.6% (n=5)	3.7% (n=4)	9.3% (n=9)	9.3% (n=9)	7.4% (n=7)	9.3% (n=9)	29.7% (n=29)	5.6% (n=5)	1.9% (n=2)	--	1.9% (n=2)	9.3% (n=9)
Nebraska (n=260)	2.7% (n=7)	4.6% (n=12)	3.8% (n=10)	12.7% (n=33)	15.4% (n=40)	18.5% (n=48)	19.6% (n=51)	7.7% (n=20)	4.6% (n=12)	--	--	5.8% (n=15)
Nevada (n=62)	1.6% (n=1)	3.2% (n=2)	11.3% (n=7)	16.1% (n=10)	1.6% (n=1)	3.2% (n=4.8)	8.1% (n=5)	1.6% (n=1)	--	24.2% (n=15)	24.2% (n=15)	--
New Hampshire (n=212)	5.2% (n=11)	9.0% (n=19)	3.8% (n=8)	19.8% (n=42)	8.0% (n=17)	8.0% (n=17)	14.6% (n=31)	7.5% (n=16)	2.8% (n=6)	1.4% (n=3)	5.2% (n=11)	2.8% (n=6)
New Jersey (n=385)	*	4.4% (n=17)	9.9% (n=38)	1.8% (n=7)	--	1.8% (n=7)	26.8% (n=103)	9.9% (n=38)	*	*	17.7% (n=68)	17.1% (n=66)

Figure 77 (continued): Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	768Kbps or less	769Kbps – 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6 – 3.0Mbps	3.1 – 4.0Mbps	4.1 – 6.0Mbps	6.1 – 10Mbps	10.1 – 20Mbps	20.1 – 30Mbps	30.1 – 40Mbps	40.1 – 99.9Mbps	100Mbps or greater
New Mexico (n=108)	2.6% (n=3)	12.0% (n=14)	9.4% (n=11)	15.4% (n=18)	12.0% (n=14)	26.5% (n=31)	8.5% (n=10)	2.6% (n=3)	--	--	--	6.8% (n=8)
New York (n=966)	2.7% (n=26)	3.1% (n=30)	2.2% (n=21)	4.2% (n=41)	18.0% (n=174)	12.2% (n=118)	24.9% (n=241)	4.6% (n=44)	*	*	2.2% (n=21)	19.9% (n=192)
North Carolina (n=299)	*	3.7% (n=11)	2.3% (n=7)	2.0% (n=6)	28.8% (n=86)	29.8% (n=89)	19.4% (n=58)	3.7% (n=11)	1.7% (n=5)	*	3.7% (n=11)	1.7% (n=5)
North Dakota (n=84)	4.8% (n=4)	2.4% (n=2)	2.4% (n=2)	9.5% (n=8)	7.1% (n=6)	4.8% (n=4)	14.3% (n=12)	9.5% (n=8)	4.8% (n=4)	4.8% (n=4)	4.8% (n=4)	11.9% (n=10)
Ohio (n=569)	1.8% (n=10)	1.8% (n=10)	8.4% (n=48)	14.7% (n=84)	7.2% (n=41)	4.6% (n=26)	9.3% (n=53)	13.2% (n=75)	16.9% (n=96)	1.4% (n=8)	1.1% (n=6)	8.3% (n=47)
Oklahoma (n=159)	3.1% (n=5)	6.3% (n=10)	21.4% (n=34)	11.9% (n=19)	--	3.8% (n=6)	12.6% (n=20)	11.5% (n=19)	1.3% (n=2)	--	19.5% (n=31)	8.2% (n=13)
Pennsylvania (n=444)	3.6% (n=16)	2.7% (n=12)	13.3% (n=59)	8.8% (n=39)	8.3% (n=37)	9.7% (n=43)	10.8% (n=48)	6.3% (n=28)	4.3% (n=19)	2.5% (n=11)	3.6% (n=16)	16.4% (n=73)
Rhode Island (n=65)	3.1% (n=2)	3.1% (n=2)	7.7% (n=5)	16.9% (n=11)	3.1% (n=2)	--	29.2% (n=19)	9.2% (n=6)	9.2% (n=6)	3.1% (n=2)	9.2% (n=6)	3.1% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=123)	--	8.9% (n=11)	11.4% (n=14)	8.1% (n=10)	--	--	18.7% (n=23)	26.0% (n=32)	--	--	6.5% (n=8)	4.9% (n=6)
South Dakota (n=147)	8.8% (n=13)	6.1% (n=9)	11.6% (n=17)	8.2% (n=12)	4.8% (n=7)	6.8% (n=10)	9.5% (n=14)	10.9% (n=16)	3.4% (n=5)	2.0% (n=3)	3.4% (n=5)	21.1% (n=31)
Tennessee (n=224)	5.8% (n=13)	9.8% (n=22)	6.7% (n=15)	5.8% (n=13)	8.9% (n=20)	15.6% (n=35)	8.5% (n=19)	5.8% (n=13)	1.8% (n=4)	--	13.8% (n=31)	9.8% (n=22)
Texas (n=630)	2.4% (n=15)	3.0% (n=19)	20.2% (n=127)	14.4% (n=91)	6.0% (n=38)	10.5% (n=66)	13.5% (n=85)	5.6% (n=35)	2.1% (n=13)	5.7% (n=36)	5.1% (n=32)	5.9% (n=37)
Utah (n=103)	1.9% (n=2)	3.9% (n=4)	8.7% (n=9)	5.8% (n=6)	5.8% (n=6)	2.9% (n=3)	11.7% (n=12)	12.6% (n=13)	1.9% (n=2)	--	7.8% (n=8)	31.1% (n=32)
Vermont (n=167)	4.8% (n=8)	7.8% (n=13)	3.6% (n=6)	9.0% (n=15)	15.0% (n=25)	15.0% (n=25)	6.0% (n=10)	4.8% (n=8)	4.8% (n=8)	1.2% (n=2)	4.8% (n=8)	11.4% (n=19)

Figure 77 (continued): Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	768Kbps or less	769Kbps – 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6 – 3.0Mbps	3.1 – 4.0Mbps	4.1 – 6.0Mbps	6.1 – 10Mbps	10.1 – 20Mbps	20.1 – 30Mbps	30.1 – 40Mbps	40.1 – 99.9Mbps	100Mbps or greater
Virginia (n=283)	9.5% (n=27)	3.2% (n=9)	12.7% (n=36)	13.1% (n=37)	*	5.3% (n=15)	4.9% (n=14)	13.1% (n=37)	2.1% (n=6)	5.7% (n=16)	11.3% (n=32)	3.2% (n=9)
Washington (n=177)	--	4.5% (n=8)	24.3% (n=43)	4.5% (n=8)	--	1.1% (n=2)	9.6% (n=17)	10.7% (n=19)	18.1% (n=32)	2.3% (n=4)	8.5% (n=15)	11.9% (n=21)
Washington, DC (n=27)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100% (n=27)
West Virginia (n=168)	--	--	91.1% (n=153)	--	--	--	--	--	*	--	--	8.3% (n=14)
Wisconsin (n=446)	--	*	32.3% (n=144)	45.1% (n=201)	4.0% (n=18)	3.1% (n=14)	1.3% (n=6)	2.9% (n=13)	4.3% (n=19)	*	--	*
Wyoming (n=74)	6.8% (n=5)	12.2% (n=9)	29.7% (n=22)	12.2% (n=9)	6.8% (n=5)	6.8% (n=5)	6.8% (n=5)	8.1% (n=6)	4.1% (n=3)	--	1.4% (n=1)	--
National	2.8% (n=388)	4.1% (n=561)	16.5% (n=2,289)	12.9% (n=1,781)	5.7% (n=786)	7.7% (n=1,068)	12.2% (n=1,690)	10.7% (n=1,477)	5.1% (n=712)	1.9% (n=263)	4.4% (n=603)	9.1% (n=1,259)

Key * = Insufficient data to report

-- = No data to report

To conserve space, Figure 77 does not include the “don’t know” category reported by libraries regarding their broadband connectivity. This will impact the total N reported for each state.

The maximum speed of public access Internet service is shown in Figure 77. The largest percentage of libraries report having 1.5Mbps (T1) connection (16.5 percent), which was the largest reported category in 2010-2011 (21.8 percent) as well. In 2010-2011, West Virginia (91.1 percent), Mississippi (60.6 percent) reported the highest percentage of T1 connections. Significantly, 2011-2012 responses indicate 69.7 percent of all outlets have greater than a T1 connection, up from 60.6 percent last year. 16.8 percent of outlets in Alaska report a connection speed less than 769Kbps, which is a substantial difference from the 41.3 percent of outlets with this connection speed in 2010-2011.

Figure 78: Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State

State	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs at some times	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time	Don't know
Alabama (n=209)	13.4% (n=28)	19.6% (n=41)	67.0% (n=140)	--
Alaska (n=102)	32.4% (n=33)	29.4% (n=30)	38.2% (n=39)	--
Arizona (n=199)	1.5% (n=3)	28.6% (n=57)	69.8% (n=139)	--
Arkansas (n=173)	6.9% (n=12)	58.4% (n=101)	27.2% (n=47)	7.5% (n=13)
California (n=870)	23.8% (n=207)	36.0% (n=313)	40.2% (n=350)	*
Colorado (n=224)	9.8% (n=22)	37.5% (n=84)	52.7% (n=118)	--
Delaware (n=33)	--	3.0% (n=1)	97.0% (n=32)	--
Florida (n=441)	15.2% (n=67)	16.8% (n=74)	68.0% (n=300)	--
Georgia (n=326)	16.6% (n=54)	31.9% (n=104)	51.5% (n=168)	--
Hawaii (n=45)	17.8% (n=8)	46.7% (n=21)	35.6% (n=16)	--
Idaho (n=133)	9.0% (n=12)	33.1% (n=44)	57.9% (n=77)	--
Illinois (n=725)	14.9% (n=108)	27.4% (n=199)	57.2% (n=415)	*
Indiana (n=345)	9.6% (n=33)	27.2% (n=94)	62.9% (n=217)	*
Iowa (n=503)	20.1% (n=101)	19.1% (n=96)	60.8% (n=306)	--
Kansas (n=366)	13.4% (n=49)	29.2% (n=107)	56.3% (n=206)	1.1% (n=4)
Kentucky (n=170)	8.2% (n=14)	21.2% (n=36)	70.6% (n=120)	--
Louisiana (n=285)	7.0% (n=20)	11.6% (n=33)	81.4% (n=232)	--
Maine (n=261)	4.6% (n=12)	17.2% (n=45)	78.2% (n=204)	--
Maryland (n=175)	13.1% (n=23)	6.9% (n=12)	80.0% (n=140)	--
Massachusetts (n=376)	10.6% (n=40)	20.7% (n=78)	68.6% (n=258)	*
Michigan (n=556)	9.2% (n=51)	34.7% (n=193)	56.1% (n=312)	--

Figure 78 (continued): Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State

State	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs at some times	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time	Don't know
Minnesota (n=302)	5.0% (n=15)	33.4% (n=101)	61.3% (n=185)	*
Mississippi (n=210)	24.8% (n=52)	41.9% (n=88)	33.3% (n=70)	--
Missouri (n=296)	6.8% (n=20)	25.7% (n=76)	67.6% (n=200)	--
Montana (n=97)	13.4% (n=13)	23.7% (n=23)	62.9% (n=61)	--
Nebraska (n=264)	4.5% (n=12)	12.1% (n=32)	83.3% (n=220)	--
Nevada (n=84)	39.3% (n=33)	10.7% (n=9)	50.0% (n=42)	--
New Hampshire (n=221)	13.6% (n=30)	24.9% (n=55)	60.2% (n=133)	1.4% (n=3)
New Jersey (n=364)	12.4% (n=45)	21.4% (n=78)	66.2% (n=241)	--
New Mexico (n=121)	14.9% (n=18)	39.7% (n=48)	45.5% (n=55)	--
New York (n=976)	6.5% (n=63)	43.90% (n=428)	48.7% (n=475)	1.0% (n=1)
North Carolina (n=304)	4.9% (n=15)	19.1% (n=58)	76.0% (n=231)	--
North Dakota (n=85)	7.1% (n=6)	--	90.6% (n=77)	2.4% (n=2)
Ohio (n=589)	7.8% (n=46)	30.2% (n=178)	62.0% (n=365)	--
Oklahoma (n=153)	20.9% (n=32)	36.6% (n=56)	40.5% (n=62)	3.0% (n=3)
Pennsylvania (n=450)	16.7% (n=75)	22.4% (n=101)	60.9% (n=274)	--
Rhode Island (n=66)	4.5% (n=3)	21.2% (n=14)	74.2% (n=49)	--
South Carolina (n=125)	8.8% (n=11)	18.4% (n=23)	72.8% (n=91)	--
South Dakota (n=153)	8.5% (n=13)	21.6% (n=33)	69.9% (n=107)	--
Tennessee (n=238)	13.9% (n=33)	20.2% (n=48)	65.1% (n=155)	*
Texas (n=643)	16.2% (n=104)	26.7% (n=172)	56.5% (n=363)	*

Figure 78 (continued): Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State

State	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs at some times	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time	Don't know
Utah (n=113)	25.7% (n=29)	22.1% (n=25)	52.2% (n=59)	--
Vermont (n=178)	18.5% (n=33)	17.4% (n=31)	64.0% (n=114)	--
Virginia (n=292)	10.6% (n=31)	31.5% (n=92)	57.2% (n=167)	*
Washington (n=186)	27.4% (n=51)	26.3% (n=49)	46.2% (n=86)	--
Washington, DC (n=27)	--	--	100.0% (n=27)	--
West Virginia (n=158)	20.3% (n=32)	29.7% (n=47)	48.1% (n=76)	1.9% (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=421)	14.7% (n=62)	45.4% (n=191)	39.2% (n=165)	*
Wyoming (n=76)	9.2% (n=7)	42.1% (n=32)	48.7% (n=37)	--
National	13.0% (n=1,827)	28.4% (n=3,993)	58.3% (n=8,210)	*
Key * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report				

The adequacy of connection speeds in public libraries is shown in Figure 78 and the results are very similar to results from last year's survey. More than half of outlets (58.3 percent) report that their connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at all times. Some states, however, experience greater challenges in this area, with only 27.2 percent of Arkansas libraries and 35.6 percent of Hawaiian libraries reporting sufficient connection speeds at all times. Overall, 28.4 percent of libraries report having sufficient connection speeds only some times during the day, although in some states insufficient connection speeds are more problematic than others. For example, nearly half the libraries in Wisconsin (45.4 percent) and over half in Arkansas (58.4 percent) report having insufficient connection speeds at some times during the day. Overall, just under half of libraries (41.5 percent) report having insufficient connection speeds either always or at some times of the day.

Figure 79: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch and when the library is closed	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch, but not when the library is closed	Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	Don't Know
Alabama (n=237)	73.8% (n=175)	10.5% (n=25)	3.0% (n=7)	12.7% (n=30)	--
Alaska (n=102)	58.8% (n=60)	26.5% (n=27)	8.8% (n=9)	5.9% (n=6)	--
Arizona (n=198)	89.4% (n=177)	8.1% (n=16)	2.5% (n=5)	--	--
Arkansas (n=170)	52.9% (n=90)	7.1% (n=12)	7.6% (n=13)	32.4% (n=55)	--
California (n=923)	57.0% (n=526)	21.0% (n=194)	4.3% (n=40)	17.7% (n=163)	--
Colorado (n=224)	88.4% (n=198)	6.3% (n=14)	--	5.4% (n=12)	--
Delaware (n=33)	75.8% (n=25)	24.2% (n=8)	--	--	--
Florida (n=467)	85.7% (n=400)	12.0% (n=56)	1.9% (n=9)	*	--
Georgia (n=327)	73.4% (n=240)	24.5% (n=80)	1.2% (n=4)	*	--
Hawaii (n=50)	--	4.0% (n=2)	96.0% (n=48)	--	--
Idaho (n=134)	83.6% (n=112)	9.0% (n=12)	--	7.5% (n=10)	--
Illinois (n=734)	52.6% (n=386)	38.7% (n=284)	1.2% (n=9)	7.5% (n=55)	*
Indiana (n=361)	69.3% (n=250)	25.5% (n=92)	2.5% (n=9)	2.8% (n=10)	--
Iowa (n=503)	76.7% (n=386)	13.1% (n=66)	3.2% (n=16)	7.0% (n=35)	--
Kansas (n=366)	81.7% (n=299)	10.4% (n=38)	1.9% (n=7)	6.0% (n=22)	--
Kentucky (n=157)	84.7% (n=133)	12.1% (n=19)	--	3.2% (n=5)	--
Louisiana (n=293)	70.0% (n=205)	26.6% (n=78)	3.4% (n=10)	--	--
Maine (n=261)	88.5% (n=231)	4.6% (n=12)	2.3% (n=6)	4.6% (n=12)	--
Maryland (n=179)	86.0% (n=154)	12.3% (n=22)	--	1.7% (n=3)	--
Massachusetts (n=408)	86.3% (n=352)	10.8% (n=44)	1.0% (n=4)	2.0% (n=8)	--

Figure 79 (continued): Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch and when the library is closed	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch, but not when the library is closed	Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	Don't Know
Michigan (n=570)	64.7% (n=369)	30.2% (n=172)	*	4.2% (n=24)	--
Minnesota (n=300)	76.3% (n=229)	16.3% (n=49)	*	6.7% (n=20)	--
Mississippi (n=201)	41.8% (n=84)	30.3% (n=61)	14.4% (n=29)	13.4% (n=27)	--
Missouri (n=307)	22.8% (n=70)	55.0% (n=169)	4.2% (n=13)	17.9% (n=55)	--
Montana (n=97)	88.7% (n=86)	11.3% (n=11)	--	--	--
Nebraska (n=265)	82.3% (n=218)	16.6% (n=44)	*	*	--
Nevada (n=61)	80.3% (n=49)	1.6% (n=1)	8.2% (n=5)	9.8% (n=6)	--
New Hampshire (n=221)	86.4% (n=191)	8.6% (n=19)	1.4% (n=3)	3.6% (n=8)	--
New Jersey (n=384)	84.1% (n=323)	15.9% (n=61)	--	--	--
New Mexico (n=121)	52.9% (n=64)	35.5% (n=43)	2.5% (n=3)	9.1% (n=11)	--
New York (n=1001)	74.2% (n=743)	24.3% (n=243)	*	1.0% (n=10)	--
North Carolina (n=312)	64.7% (n=202)	17.6% (n=55)	16.0% (n=50)	1.6% (n=5)	--
North Dakota (n=85)	61.2% (n=52)	12.9% (n=11)	7.1% (n=6)	18.8% (n=16)	--
Ohio (n=626)	71.1% (n=445)	23.2% (n=145)	3.0% (n=19)	2.7% (n=17)	--
Oklahoma (n=161)	88.8% (n=143)	8.1% (n=13)	2.2% (n=4)	1.1% (n=2)	--
Pennsylvania (n=453)	70.4% (n=319)	27.8% (n=126)	*	*	--
Rhode Island (n=67)	73.1% (n=49)	22.4% (n=15)	--	4.5% (n=3)	--
South Carolina (n=125)	64.0% (n=80)	25.6% (n=32)	7.2% (n=9)	3.2% (n=4)	--
South Dakota (n=151)	44.4% (n=67)	14.6% (n=22)	7.9% (n=12)	33.1% (n=50)	--
Tennessee (n=240)	65.8% (n=158)	27.5% (n=66)	4.2% (n=10)	2.5% (n=6)	--

Figure 79 (continued): Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch and when the library is closed	Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch, but not when the library is closed	Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	Don't Know
Texas (n=687)	67.4% (n=463)	23.6% (n=162)	4.5% (n=31)	4.5% (n=31)	--
Utah (n=114)	72.8% (n=83)	22.8% (n=26)	--	4.4% (n=5)	--
Vermont (n=179)	89.9% (n=161)	8.4% (n=15)	1.7% (n=3)	--	--
Virginia (n=290)	54.1% (n=157)	29.3% (n=85)	8.6% (n=25)	7.9% (n=23)	--
Washington (n=280)	74.6% (n=209)	21.8% (n=61)	*	2.9% (n=8)	--
Washington, DC (n=27)	100% (n=27)	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=158)	34.8% (n=55)	65.2% (n=103)	*	*	--
Wisconsin (n=403)	79.4% (n=320)	19.6% (n=79)	1.0% (n=4)	--	--
Wyoming (n=70)	64.3% (n=45)	24.3% (n=17)	1.4% (n=1)	10.0% (n=7)	--
National	68.5% (n=9,926)	22.0% (n=3,186)	3.5% (n=566)	5.6% (n=806)	--
Key * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report					

Whether or not wireless Internet service is available in public libraries is shown in Figure 79. Most libraries (89.5 percent) do provide wireless, up from 86.6 percent in 2010-2011. All libraries in Delaware, Washington, DC, New Jersey, and Montana provide wireless Internet access. Hawaii currently has extremely low wireless availability rates, but 96.0 percent of libraries in Hawaii report plans to make wireless available within the next year, well above the national average of 3.5 percent. Also well above the national average in this category are Mississippi (14.4 percent), North Carolina (16.0 percent). A total of 32.4 percent of outlets in Arkansas and 33.1 percent of outlets in South Dakota reported no plans to provide wireless access, well above the national average of 5.6 percent.

Figure 80: Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State

<i>State</i>	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with no management techniques	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with management techniques	The wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	Don't Know
Alabama (n=199)	65.8% (n=131)	17.1% (n=34)	14.6% (n=29)	2.5% (n=5)
Alaska (n=87)	59.8% (n=52)	19.5% (n=17)	17.2% (n=15)	3.4% (n=3)
Arizona (n=185)	70.3% (n=130)	23.2% (n=43)	4.9% (n=9)	1.6% (n=3)
Arkansas (n=102)	66.7% (n=68)	30.4% (n=31)	2.9% (n=3)	--
California (n=625)	40.6% (n=254)	31.7% (n=198)	26.9% (n=168)	*
Colorado (n=206)	51.9% (n=107)	13.1% (n=27)	34.0% (n=70)	1.0% (n=2)
Delaware (n=28)	21.4% (n=6)	39.3% (n=11)	35.7% (n=10)	3.6% (n=1)
Florida (n=429)	61.1% (n=262)	25.2% (n=108)	10.0% (n=43)	3.7% (n=16)
Georgia (n=313)	63.9% (n=200)	32.2% (n=104)	1.0% (n=3)	1.9% (n=6)
Hawaii (n=2)	--	--	100% (n=2)	--
Idaho (n=123)	80.5% (n=99)	3.3% (n=4)	16.3% (n=20)	--
Illinois (n=660)	72.1% (n=476)	17.1% (n=113)	8.9% (n=59)	1.8% (n=12)
Indiana (n=340)	54.1% (n=184)	34.7% (n=118)	9.1% (n=31)	2.1% (n=7)
Iowa (n=453)	75.9% (n=344)	7.3% (n=33)	11.9% (n=64)	4.9% (n=22)
Kansas (n=333)	73.3% (n=244)	9.6% (n=32)	13.8% (n=46)	3.3% (n=11)
Kentucky (n=148)	54.1% (n=80)	37.8% (n=56)	8.1% (n=12)	--
Louisiana (n=282)	61.7% (n=174)	25.5% (n=72)	8.5% (n=24)	4.3% (n=12)
Maine (n=238)	85.3% (n=203)	5.0% (n=12)	2.5% (n=6)	7.1% (n=17)
Maryland (n=157)	47.1% (n=74)	37.6% (n=59)	15.3% (n=24)	--
Massachusetts (n=387)	39.5% (n=153)	22.7% (n=88)	32.3% (n=125)	5.4% (n=21)
Michigan (n=494)	48.2% (n=238)	37.4% (n=185)	14.4% (n=71)	--

Figure 80 (continued): Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State

<i>State</i>	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with no management techniques	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with management techniques	The wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	Don't Know
Minnesota (n=281)	31.3% (n=88)	54.1% (n=152)	11.4% (n=32)	3.2% (n=9)
Mississippi (n=151)	53.0% (n=80)	41.7% (n=63)	5.3% (n=8)	--
Missouri (n=231)	64.1% (n=148)	22.1% (n=51)	13.9% (n=32)	--
Montana (n=97)	87.6% (n=85)	5.2% (n=5)	7.2% (n=7)	--
Nebraska (n=258)	77.5% (n=200)	8.1% (n=21)	8.5% (n=22)	5.8% (n=15)
Nevada (n=50)	60.0% (n=30)	38.0% (n=19)	2.0% (n=1)	--
New Hampshire (n=203)	78.8% (n=160)	3.9% (n=8)	10.3% (n=21)	6.9% (n=14)
New Jersey (n=384)	29.2% (n=112)	25.5% (n=98)	42.4% (n=163)	2.9% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=107)	46.7% (n=50)	23.4% (n=25)	21.5% (n=23)	8.4% (n=9)
New York (n=975)	37.6% (n=367)	33.4% (n=326)	26.9% (n=262)	2.1% (n=20)
North Carolina (n=263)	51.3% (n=135)	33.5% (n=88)	14.1% (n=37)	1.1% (n=3)
North Dakota (n=59)	57.6% (n=34)	10.2% (n=6)	25.4% (n=15)	6.8% (n=4)
Ohio (n=570)	61.9% (n=353)	33.9% (n=193)	4.2% (n=24)	--
Oklahoma (n=155)	75.5% (n=117)	15.5% (n=24)	7.1% (n=11)	1.9% (n=3)
Pennsylvania (n=415)	58.3% (n=242)	20.7% (n=86)	2.4% (n=10)	2.4% (n=10)
Rhode Island (n=62)	43.5% (n=27)	48.4% (n=30)	8.1% (n=5)	--
South Carolina (n=109)	46.8% (n=51)	36.7% (n=40)	11.0% (n=12)	5.5% (n=6)
South Dakota (n=89)	75.3% (n=67)	7.9% (n=7)	13.5% (n=12)	3.4% (n=3)
Tennessee (n=220)	75.3% (n=139)	10.0% (n=22)	25.9% (n=57)	*
Texas (n=619)	53.2% (n=329)	20.0% (n=124)	24.2% (n=150)	2.6% (n=16)
Utah (n=96)	46.9% (n=45)	33.3% (n=32)	19.8% (n=19)	--
Vermont (n=175)	84.6% (n=148)	3.4% (n=6)	8.6% (n=15)	3.4% (n=6)

Figure 80 (continued): Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State

<i>State</i>	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with no management techniques	The wireless connection and public workstations share bandwidth/connection with management techniques	The wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	Don't Know
Virginia (n=239)	57.3% (n=137)	27.6% (n=66)	14.2% (n=34)	*
Washington (n=181)	66.9% (n=121)	24.3% (n=44)	2.2% (n=4)	6.6% (n=12)
Washington, DC (n=27)	100% (n=27)	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=146)	64.4% (n=94)	15.4% (n=22)	9.6% (n=14)	11.0% (n=16)
Wisconsin (n=400)	54.3% (n=217)	27.0% (n=108)	15.5% (n=62)	3.3% (n=13)
Wyoming (n=62)	74.2% (n=46)	21.0% (n=13)	4.8% (n=3)	--
National	57.1% (n=7,179)	25.2% (n=3,164)	15.4% (n=1,931)	2.3% (n=293)
Key * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report				

Figure 80 details whether or not the wireless and public access workstations share the same bandwidth or connection in libraries that do provide wireless access. Over half (57.1 percent) of outlets have a shared bandwidth/connection, and do not utilize any management techniques. The states most likely to share connections are Washington, DC (100 percent), Montana (87.6 percent), Vermont (84.6 percent), and Maine (85.3 percent). States that tend to share bandwidth, yet have management techniques are Minnesota (54.1 percent), Rhode Island (48.4), Mississippi (41.7 percent). States reporting the highest percentage of having a separate connection are Hawaii (100 percent) and New Jersey (42.4 percent).

Figure 81: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

State	Provide services for job seekers	Provide information for local economic development	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investment	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
Alabama (n=249)	4.6 (n=249)	3.6 (n=249)	4.5 (n=249)	3.9 (n=229)	4.2 (n=243)	4.1 (n=249)	3.9 (n=249)	4.0 (n=249)	3.9 (n=249)	3.6 (n=239)	2.8 (n=239)	2.9 (n=239)	4.3 (n=28)
Alaska (n=99)	4.1 (n=97)	3.4 (n=97)	4.5 (n=99)	3.4 (n=97)	3.9 (n=99)	4.1 (n=99)	3.8 (n=92)	4.2 (n=99)	3.7 (n=97)	3.8 (n=97)	2.9 (n=97)	2.7 (n=85)	4.3 (n=16)
Arizona (n=199)	4.5 (n=199)	3.8 (n=199)	4.3 (n=199)	4.2 (n=196)	4.2 (n=199)	4.0 (n=199)	4.1 (n=199)	4.2 (n=199)	3.8 (n=199)	4.2 (n=199)	3.5 (n=196)	3.7 (n=199)	4.4 (n=29)
Arkansas (n=172)	4.7 (n=172)	2.9 (n=170)	4.3 (n=170)	3.1 (n=149)	3.9 (n=172)	3.7 (n=172)	3.9 (n=172)	3.8 (n=172)	3.2 (n=172)	3.2 (n=170)	2.7 (n=170)	2.5 (n=170)	5.0 (n=8)
California (n=838)	4.6 (n=831)	3.7 (n=831)	4.4 (n=832)	3.9 (n=813)	4.3 (n=820)	3.9 (n=830)	4.0 (n=830)	4.1 (n=833)	3.8 (n=832)	3.9 (n=832)	3.3 (n=823)	3.8 (n=825)	3.6 (n=42)
Colorado (n=220)	4.4 (n=220)	3.4 (n=219)	4.2 (n=220)	3.8 (n=216)	3.7 (n=210)	3.3 (n=211)	3.6 (n=218)	3.7 (n=217)	3.3 (n=220)	3.7 (n=219)	2.98 (n=213)	3.4 (n=214)	4.3 (n=30)
Delaware (n=33)	4.8 (n=33)	3.9 (n=33)	4.5 (n=33)	4.2 (n=32)	4.0 (n=33)	3.9 (n=33)	3.7 (n=33)	4.2 (n=33)	3.9 (n=33)	4.0 (n=32)	3.0 (n=33)	3.7 (n=33)	5.0 (n=2)
Florida (n=459)	4.8 (n=459)	4.0 (n=457)	4.9 (n=459)	4.2 (n=452)	4.3 (n=457)	4.0 (n=455)	4.0 (n=466)	4.1 (n=455)	3.8 (n=456)	4.1 (n=457)	3.7 (n=454)	4.0 (n=446)	3.9 (n=60)
Georgia (n=322)	4.4 (n=320)	3.9 (n=322)	4.2 (n=322)	3.9 (n=311)	3.9 (n=320)	3.8 (n=322)	4.0 (n=322)	4.0 (n=322)	3.6 (n=320)	3.6 (n=320)	3.2 (n=320)	3.2 (n=318)	3.5 (n=42)
Hawaii (n=50)	3.5 (n=50)	3.9 (n=50)	3.8 (n=49)	4.1 (n=49)	3.7 (n=50)	3.2 (n=43)	3.1 (n=50)	2.9 (n=50)	3.4 (n=50)	4.4 (n=50)	3.0 (n=50)	3.9 (n=10)	3.8 (n=50)
Idaho (n=134)	4.4 (n=134)	3.9 (n=134)	4.6 (n=134)	3.8 (n=127)	4.2 (n=134)	3.9 (n=134)	4.0 (n=134)	4.1 (n=129)	4.0 (n=134)	3.9 (n=134)	3.2 (n=132)	3.2 (n=109)	4.4 (n=35)
Illinois (n=728)	4.3 (n=718)	4.0 (n=721)	4.1 (n=724)	4.4 (n=712)	3.9 (n=703)	3.7 (n=676)	3.9 (n=703)	3.4 (n=700)	3.8 (n=712)	4.4 (n=715)	3.1 (n=679)	3.4 (n=340)	4.0 (n=413)

Figure 81 (continued): Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

State	Provide services for job seekers	Provide information for local economic development	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investment	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
Indiana (n=365)	4.4 (n=365)	3.9 (n=362)	4.4 (n=359)	4.2 (n=358)	4.0 (n=357)	4.0 (n=356)	4.1 (n=358)	3.5 (n=358)	3.8 (n=363)	4.3 (n=363)	3.1 (n=363)	3.0 (n=230)	4.1 (n=151)
Iowa (n=499)	4.3 (n=499)	3.3 (n=486)	4.1 (n=495)	3.5 (n=495)	3.9 (n=495)	3.8 (n=490)	3.6 (n=486)	3.9 (n=481)	3.6 (n=486)	3.8 (n=481)	2.9 (n=470)	2.8 (n=468)	4.1 (n=88)
Kansas (n=360)	4.3 (n=358)	3.4 (n=355)	4.4 (n=355)	3.3 (n=329)	3.6 (n=355)	3.7 (n=355)	3.5 (n=349)	3.8 (n=353)	3.4 (n=355)	3.7 (n=355)	2.8 (n=344)	2.6 (n=318)	4.7 (n=33)
Kentucky (n=178)	4.6 (n=178)	3.6 (n=178)	4.5 (n=178)	4.2 (n=167)	4.4 (n=178)	4.2 (n=178)	4.2 (n=178)	4.4 (n=178)	3.9 (n=178)	4.0 (n=174)	3.0 (n=178)	3.2 (n=178)	3.1 (n=18)
Louisiana (n=290)	4.6 (n=289)	4.0 (n=289)	4.6 (n=289)	4.3 (n=282)	4.6 (n=276)	4.2 (n=288)	4.2 (n=290)	4.3 (n=290)	4.2 (n=289)	4.0 (n=290)	3.3 (n=289)	3.3 (n=273)	3.8 (n=7)
Maine (n=254)	4.6 (n=237)	3.8 (n=237)	4.6 (n=249)	3.6 (n=243)	4.0 (n=243)	3.9 (n=237)	4.2 (n=243)	4.1 (n=243)	4.0 (n=249)	4.0 (n=243)	3.2 (n=249)	2.9 (n=220)	4.74 (n=45)
Maryland (n=172)	4.9 (n=172)	4.4 (n=172)	4.5 (n=170)	4.5 (n=171)	4.6 (n=172)	3.9 (n=172)	4.3 (n=172)	4.0 (n=172)	3.9 (n=172)	4.2 (n=172)	3.7 (n=172)	3.3 (n=163)	4.1 (n=27)
Massachusetts (n=350)	4.4 (n=350)	3.5 (n=347)	4.3 (n=350)	3.6 (n=332)	3.9 (n=350)	3.6 (n=347)	3.7 (n=347)	3.8 (n=350)	3.5 (n=347)	3.9 (n=347)	3.1 (n=350)	3.0 (n=335)	4.0 (n=64)
Michigan (n=543)	4.8 (n=543)	3.9 (n=538)	4.6 (n=538)	4.0 (n=523)	3.9 (n=538)	3.7 (n=538)	3.9 (n=538)	3.8 (n=533)	3.7 (n=533)	3.9 (n=533)	3.3 (n=533)	2.8 (n=522)	3.4 (n=36)
Minnesota (n=289)	3.9 (n=289)	3.7 (n=285)	4.2 (n=289)	4.1 (n=282)	3.9 (n=282)	3.8 (n=285)	3.8 (n=280)	3.4 (n=279)	3.6 (n=285)	4.2 (n=286)	3.1 (n=277)	3.7 (n=127)	3.8 (n=173)
Mississippi (n=214)	4.7 (n=214)	3.7 (n=213)	4.5 (n=214)	3.5 (n=202)	4.2 (n=213)	4.1 (n=213)	3.9 (n=213)	4.2 (n=213)	4.1 (n=212)	3.3 (n=210)	2.8 (n=211)	3.0 (n=208)	3.5 (n=8)
Missouri (n=294)	4.0 (n=292)	3.9 (n=289)	4.1 (n=292)	4.2 (n=292)	3.8 (n=290)	3.9 (n=269)	3.7 (n=294)	3.4 (n=290)	3.8 (n=292)	4.3 (n=294)	3.2 (n=269)	3.3 (n=93)	3.8 (n=220)
Montana (n=94)	4.0 (n=94)	3.1 (n=94)	4.1 (n=94)	3.4 (n=88)	3.6 (n=94)	3.4 (n=92)	3.5 (n=94)	3.5 (n=92)	3.5 (n=94)	3.2 (n=92)	2.8 (n=92)	2.3 (n=85)	4.5 (n=7)

Figure 81 (continued): Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

State	Provide services for job seekers	Provide information for local economic development	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investment	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
Nebraska (n=263)	3.9 (n=260)	3.4 (n=258)	4.1 (n=260)	3.8 (n=251)	3.6 (n=248)	3.6 (n=246)	3.6 (n=243)	3.4 (n=251)	3.6 (n=256)	3.8 (n=252)	2.9 (n=241)	3.1 (n=163)	4.1 (n=116)
Nevada (n=78)	4.1 (n=78)	3.7 (n=78)	3.9 (n=77)	3.5 (n=78)	3.9 (n=78)	3.6 (n=78)	3.9 (n=78)	3.6 (n=78)	3.1 (n=77)	3.7 (n=78)	2.9 (n=78)	3.0 (n=77)	--
New Hampshire (n=221)	4.6 (n=215)	3.5 (n=216)	4.4 (n=218)	3.4 (n=201)	3.4 (n=218)	3.4 (n=218)	3.6 (n=218)	3.7 (n=215)	3.2 (n=221)	3.8 (n=215)	2.6 (n=212)	2.1 (n=195)	3.9 (n=33)
New Jersey (n=385)	4.7 (n=385)	4.2 (n=381)	4.6 (n=385)	4.2 (n=367)	4.4 (n=385)	4.0 (n=385)	4.0 (n=385)	4.1 (n=385)	4.2 (n=381)	4.4 (n=381)	3.8 (n=381)	4.1 (n=374)	3.6 (n=35)
New Mexico (n=120)	4.7 (n=120)	3.7 (n=120)	4.7 (n=120)	3.9 (n=115)	4.0 (n=118)	3.9 (n=118)	4.0 (n=118)	4.1 (n=120)	3.7 (n=115)	4.1 (n=120)	3.0 (n=117)	3.4 (n=120)	4.2 (n=17)
New York (n=990)	4.6 (n=985)	3.9 (n=983)	4.4 (n=990)	4.2 (n=960)	3.8 (n=973)	3.8 (n=985)	3.8 (n=855)	4.0 (n=983)	3.6 (n=982)	3.9 (n=988)	3.4 (n=974)	3.4 (n=918)	3.9 (n=102)
North Carolina (n=311)	4.7 (n=309)	3.7 (n=309)	4.3 (n=309)	3.7 (n=284)	4.1 (n=311)	3.9 (n=311)	4.1 (n=311)	4.1 (n=311)	3.7 (n=307)	3.7 (n=311)	3.1 (n=309)	3.2 (n=300)	4.3 (n=30)
North Dakota (n=82)	3.9 (n=80)	3.3 (n=82)	3.5 (n=80)	3.9 (n=78)	3.8 (n=80)	3.4 (n=79)	3.5 (n=80)	3.2 (n=80)	3.4 (n=82)	3.7 (n=82)	3.1 (n=82)	2.5 (n=40)	3.8 (n=46)
Ohio (n=590)	3.9 (n=581)	3.7 (n=586)	3.7 (n=588)	4.2 (n=583)	3.8 (n=584)	3.7 (n=581)	3.7 (n=586)	3.3 (n=578)	3.4 (n=587)	4.4 (n=583)	2.9 (n=562)	2.7 (n=205)	3.7 (n=401)
Oklahoma (n=159)	4.6 (n=159)	3.8 (n=157)	4.7 (n=159)	3.8 (n=153)	4.2 (n=148)	4.2 (n=146)	4.1 (n=156)	4.1 (n=157)	4.0 (n=159)	4.1 (n=154)	3.2 (n=143)	3.5 (n=154)	4.3 (n=31)
Pennsylvania (n=429)	4.5 (n=429)	3.6 (n=425)	4.4 (n=429)	3.8 (n=373)	3.8 (n=414)	3.4 (n=417)	3.9 (n=421)	3.8 (n=418)	3.5 (n=421)	3.6 (n=429)	3.0 (n=409)	2.9 (n=365)	3.7 (n=47)
Rhode Island (n=62)	4.7 (n=59)	3.4 (n=59)	4.6 (n=59)	4.3 (n=59)	4.1 (n=56)	3.6 (n=62)	4.2 (n=62)	4.2 (n=62)	3.8 (n=60)	4.5 (n=62)	3.5 (n=60)	3.5 (n=62)	2.0 (n=3)

Figure 81 (continued): Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

State	Provide services for job seekers	Provide information for local economic development	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investment	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
South Carolina (n=128)	4.9 (n=126)	4.0 (n=128)	4.7 (n=128)	4.2 (n=124)	4.3 (n=128)	3.8 (n=128)	3.9 (n=128)	4.1 (n=128)	4.0 (n=126)	3.8 (n=128)	3.1 (n=128)	3.0 (n=124)	1.4 (n=8)
South Dakota (n=146)	4.1 (n=144)	3.5 (n=136)	4.1 (n=146)	3.7 (n=141)	3.9 (n=141)	3.6 (n=139)	3.7 (n=142)	3.5 (n=141)	3.7 (n=144)	3.8 (n=144)	2.8 (n=132)	2.7 (n=96)	3.8 (n=58)
Tennessee (n=236)	4.8 (n=233)	4.0 (n=223)	4.8 (n=233)	4.3 (n=223)	4.3 (n=231)	4.2 (n=233)	4.2 (n=230)	4.2 (n=223)	4.3 (n=221)	4.0 (n=226)	3.3 (n=229)	3.3 (n=220)	4.8 (n=8)
Texas (n=709)	4.7 (n=706)	4.0 (n=700)	4.6 (n=703)	4.1 (n=669)	4.0 (n=693)	4.0 (n=698)	4.1 (n=692)	4.1 (n=694)	4.0 (n=701)	4.1 (n=698)	3.3 (n=695)	3.7 (n=698)	4.0 (n=78)
Utah (n=116)	4.3 (n=116)	3.7 (n=116)	4.3 (n=116)	3.6 (n=105)	4.0 (n=114)	3.9 (n=114)	3.9 (n=114)	3.9 (n=114)	3.7 (n=111)	3.9 (n=112)	3.2 (n=108)	3.7 (n=109)	1.3 (n=7)
Vermont (n=171)	3.8 (n=176)	3.2 (n=174)	3.9 (n=176)	3.6 (n=166)	3.5 (n=170)	3.4 (n=172)	3.6 (n=174)	3.3 (n=174)	3.2 (n=174)	3.9 (n=170)	2.5 (n=162)	2.6 (n=124)	3.7 (n=23)
Virginia (n=288)	4.6 (n=253)	3.6 (n=288)	4.3 (n=288)	4.2 (n=276)	4.2 (n=288)	3.9 (n=286)	4.2 (n=288)	4.0 (n=288)	3.5 (n=286)	4.0 (n=286)	3.7 (n=274)	3.6 (n=286)	4.0 (n=37)
Washington (n= 223)	4.5 (n=223)	3.6 (n=215)	4.1 (n=223)	3.4 (n=213)	4.5 (n=219)	3.4 (n=219)	4.1 (n=219)	3.8 (n=219)	3.6 (n=223)	3.6 (n=223)	2.9 (n=217)	3.1 (n=212)	5.0 (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=27)	5.0 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	5.0 (n=27)	5.0 (n=27)	4.0 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	4.0 (n=27)	3.1 (n=27)	2.1 (n=27)	2.0 (n=27)
West Virginia (n=149)	4.3 (n=148)	3.5 (n=147)	4.3 (n=149)	3.7 (n=137)	4.2 (n=149)	4.2 (n=148)	4.2 (n=149)	4.2 (n=149)	4.2 (n=146)	4.3 (n=148)	3.8 (n=149)	3.2 (n=126)	2.6 (n=11)
Wisconsin (n=403)	4.0 (n=399)	3.6 (n=395)	4.0 (n=399)	4.1 (n=382)	3.8 (n=395)	3.7 (n=394)	3.9 (n=389)	3.5 (n=397)	3.5 (n=385)	4.2 (n=395)	3.1 (n=381)	3.3 (n=172)	3.8 (n=230)
Wyoming (n=76)	4.4 (n=76)	3.9 (n=76)	4.4 (n=76)	3.6 (n=74)	4.3 (n=75)	4.5 (n=75)	4.4 (n=72)	4.4 (n=76)	3.9 (n=75)	3.7 (n=76)	3.5 (n=75)	3.3 (n=71)	2.8 (n=9)

National	4.4 (n=14,015)	3.7 (n=13,991)	4.3 (n=14,072)	4.0 (n=13,571)	4.0 (n=13,918)	3.8 (n=13,860)	3.9 (n=13,833)	3.8 (n=13,949)	3.7 (n=13,973)	4.0 (n=13,979)	3.2 (n=13,725)	3.3 (n=11,498)	3.9 (n=3,431)
Key: -- = No data to report													

Figure 81 shows the average ratings of the importance of public internet services to the community. Nationally, providing services to job as seekers was rated the most important service and ratings of most states reflect this. However, Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Vermont rated providing access to government information and services the most important service. In Hawaii and Illinois, providing information about the library's community was surveyed as the top-rated service. In Indiana, Louisiana, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Washington DC, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, providing services to job seekers was tied with other services for the top-rated service.

Figure 82: Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State

State	Offers formal IT training classes	Offers one-on-one IT training by appointment	Offers informal point-of-use assistance	Offers online training material	Does not offer any technology training
Alabama (n=235)	29.4% (n=69)	35.7% (n=84)	80.0% (n=188)	27.8% (n=65)	11.1% (n=26)
Alaska (n=102)	11.9% (n=12)	19.8% (n=20)	75.5% (n=77)	7.8% (n=8)	19.8% (n=20)
Arizona (n=199)	53.8% (n=107)	31.2% (n=62)	76.4% (n=152)	44.2% (n=88)	12.6% (n=25)
Arkansas (n=170)	15.9% (n=27)	21.2% (n=36)	60.0% (n=102)	8.8% (n=15)	38.8% (n=66)
California (n=800)	34.5% (n=276)	15.1% (n=121)	77.6% (n=621)	13.3% (n=106)	14.1% (n=113)
Colorado (n=222)	51.4% (n=114)	53.4% (n=118)	80.5% (n=178)	28.1% (n=62)	5.9% (n=13)
Delaware (n=33)	57.6% (n=19)	36.4% (n=12)	90.9% (n=30)	42.4% (n=14)	--
Florida (n=466)	55.6% (n=259)	38.0% (n=177)	82.1% (n=316)	27.0% (n=126)	16.7% (n=78)
Georgia (n=314)	34.4% (n=108)	13.3% (n=42)	81.8% (n=257)	20.7% (n=65)	10.8% (n=34)
Hawaii (n=50)	8.0% (n=4)	24.0% (n=12)	80.0% (n=40)	10.0% (n=5)	18.0% (n=9)
Idaho (n=134)	32.1% (n=43)	17.9% (n=24)	91.0% (n=122)	18.7% (n=25)	6.8% (n=9)
Illinois (n=686)	37.9% (n=260)	37.1% (n=254)	78.7% (n=540)	22.9% (n=157)	12.4% (n=85)
Indiana (n=365)	60.0% (n=219)	37.5% (n=137)	73.7% (n=269)	36.2% (n=132)	8.5% (n=31)
Iowa (n=495)	22.2% (n=110)	33.1% (n=164)	68.0% (n=336)	14.2% (n=70)	20.9% (n=103)
Kansas (n=360)	21.1% (n=76)	28.9% (n=104)	76.7% (n=276)	18.6% (n=67)	19.2% (n=69)
Kentucky (n=174)	52.3% (n=91)	34.5% (n=60)	86.3% (n=151)	27.6% (n=48)	2.3% (n=4)
Louisiana (n=275)	68.4% (n=188)	18.2% (n=50)	87.6% (n=241)	45.8% (n=126)	2.6% (n=7)
Maine (n=191)	18.3% (n=35)	42.4% (n=81)	82.2% (n=157)	20.9% (n=40)	17.8% (n=34)
Maryland (n=153)	67.3% (n=103)	60.8% (n=93)	95.4% (n=146)	60.8% (n=93)	*
Massachusetts (n=335)	33.5% (n=119)	34.4% (n=122)	80.3% (n=285)	9.6% (n=34)	12.1% (n=43)
Michigan (n=538)	64.5% (n=347)	29.1% (n=153)	96.1% (n=516)	35.5% (n=191)	*

Figure 82 (continued): Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State

State	Offers formal IT training classes	Offers one-on-one IT training by appointment	Offers informal point-of-use assistance	Offers online training material	Does not offer any technology training
Minnesota (n=285)	43.9% (n=125)	36.3% (n=103)	86.3% (n=246)	27.5% (n=78)	10.9% (n=31)
Mississippi (n=213)	30.5% (n=65)	9.4% (n=20)	77.0% (n=164)	19.2% (n=41)	13.6% (n=29)
Missouri (n=281)	41.3% (n=116)	32.4% (n=91)	88.6% (n=249)	22.8% (n=64)	8.5% (n=24)
Montana (n=94)	34.4% (n=32)	38.7% (n=36)	92.5% (n=86)	19.1% (n=18)	13.6% (n=29)
Nebraska (n=261)	21.2% (n=55)	26.2% (n=68)	80.0% (n=208)	8.0% (n=21)	13.5% (n=35)
Nevada (n=83)	59.0% (n=49)	3.6% (n=3)	86.7% (n=72)	2.4% (n=2)	13.3% (n=11)
New Hampshire (n=221)	23.5% (n=52)	39.8% (n=88)	85.0% (n=187)	15.0% (n=33)	10.4% (n=23)
New Jersey (n=370)	63.2% (n=234)	67.1% (n=249)	90.6% (n=336)	52.4% (n=194)	4.6% (n=17)
New Mexico (n=116)	40.5% (n=47)	36.5% (n=42)	97.4% (n=112)	40.9% (n=47)	2.6% (n=3)
New York (n=975)	74.1% (n=722)	52.2% (n=509)	91.1% (n=888)	43.3% (n=422)	1.5% (n=15)
North Carolina (n=320)	39.1% (n=125)	25.3% (n=81)	86.6% (n=227)	24.7% (n=79)	6.3% (n=20)
North Dakota (n=79)	27.8% (n=22)	20.6% (n=16)	64.1% (n=50)	17.9% (n=14)	15.4% (n=12)
Ohio (n=599)	66.3% (n=397)	54.9% (n=329)	85.3% (n=511)	45.9% (n=275)	3.3% (n=20)
Oklahoma (n=159)	52.2% (n=83)	27.7% (n=44)	78.0% (n=124)	37.7% (n=60)	13.2% (n=21)
Pennsylvania (n=400)	38.0% (n=152)	34.0% (n=136)	71.3% (n=286)	17.0% (n=68)	17.8% (n=71)
Rhode Island (n=62)	51.6% (n=32)	31.7% (n=20)	82.5% (n=52)	21.0% (n=13)	4.8% (n=3)
South Carolina (n=114)	54.4% (n=62)	38.4% (n=44)	94.7% (n=108)	43.0% (n=49)	1.8% (n=2)
South Dakota (n=149)	17.6% (n=26)	17.4% (n=26)	74.5% (n=111)	8.7% (n=13)	23.5% (n=35)
Tennessee (n=236)	50.4% (n=119)	23.0% (n=76)	89.4% (n=211)	42.6% (n=100)	7.2% (n=17)
Texas (n=642)	42.8% (n=275)	34.7% (n=223)	85.8% (n=551)	33.6% (n=216)	7.5% (n=48)
Utah (n=115)	41.7% (n=48)	21.7% (n=25)	82.8% (n=96)	42.6% (n=49)	12.1% (n=14)

Figure 82 (continued): Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State

State	Offers formal IT training classes	Offers one-on-one IT training by appointment	Offers informal point-of-use assistance	Offers online training material	Does not offer any technology training
Vermont (n=175)	41.7% (n=48)	42.0% (n=64)	85.1% (n=148)	23.6% (n=41)	9.7% (n=17)
Virginia (n=281)	56.2% (n=158)	45.2% (n=127)	94.0% (n=264)	32.0% (n=90)	3.6% (n=10)
Washington (n= 162)	61.7% (n=100)	42.6% (n=69)	92.6% (n=150)	19.1% (n=31)	4.9% (n=8)
Washington, DC (n=26)	84.6% (n=22)	--	15.4% (n=4)	3.8% (n=1)	3.8% (n=1)
West Virginia (n=153)	22.4% (n=34)	30.7% (n=47)	80.3% (n=122)	17.8% (n=27)	13.8% (n=21)
Wisconsin (n=401)	24.4% (n=98)	37.5% (n=150)	86.0% (n=344)	19.8% (n=79)	6.0% (n=24)
Wyoming (n=75)	20.0% (n=15)	26.7% (n=20)	72.4% (n=55)	17.3% (n=13)	23.0% (n=17)
National	44.3% (n=6,105)	34.8% (n=4,800)	82.7% (n=11,405)	28.1% (n=3,871)	9.8% (n=1,354)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive Key -- = No data to report; * = Insufficient data to report					

The availability of formal and informal technology training at public libraries is shown in Figure 82. Point-of-use assistance is the most prevalent form of technology training and the states with the highest percentages of libraries offering it are New Mexico (97.4 percent), Michigan (96.1 percent), and Maryland (95.4 percent). The highest percentage of libraries providing formal training are in Washington, DC (84.6 percent), New York (74.1 percent), and Louisiana (68.4 percent). New Jersey (67.1 percent), Maryland (60.8 percent), and Ohio (66.3 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries offering one-on-one training sessions. The states with the highest percentages of libraries offering online training materials were Maryland (60.8 percent), New Jersey (52.4 percent) and Ohio (45.9 percent). Arkansas (38.8 percent), South Dakota (23.5 percent), and Wyoming (23.0 percent) had the highest percentages of libraries not offering formal or informal training.

Figure 83 (Part 1): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

State	General computer skills	General software use	General Internet use	General online/Web searching	Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	Using online databases	Safe online practices	Accessing online government information
Alabama (n=74)	100.0% (n=69)	78.3% (n=54)	100.0% (n=74)	100.0% (n=74)	91.9% (n=68)	85.5% (n=59)	65.2% (n=45)	44.6% (n=33)
Alaska (n=19)	75.0% (n=9)	61.5% (n=8)	76.9% (n=10)	61.5% (n=8)	61.5% (n=8)	73.7% (n=14)	53.8% (n=7)	66.7% (n=12)
Arizona (n=110)	89.1% (n=98)	83.6% (n=92)	91.8% (n=101)	84.5% (n=93)	70.0% (n=77)	72.7% (n=80)	34.5% (n=38)	48.2% (n=53)
Arkansas (n=33)	78.6% (n=22)	70.4% (n=19)	78.6% (n=22)	71.4% (n=20)	32.1% (n=9)	60.0% (n=18)	60.7% (n=17)	14.8% (n=4)
California (n=282)	84.0% (n=237)	70.2% (n=198)	85.8% (n=242)	82.3% (n=233)	51.4% (n=145)	57.1% (n=161)	29.7% (n=82)	30.1% (n=83)
Colorado (n=118)	90.7% (n=107)	85.3% (n=99)	91.6% (n=109)	85.3% (n=99)	53.4% (n=62)	66.1% (n=78)	38.8% (n=45)	30.2% (n=35)
Delaware (n=19)	100.0% (n=19)	77.8% (n=14)	100.0% (n=19)	77.8% (n=14)	77.8% (n=14)	61.1% (n=11)	50.0% (n=9)	26.3% (n=5)
Florida (n=263)	86.3% (n=227)	54.4% (n=143)	87.0% (n=228)	79.9% (n=211)	39.3% (n=103)	70.1% (n=183)	62.5% (n=163)	25.6% (n=67)
Georgia (n=110)	95.5% (n=105)	75.0% (n=81)	92.7% (n=101)	73.1% (n=79)	33.3% (n=36)	57.4% (n=62)	24.1% (n=26)	35.5% (n=38)
Hawaii (n=4)	50.0% (n=2)	25.0% (n=1)	40.0% (n=2)	60.0% (n=3)	60.0% (n=3)	50.0% (n=2)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)
Idaho (n=43)	74.4% (n=32)	62.8% (n=27)	81.0% (n=34)	62.8% (n=27)	27.9% (n=12)	39.5% (n=17)	30.2% (n=13)	21.4% (n=9)
Illinois (n=313)	89.5% (n=280)	88.2% (n=268)	88.6% (n=280)	85.2% (n=265)	43.4% (n=131)	65.1% (n=194)	46.3% (n=138)	32.9% (n=98)
Indiana (n=220)	82.3% (n=181)	70.9% (n=156)	82.3% (n=181)	49.5% (n=109)	51.4% (n=112)	41.4% (n=91)	28.6% (n=63)	23.9% (n=52)
Iowa (n=110)	96.4% (n=106)	70.0% (n=77)	88.2% (n=97)	76.4% (n=84)	38.2% (n=42)	38.2% (n=42)	31.8% (n=35)	25.5% (n=28)
Kansas (n=75)	92.0% (n=69)	80.0% (n=60)	86.7% (n=65)	82.7% (n=62)	61.3% (n=46)	50.0% (n=38)	34.7% (n=26)	47.4% (n=36)
Kentucky (n=103)	95.1% (n=98)	79.6% (n=82)	93.1% (n=95)	81.4% (n=83)	24.2% (n=23)	41.1% (n=39)	17.6% (n=16)	19.8% (n=18)
Louisiana (n=196)	96.9% (n=190)	93.9% (n=184)	84.8% (n=167)	69.6% (n=135)	55.9% (n=109)	57.7% (n=113)	37.1% (n=72)	40.5% (n=77)
Maine (n=41)	70.7% (n=29)	65.7% (n=23)	85.4% (n=35)	85.4% (n=35)	65.7% (n=23)	70.7% (n=29)	57.5% (n=23)	50.0% (n=17)
Maryland (n=107)	73.8% (n=79)	69.2% (n=74)	84.1% (n=90)	68.2% (n=73)	41.1% (n=44)	57.9% (n=62)	27.2% (n=28)	23.3% (n=24)

Figure 83 (Part 1, continued): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

State	General computer skills	General software use	General Internet use	General online/Web searching	Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	Using online databases	Safe online practices	Accessing online government information
Massachusetts (n=120)	87.5% (n=105)	73.1% (n=87)	83.3% (n=100)	66.7% (n=80)	58.3% (n=70)	56.7% (n=68)	26.9% (n=32)	27.5% (n=33)
Michigan (n=353)	78.5% (n=277)	72.6% (n=252)	87.3% (n=308)	73.0% (n=257)	19.3% (n=68)	50.3% (n=180)	30.8% (n=107)	23.6% (n=82)
Minnesota (n=124)	66.9% (n=83)	39.2% (n=49)	70.2% (n=87)	59.2% (n=74)	40.8% (n=51)	40.8% (n=51)	12.9% (n=16)	24.8% (n=31)
Mississippi (n=66)	84.8% (n=56)	60.6% (n=40)	75.8% (n=50)	65.2% (n=43)	21.2% (n=14)	43.8% (n=28)	45.5% (n=30)	30.8% (n=20)
Missouri (n=120)	95.8% (n=115)	62.9% (n=73)	95.8% (n=113)	93.2% (n=110)	49.2% (n=58)	53.4% (n=62)	43.1% (n=50)	28.8% (n=34)
Montana (n=32)	56.3% (n=18)	43.8% (n=14)	66.7% (n=22)	56.3% (n=18)	33.3% (n=11)	56.3% (n=18)	28.1% (n=9)	21.9% (n=7)
Nebraska (n=55)	92.7% (n=51)	69.1% (n=38)	90.9% (n=50)	87.3% (n=48)	55.4% (n=31)	49.1% (n=27)	50.9% (n=28)	38.2% (n=21)
Nevada (n=49)	22.4% (n=11)	14.6% (n=7)	34.7% (n=17)	22.4% (n=11)	12.5% (n=6)	12.5% (n=6)	--	10.4% (n=5)
New Hampshire (n=55)	63.6% (n=35)	67.3% (n=35)	63.6% (n=35)	51.0% (n=26)	23.1% (n=12)	45.1% (n=23)	25.9% (n=14)	--
New Jersey (n=238)	84.9% (n=202)	78.0% (n=188)	86.7% (n=209)	76.3% (n=184)	64.6% (n=153)	67.5% (n=160)	43.2% (n=101)	7.7% (n=18)
New Mexico (n=47)	91.5% (n=43)	84.8% (n=39)	93.6% (n=44)	87.0% (n=40)	70.2% (n=33)	56.5% (n=26)	57.4% (n=27)	61.7% (n=29)
New York (n=727)	89.0% (n=647)	88.3% (n=642)	93.1% (n=667)	82.7% (n=601)	48.0% (n=349)	49.1% (n=357)	32.9% (n=239)	30.5% (n=220)
North Carolina (n=129)	94.6% (n=122)	79.5% (n=101)	92.2% (n=119)	74.0% (n=94)	28.6% (n=36)	33.1% (n=42)	44.5% (n=57)	14.5% (n=18)
North Dakota (n=21)	76.2% (n=16)	81.8% (n=18)	90.9% (n=20)	81.8% (n=18)	81.8% (n=18)	71.4% (n=15)	47.6% (n=10)	45.5% (n=10)
Ohio (n=411)	93.9% (n=386)	71.7% (n=292)	94.6% (n=389)	87.4% (n=354)	64.9% (n=266)	62.8% (n=255)	45.3% (n=181)	40.1% (n=161)
Oklahoma (n=85)	92.9% (n=79)	87.1% (n=74)	88.4% (n=76)	54.7% (n=47)	43.5% (n=37)	60.0% (n=51)	32.5% (n=27)	62.4% (n=53)
Pennsylvania (n=160)	82.5% (n=132)	80.1% (n=129)	90.0% (n=144)	83.1% (n=133)	36.3% (n=58)	43.4% (n=66)	23.1% (n=37)	12.5% (n=19)
Rhode Island (n=32)	93.8% (n=30)	93.8% (n=30)	93.8% (n=30)	72.7% (n=24)	43.8% (n=14)	53.1% (n=17)	21.9% (n=7)	21.2% (n=7)
South Carolina (n=62)	100.0% (n=62)	79.0% (n=49)	85.7% (n=54)	72.6% (n=45)	12.7% (n=8)	33.9% (n=21)	62.9% (n=39)	19.4% (n=12)

Figure 83 (Part 1, continued): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

<i>State</i>	General computer skills	General software use	General Internet use	General online/Web searching	Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	Using online databases	Safe online practices	Accessing online government information
South Dakota (n=29)	82.8% (n=24)	70.0% (n=21)	82.8% (n=24)	86.7% (n=26)	51.7% (n=15)	57.1% (n=16)	38.5% (n=10)	40.0% (n=12)
Tennessee (n=120)	94.2% (n=113)	88.3% (n=106)	92.5% (n=111)	79.2% (n=95)	19.5% (n=23)	26.9% (n=32)	29.4% (n=35)	17.8% (n=21)
Texas (n=338)	87.6% (n=296)	77.2% (n=257)	86.7% (n=294)	83.4% (n=282)	50.5% (n=167)	55.9% (n=185)	52.9% (n=174)	39.0% (n=128)
Utah (n=48)	97.9% (n=47)	93.9% (n=46)	95.8% (n=46)	95.8% (n=46)	53.1% (n=26)	58.3% (n=28)	54.2% (n=26)	29.2% (n=14)
Vermont (n=44)	77.3% (n=34)	53.3% (n=24)	77.3% (n=34)	48.9% (n=22)	27.3% (n=12)	38.6% (n=17)	22.2% (n=10)	17.8% (n=8)
Virginia (n=158)	87.3% (n=138)	86.1% (n=136)	86.1% (n=136)	73.9% (n=116)	45.6% (n=72)	58.2% (n=92)	40.8% (n=64)	33.1% (n=52)
Washington (n=100)	96.0% (n=96)	44.4% (n=44)	96.0% (n=96)	82.8% (n=82)	61.6% (n=61)	75.0% (n=75)	54.0% (n=54)	8.0% (n=8)
Washington, DC (n=22)	95.5% (n=21)	23.8% (n=5)	14.3% (n=3)	9.5% (n=2)	4.5% (n=1)	9.5% (n=2)	--	14.3% (n=3)
West Virginia (n=34)	97.1% (n=33)	76.5% (n=26)	91.2% (n=31)	76.5% (n=26)	47.1% (n=16)	38.2% (n=13)	38.2% (n=13)	50.0% (n=17)
Wisconsin (n=100)	93.0% (n=93)	79.8% (n=79)	95.3% (n=101)	82.5% (n=85)	61.5% (n=64)	44.6% (n=45)	40.2% (n=41)	33.7% (n=35)
Wyoming (n=17)	88.2% (n=15)	37.5% (n=6)	47.1% (n=8)	41.2% (n=7)	31.3% (n=5)	20.0% (n=3)	13.3% (n=2)	18.8% (n=3)
National	87.0% (n=5,313)	73.3% (n=4,474)	86.5% (n=5,282)	75.6% (n=4,612)	46.6% (n=2,845)	53.2% (n=3,248)	37.0% (n=2,259)	29.7% (n=1,814)

Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive

Key -- = No data to report; ** Percentages reported are out of those libraries that reported they provide formal IT training classes

Figure 83 (Part 2): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

State	Accessing online job seeking and career related information	Accessing online health information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing genealogy information	Accessing consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social media	Other
Alabama (n=74)	70.3% (n=52)	41.9% (n=31)	10.1% (n=7)	51.4% (n=38)	26.1% (n=18)	39.1% (n=27)	50.7% (n=35)	8.7% (n=6)
Alaska (n=19)	21.4% (n=3)	25.0% (n=3)	21.4% (n=3)	29.4% (n=5)	15.4% (n=2)	25.0% (n=3)	57.9% (n=11)	38.5% (n=5)
Arizona (n=110)	80.9% (n=89)	59.1% (n=65)	49.5% (n=54)	68.8% (n=75)	49.1% (n=54)	58.9% (n=63)	68.2% (n=75)	11.2% (n=12)
Arkansas (n=33)	39.3% (n=11)	14.8% (n=4)	39.3% (n=11)	71.0% (n=22)	7.4% (n=2)	53.6% (n=15)	63.0% (n=17)	39.4% (n=13)
California (n=282)	51.1% (n=145)	28.3% (n=78)	23.2% (n=64)	37.6% (n=106)	26.4% (n=73)	26.4% (n=73)	41.7% (n=115)	15.8% (n=45)
Colorado (n=118)	52.5% (n=62)	29.8% (n=34)	35.7% (n=41)	49.1% (n=57)	29.3% (n=34)	44.2% (n=50)	56.4% (n=66)	3.5% (n=4)
Delaware (n=19)	50.0% (n=9)	44.4% (n=8)	16.7% (n=3)	68.4% (n=13)	36.8% (n=7)	--	--	5.6% (n=1)
Florida (n=263)	55.1% (n=145)	4.2% (n=11)	5.4% (n=14)	27.4% (n=71)	9.3% (n=24)	15.8% (n=41)	15.8% (n=41)	5.8% (n=15)
Georgia (n=110)	67.3% (n=74)	15.7% (n=17)	13.0% (n=14)	40.9% (n=45)	15.7% (n=17)	15.7% (n=17)	7.4% (n=8)	8.8% (n=10)
Hawaii (n=4)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	25.0% (n=1)	--
Idaho (n=43)	39.5% (n=17)	11.6% (n=5)	11.6% (n=5)	38.1% (n=16)	16.3% (n=7)	16.3% (n=7)	27.9% (n=12)	--
Illinois (n=313)	63.1% (n=190)	19.8% (n=59)	19.0% (n=56)	53.0% (n=161)	27.5% (n=82)	48.7% (n=145)	59.0% (n=181)	9.1% (n=27)
Indiana (n=220)	32.9% (n=72)	15.5% (n=34)	12.3% (n=27)	56.8% (n=125)	15.5% (n=34)	38.5% (n=84)	57.3% (n=125)	1.8% (n=4)
Iowa (n=110)	34.5% (n=38)	21.8% (n=24)	8.2% (n=9)	38.2% (n=42)	16.4% (n=18)	26.4% (n=29)	54.5% (n=60)	1.8% (n=2)
Kansas (n=75)	50.0% (n=38)	26.7% (n=20)	5.3% (n=4)	50.0% (n=38)	24.0% (n=18)	29.3% (n=22)	64.0% (n=48)	20.5% (n=16)
Kentucky (n=103)	58.3% (n=60)	11.6% (n=11)	--	54.5% (n=54)	18.2% (n=18)	47.5% (n=47)	51.0% (n=50)	--
Louisiana (n=196)	48.5% (n=94)	31.6% (n=60)	16.5% (n=31)	59.3% (n=115)	29.1% (n=55)	29.0% (n=56)	39.4% (n=76)	3.7% (n=7)
Maine (n=41)	65.7% (n=23)	17.1% (n=6)	17.1% (n=6)	65.7% (n=23)	34.3% (n=12)	17.1% (n=6)	34.3% (n=12)	--
Maryland (n=107)	40.8% (n=42)	18.4% (n=19)	10.7% (n=11)	30.1% (n=31)	14.6% (n=15)	13.1% (n=14)	29.9% (n=32)	2.9% (n=3)
Massachusetts (n=120)	45.8% (n=55)	16.7% (n=20)	12.6% (n=15)	36.7% (n=44)	20.0% (n=24)	37.8% (n=45)	40.3% (n=48)	14.2% (n=17)
Michigan (n=353)	48.3% (n=170)	16.1% (n=57)	16.2% (n=57)	29.4% (n=102)	30.7% (n=108)	43.2% (n=150)	51.3% (n=178)	4.3% (n=15)

Figure 83 (Part 2, continued): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

State	Accessing online job seeking and career related information	Accessing online health information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing genealogy information	Accessing consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social media	Other
Minnesota (n=124)	34.4% (n=43)	25.0% (n=31)	16.0% (n=20)	47.2% (n=59)	5.6% (n=7)	16.1% (n=20)	31.2% (n=39)	20.8% (n=26)
Mississippi (n=66)	15.6% (n=10)	30.8% (n=20)	1.6% (n=1)	37.9% (n=25)	6.2% (n=4)	7.8% (n=5)	26.2% (n=17)	--
Missouri (n=120)	35.3% (n=41)	21.6% (n=25)	15.5% (n=18)	40.2% (n=47)	17.2% (n=20)	29.3% (n=34)	40.5% (n=47)	4.3% (n=5)
Montana (n=32)	33.3% (n=11)	21.9% (n=7)	6.1% (n=2)	50.0% (n=16)	12.1% (n=4)	21.9% (n=7)	50.0% (n=16)	12.1% (n=4)
Nebraska (n=55)	40.0% (n=22)	26.8% (n=15)	3.6% (n=2)	46.6% (n=27)	9.1% (n=5)	30.9% (n=17)	59.6% (n=34)	8.6% (n=5)
Nevada (n=49)	10.4% (n=5)	4.1% (n=2)	4.1% (n=2)	--	4.1% (n=2)	--	--	12.2% (n=6)
New Hampshire (n=55)	28.8% (n=15)	10.9% (n=6)	--	45.1% (n=23)	5.8% (n=3)	38.5% (n=20)	49.0% (n=25)	10.9% (n=6)
New Jersey (n=238)	42.9% (n=102)	10.3% (n=24)	6.0% (n=14)	51.9% (n=125)	32.5% (n=76)	44.9% (n=105)	23.9% (n=56)	1.3% (n=3)
New Mexico (n=47)	68.1% (n=32)	8.7% (n=4)	8.7% (n=4)	60.9% (n=28)	48.9% (n=23)	8.7% (n=4)	15.2% (n=7)	6.4% (n=3)
New York (n=727)	46.6% (n=336)	35.3% (n=255)	22.4% (n=162)	37.5% (n=271)	16.1% (n=116)	22.6% (n=164)	37.1% (n=268)	9.7% (n=70)
North Carolina (n=129)	68.7% (n=90)	26.6% (n=34)	12.8% (n=16)	48.8% (n=63)	11.8% (n=15)	31.5% (n=40)	36.5% (n=46)	7.9% (n=10)
North Dakota (n=21)	54.5% (n=12)	54.5% (n=12)	18.2% (n=4)	71.4% (n=15)	28.6% (n=6)	54.5% (n=12)	72.7% (n=16)	--
Ohio (n=411)	59.2% (n=239)	31.4% (n=126)	26.0% (n=104)	46.0% (n=186)	28.2% (n=113)	33.3% (n=133)	48.1% (n=192)	6.5% (n=26)
Oklahoma (n=85)	63.5% (n=54)	24.1% (n=20)	21.4% (n=18)	60.0% (n=51)	21.4% (n=18)	37.6% (n=32)	49.4% (n=42)	3.5% (n=3)
Pennsylvania (n=160)	25.0% (n=38)	9.9% (n=15)	14.5% (n=22)	38.8% (n=62)	8.6% (n=13)	22.5% (n=34)	35.3% (n=55)	4.6% (n=7)
Rhode Island (n=32)	60.6% (n=20)	21.2% (n=7)	15.6% (n=5)	43.8% (n=14)	21.9% (n=7)	33.3% (n=11)	50.0% (n=16)	9.4% (n=3)
South Carolina (n=62)	61.9% (n=39)	6.5% (n=4)	3.2% (n=2)	58.1% (n=36)	8.1% (n=5)	22.6% (n=14)	46.8% (n=29)	9.7% (n=6)
South Dakota (n=29)	37.0% (n=10)	35.7% (n=10)	7.4% (n=2)	46.7% (n=14)	33.3% (n=10)	37.0% (n=10)	42.9% (n=12)	18.5% (n=5)
Tennessee (n=120)	38.7% (n=46)	19.5% (n=23)	5.0% (n=6)	24.4% (n=29)	14.3% (n=17)	14.4% (n=17)	17.8% (n=21)	--
Texas (n=338)	62.8% (n=208)	39.4% (n=129)	25.7% (n=84)	45.2% (n=126)	31.0% (n=102)	29.6% (n=82)	45.9% (n=152)	4.7% (n=13)
Utah (n=48)	42.9% (n=21)	42.9% (n=21)	46.9% (n=23)	43.8% (n=21)	14.3% (n=7)	16.3% (n=8)	37.5% (n=18)	27.1% (n=13)
Vermont (n=44)	22.2% (n=10)	22.2% (n=10)	4.4% (n=2)	36.4% (n=16)	9.1% (n=4)	17.8% (n=8)	13.6% (n=6)	12.2% (n=6)

Figure 83 (Part 2, continued): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State**

State	Accessing online job seeking and career related information	Accessing online health information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing genealogy information	Accessing consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social media	Other
Virginia (n=158)	57.0% (n=90)	32.9% (n=52)	23.6% (n=37)	57.3% (n=90)	29.7% (n=47)	45.6% (n=72)	72.2% (n=114)	6.3% (n=10)
Washington (n=100)	65.7% (n=65)	8.0% (n=8)	10.0% (n=10)	19.2% (n=19)	6.0% (n=6)	10.0% (n=10)	21.0% (n=21)	4.0% (n=4)
Washington, DC (n=22)	9.5% (n=2)	9.5% (n=2)	--	4.5% (n=1)	--	4.5% (n=1)	4.5% (n=1)	--
West Virginia (n=34)	50.0% (n=17)	38.2% (n=13)	17.6% (n=6)	50.0% (n=17)	32.4% (n=11)	23.5% (n=8)	38.2% (n=13)	8.8% (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=100)	55.4% (n=56)	22.5% (n=23)	17.2% (n=17)	43.3% (n=45)	24.5% (n=25)	40.6% (n=41)	48.0% (n=49)	5.1% (n=5)
Wyoming (n=17)	13.3% (n=2)	6.7% (n=1)	20.0% (n=3)	25.0% (n=4)	6.7% (n=1)	28.6% (n=4)	18.8% (n=3)	6.7% (n=1)
National	49.2% (n=3,005)	23.9% (n=1,461)	17.1% (n=1,044)	46.3% (n=2,642)	20.3% (n=1,239)	29.0% (n=1,769)	39.4% (n=2,407)	6.7% (n=406)

Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive

Key -- = No data to report; ** Percentages reported are out of those libraries that reported they provide formal IT training classes

Of the libraries offering formal technology training classes (see Figure 82), Figure 83 (Parts 1 and 2) shows the types of classes available. The states with the highest percentage of libraries offering each type of class are:

- General computer skills: Alabama (100 percent); Delaware (100 percent); South Carolina (100 percent); Utah (97.9 percent); West Virginia (97.1 percent); Louisiana (96.9 percent); Iowa (96.4 percent); Washington (96.0 percent); and Missouri (95.8 percent);
- General software use: Utah (93.9 percent); Louisiana (93.9 percent); Rhode Island (93.8 percent).
- General Internet use: Alabama (100 percent); Delaware (100 percent); Washington (96.0 percent); Utah (95.8 percent); Missouri (95.8 percent); and Wyoming (100 percent);
- General online/Web searching: Alabama (100 percent); Utah (95.8 percent); Missouri (93.2 percent); and Ohio (87.4 percent)
- Using the library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC): Alabama (82.4 percent);
- Using online databases: Alabama (85.5 percent);
- Safe online practices: Alabama (65.2 percent);
- Accessing online government information: Alaska (66.7 percent);
- Accessing online job-seeking information: Arizona (80.9 percent);
- Accessing online health information: Arizona (59.1 percent);
- Accessing online investment information: Arizona (49.5 percent);
- Accessing genealogy information: North Dakota (71.4 percent);
- Accessing consumer information: Arizona (49.1 percent);
- Using digital photography software and online applications: Arizona (58.9 percent);
- Participating in social networking: North Dakota (72.7 percent).

Figure 84 (Part 1): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Digital Reference/Virtual Reference		Licensed databases		E-books		Web/Business Conferencing		Online Instruction Courses/Tutorials		Homework Resources	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Alabama (n=231)	76.6% (n=177)	76.6% (n=177)	100.0% (n=228)	100.0% (n=228)	46.0% (n=104)	43.1% (n=97)	47.7% (n=19)	2.3% (n=5)	80.2% (n=178)	53.2% (n=118)	100.0% (n=237)	75.5% (n=179)
Alaska (n=101)	50.5% (n=51)	50.5% (n=51)	98.0% (n=98)	98.0% (n=98)	41.1% (n=39)	41.1% (n=39)	20.2% (n=19)	--	50.0% (n=45)	15.6% (n=14)	90.8% (n=14)	43.9% (n=43)
Arizona (n=195)	44.1% (n=86)	44.1% (n=86)	100.0% (n=199)	100.0% (n=199)	56.0% (n=108)	56.0% (n=108)	11.3% (n=22)	2.6% (n=5)	52.8% (n=105)	46.7% (n=93)	78.6% (n=154)	71.6% (n=141)
Arkansas (n=167)	36.5% (n=61)	36.5% (n=61)	100.0% (n=107)	100.0% (n=107)	40.6% (n=69)	40.6% (n=69)	9.4% (n=16)	--	28.8% (n=49)	17.1% (n=29)	78.0% (n=83)	25.3% (n=43)
California (n=794)	57.2% (n=454)	57.4% (n=456)	100.0% (n=806)	100.0% (n=806)	85.6% (n=685)	85.6% (n=685)	2.9% (n=22)	*	48.6% (n=386)	32.9% (n=261)	92.9% (n=743)	83.8% (n=670)
Colorado (n=219)	71.7% (n=157)	72.5% (n=158)	83.2% (n=178)	83.2% (n=178)	84.9% (n=185)	84.9% (n=185)	21.5% (n=39)	4.4% (n=7)	57.4% (n=112)	42.1% (n=82)	86.0% (n=185)	64.7% (n=139)
Delaware (n=30)	83.3% (n=25)	83.3% (n=25)	100.0% (n=31)	100.0% (n=31)	96.8% (n=30)	96.8% (n=30)	3.6% (n=1)	--	80.0% (n=24)	70.0% (n=21)	93.3% (n=28)	80.0% (n=24)
Florida (n=475)	95.6% (n=454)	95.6% (n=454)	100.0% (n=475)	100.0% (n=475)	87.3% (n=414)	87.3% (n=414)	4.4% (n=20)	*	58.1% (n=276)	52.1% (n=248)	91.0% (n=433)	84.9% (n=404)
Georgia (n=320)	59.1% (n=189)	59.1% (n=189)	95.4% (n=308)	95.4% (n=308)	72.3% (n=224)	72.3% (n=224)	4.9% (n=15)	1.0% (n=3)	50.5% (n=164)	36.7% (n=119)	72.8% (n=236)	56.0% (n=181)
Hawaii (n=50)	76.0% (n=38)	76.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=48)	100.0% (n=47)	100.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=50)	92.0% (n=46)	--	4.3% (n=2)	2.1% (n=1)	80.0% (n=15)	16.0% (n=8)
Idaho (n=124)	55.6% (n=69)	55.6% (n=69)	100.0% (n=129)	100.0% (n=129)	66.1% (n=84)	66.1% (n=84)	25.6% (n=33)	6.2% (n=8)	66.9% (n=87)	56.6% (n=73)	96.1% (n=122)	79.5% (n=101)
Illinois (n=709)	70.7% (n=501)	70.7% (n=501)	100.0% (n=702)	100.0% (n=702)	64.0% (n=454)	64.0% (n=454)	58.7% (n=409)	--	35.4% (n=246)	17.7% (n=123)	72.0% (n=511)	45.3% (n=321)

Figure 84 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Digital Reference/Virtual Reference		Licensed databases		E-books		Web/Business Conferencing		Online Instruction Courses/Tutorials		Homework Resources	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Indiana (n=353)	71.7% (n=253)	71.7% (n=253)	100.0% (n=351)	100.0% (n=351)	59.9% (n=211)	59.9% (n=211)	54.5% (n=186)	*	59.4% (n=206)	40.1% (n=139)	84.6% (n=297)	59.5% (n=209)
Iowa (n=472)	47.1% (n=233)	100.0% (n=490)	100.0% (n=490)	54.5% (n=261)	54.5% (n=261)	12.4% (n=59)	*	45.5% (n=217)	15.1% (n=72)	75.3% (n=369)	39.5% (n=194)	79.2% (n=385)
Kansas (n=349)	45.8% (n=160)	45.8% (n=160)	100.0% (n=353)	100.0% (n=353)	68.9% (n=239)	68.9% (n=239)	25.6% (n=87)	8.5% (n=29)	51.6% (n=180)	28.7% (n=100)	70.9% (n=246)	30.6% (n=106)
Kentucky (n=165)	78.8% (n=130)	78.8% (n=130)	100.0% (n=172)	100.0% (n=172)	88.1% (n=140)	88.1% (n=140)	2.6% (n=4)	--	63.9% (n=101)	45.6% (n=72)	84.8% (n=145)	66.9% (n=115)
Louisiana (n=282)	67.0% (n=189)	67.0% (n=189)	100.0% (n=282)	100.0% (n=282)	85.4% (n=229)	85.4% (n=229)	5.1% (n=14)	--	87.4% (n=250)	60.1% (n=172)	99.3% (n=283)	93.0% (n=265)
Maine (n=255)	57.5% (n=146)	88.6% (n=226)	88.6% (n=226)	45.7% (n=116)	45.7% (n=116)	11.6% (n=29)	2.4% (n=6)	27.7% (n=69)	20.9% (n=52)	74.1% (n=180)	52.7% (n=128)	77.3% (n=197)
Maryland (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	26.8% (n=40)	3.4% (n=5)	88.4% (n=114)	86.9% (n=113)	100.0% (n=150)	97.3% (n=146)
Massachusetts (n=340)	55.9% (n=190)	55.9% (n=190)	100.0% (n=353)	100.0% (n=353)	88.0% (n=308)	88.0% (n=308)	10.2% (n=34)	--	44.0% (n=151)	31.8% (n=109)	79.0% (n=278)	60.1% (n=212)
Michigan (n=532)	63.9% (n=340)	63.9% (n=340)	99.1% (n=542)	99.1% (n=542)	88.9% (n=472)	88.9% (n=472)	23.5% (n=119)	3.0% (n=15)	72.1% (n=365)	65.2% (n=330)	91.4% (n=491)	74.4% (n=399)
Minnesota (n=286)	83.2% (n=238)	83.2% (n=238)	100.0% (n=291)	100.0% (n=291)	87.8% (n=252)	87.8% (n=252)	57.4% (n=163)	*	55.1% (n=157)	49.1% (n=140)	94.8% (n=157)	42.6% (n=124)
Mississippi (n=214)	62.6% (n=134)	62.6% (n=134)	100.0% (n=216)	100.0% (n=216)	28.4% (n=61)	28.4% (n=61)	12.2% (n=26)	3.8% (n=8)	78.7% (n=116)	63.8% (n=134)	90.2% (n=194)	68.8% (n=148)
Missouri (n=283)	70.7% (n=200)	70.7% (n=200)	100.0% (n=282)	100.0% (n=282)	51.7% (n=149)	51.7% (n=149)	62.7% (n=180)	--	29.7% (n=82)	11.6% (n=32)	91.6% (n=154)	33.5% (n=91)
Montana (n=93)	65.6% (n=61)	67.0% (n=63)	100.0% (n=92)	100.0% (n=92)	74.7% (n=68)	74.7% (n=68)	25.9% (n=22)	--	40.0% (n=32)	17.5% (n=114)	95.7% (n=90)	71.0% (n=66)

Figure 84 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Digital Reference/Virtual Reference		Licensed databases		E-books		Web/Business Conferencing		Online Instruction Courses/Tutorials		Homework Resources	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Nebraska (n=267)	58.1% (n=155)	58.1% (n=155)	100.0% (n=267)	100.0% (n=267)	49.2% (n=131)	49.2% (n=131)	46.6% (n=124)	*	34.5% (n=88)	5.1% (n=13)	67.6% (n=177)	28.2% (n=74)
Nevada (n=83)	98.8% (n=82)	98.8% (n=82)	100.0% (n=83)	100.0% (n=83)	69.9% (n=58)	69.9% (n=58)	1.2% (n=1)	1.2% (n=1)	36.6% (n=30)	18.3% (n=15)	91.6% (n=76)	85.5% (n=71)
New Hampshire (n=206)	53.9% (n=111)	53.9% (n=111)	94.1% (n=207)	94.1% (n=207)	89.8% (n=194)	89.8% (n=194)	12.3% (n=25)	--	38.9% (n=81)	26.0% (n=54)	74.0% (n=159)	53.3% (n=114)
New Jersey (n=353)	79.9% (n=282)	79.9% (n=282)	98.1% (n=354)	98.1% (n=354)	95.2% (n=336)	95.2% (n=336)	23.6% (n=82)	*	78.6% (n=276)	69.6% (n=245)	79.4% (n=282)	72.7% (n=258)
New Mexico (n=113)	38.9% (n=44)	38.9% (n=44)	90.9% (n=100)	90.9% (n=100)	34.9% (n=38)	34.9% (n=38)	13.3% (n=15)	--	50.9% (n=56)	29.1% (n=32)	86.7% (n=98)	39.8% (n=45)
New York (n=959)	85.4% (n=819)	85.4% (n=819)	100.0% (n=975)	100.0% (n=975)	96.8% (n=944)	96.8% (n=944)	9.5% (n=89)	2.1% (n=20)	51.9% (n=493)	43.4% (n=412)	80.9% (n=773)	53.6% (n=511)
North Carolina (n=311)	77.5% (n=241)	77.5% (n=241)	100.0% (n=312)	100.0% (n=312)	88.7% (n=276)	88.7% (n=276)	15.5% (n=47)	2.3% (n=7)	65.5% (n=201)	58.0% (n=178)	93.9% (n=295)	82.2% (n=258)
North Dakota (n=80)	60.0% (n=48)	60.0% (n=48)	100.0% (n=78)	100.0% (n=78)	60.0% (n=48)	60.0% (n=48)	56.4% (n=44)	--	40.0% (n=32)	20.0% (n=16)	62.5% (n=50)	32.5% (n=26)
Ohio (n=598)	88.0% (n=526)	88.0% (n=526)	100.0% (n=604)	100.0% (n=604)	96.6% (n=589)	96.6% (n=589)	72.7% (n=439)	2.6% (n=16)	57.2% (n=339)	44.9% (n=266)	84.8% (n=518)	71.7% (n=439)
Oklahoma (n=146)	63.0% (n=92)	63.0% (n=92)	100.0% (n=153)	100.0% (n=153)	58.9% (n=89)	57.0% (n=86)	14.9% (n=23)	--	51.7% (n=78)	41.7% (n=63)	81.9% (n=127)	61.0% (n=94)
Pennsylvania (n=409)	75.8% (n=310)	75.8% (n=310)	98.1% (n=409)	98.1% (n=409)	74.9% (n=308)	74.0% (n=304)	10.8% (n=41)	4.2% (n=16)	41.2% (n=162)	29.8% (n=117)	73.6% (n=293)	62.5% (n=)
Rhode Island (n=62)	56.5% (n=35)	56.5% (n=35)	100.0% (n=62)	100.0% (n=62)	100.0% (n=62)	100.0% (n=62)	3.2% (n=2)	--	43.5% (n=27)	28.6% (n=18)	100.0% (n=62)	96.8% (n=)
South Carolina (n=125)	51.2% (n=64)	51.2% (n=64)	91.9% (n=124)	91.9% (n=124)	70.4% (n=95)	70.4% (n=95)	1.6% (n=2)	--	43.2% (n=54)	38.7% (n=48)	97.8% (n=132)	65.2% (n=88)

Figure 84 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Digital Reference/Virtual Reference		Licensed databases		E-books		Web/Business Conferencing		Online Instruction Courses/Tutorials		Homework Resources	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
South Dakota (n=140)	55.7% (n=78)	55.7% (n=78)	98.6% (n=142)	98.6% (n=142)	57.9% (n=81)	57.9% (n=81)	33.1% (n=48)	--	39.7% (n=56)	21.3% (n=30)	73.3% (n=107)	32.2% (n=47)
Tennessee (n=224)	75.0% (n=168)	75.0% (n=168)	100.0% (n=226)	100.0% (n=226)	90.8% (n=197)	90.8% (n=197)	5.6% (n=12)	*	51.4% (n=112)	30.7% (n=67)	88.6% (n=203)	62.9% (n=144)
Texas (n=625)	53.1% (n=332)	53.1% (n=332)	100.0% (n=643)	100.0% (n=643)	60.2% (n=383)	60.2% (n=383)	10.2% (n=63)	1.6% (n=10)	59.8% (n=378)	37.2% (n=235)	86.9% (n=550)	61.0% (n=387)
Utah (n=108)	60.2% (n=65)	60.2% (n=65)	100.0% (n=114)	100.0% (n=114)	95.6% (n=109)	95.6% (n=109)	10.5% (n=12)	5.3% (n=6)	70.5% (n=79)	54.5% (n=61)	93.9% (n=107)	78.9% (n=90)
Vermont (n=168)	70.8% (n=119)	100.0% (n=166)	100.0% (n=166)	73.3% (n=126)	73.3% (n=126)	44.4% (n=71)	1.3% (n=2)	64.5% (n=107)	52.1% (n=86)	73.2% (n=123)	39.9% (n=67)	87.9% (n=153)
Virginia (n=244)	75.0% (n=183)	75.0% (n=183)	100.0% (n=244)	100.0% (n=244)	91.0% (n=222)	91.0% (n=222)	13.5% (n=32)	9.3% (n=22)	52.5% (n=127)	39.1% (n=95)	91.8% (n=223)	70.2% (n=170)
Washington (n=240)	80.0% (n=192)	80.0% (n=192)	100.0% (n=241)	100.0% (n=241)	80.3% (n=191)	77.8% (n=186)	12.1% (n=28)	*	59.3% (n=140)	44.3% (n=105)	91.9% (n=215)	75.7% (n=178)
Washington, DC (n=25)	4.0% (n=1)	4.0% (n=1)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)	12.0% (n=3)	8.0% (n=2)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)
West Virginia (n=144)	52.1% (n=75)	100.0% (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	68.2% (n=101)	68.2% (n=101)	4.1% (n=6)	--	79.6% (n=117)	45.3% (n=67)	88.6% (n=132)	57.4% (n=85)	90.1% (n=136)
Wisconsin (n=418)	80.9% (n=338)	80.9% (n=338)	100.0% (n=416)	98.6% (n=410)	94.3% (n=398)	94.3% (n=398)	62.7% (n=257)	1.0% (n=4)	43.4% (n=175)	37.0% (n=149)	74.7% (n=310)	64.6% (n=268)
Wyoming (n=76)	72.0% (n=54)	72.0% (n=54)	100.0% (n=76)	100.0% (n=76)	68.0% (n=51)	68.0% (n=51)	32.0% (n=24)	23.0% (n=17)	73.7% (n=56)	56.6% (n=43)	88.2% (n=67)	69.7% (n=53)
National	69.7% (n=9,577)	69.8% (n=9,584)	99.1% (n=13,706)	99.1% (n=13,697)	76.3% (n=10,523)	76.1% (n=10,497)	26.5% (n=3,561)	2.2% (n=289)	54.2% (n=7,321)	40.0% (n=5,409)	81.9% (n=11,324)	62.7% (n=8,674)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive												
Key: -- = No data to report; * = Insufficient data to report												

Figure 84 (Part 2): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Audio Content		Video Content		Digitized Special Collections		Library Social Networking		Online Book Clubs	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Alabama (n=231)	75.8% (n=175)	33.3% (n=77)	65.9% (n=147)	20.2% (n=45)	34.7% (n=76)	22.4% (n=49)	60.3% (n=123)	32.5% (n=66)	24.3% (n=53)	17.4% (n=38)
Alaska (n=101)	79.2% (n=76)	30.2% (n=29)	48.5% (n=47)	5.2% (n=5)	40.2% (n=39)	17.7% (n=17)	57.6% (n=57)	24.5% (n=24)	18.0% (n=16)	10.2% (n=9)
Arizona (n=195)	92.0% (n=183)	68.3% (n=136)	61.7% (n=121)	37.2% (n=73)	43.9% (n=86)	39.8% (n=78)	53.3% (n=105)	38.1% (n=75)	19.9% (n=39)	32.7% (n=64)
Arkansas (n=167)	97.1% (n=165)	44.1% (n=75)	70.8% (n=119)	21.0% (n=35)	31.2% (n=53)	14.1% (n=24)	60.6% (n=103)	19.4% (n=33)	6.6% (n=11)	5.4% (n=9)
California (n=794)	89.8% (n=701)	74.1% (n=579)	42.4% (n=334)	23.1% (n=182)	43.5% (n=339)	39.4% (n=307)	68.1% (n=544)	61.7% (n=493)	20.3% (n=155)	19.2% (n=147)
Colorado (n=219)	97.3% (n=213)	80.3% (n=175)	77.3% (n=167)	60.2% (n=130)	41.5% (n=88)	33.5% (n=71)	60.3% (n=129)	47.2% (n=101)	16.7% (n=35)	34.8% (n=73)
Delaware (n=30)	96.8% (n=30)	61.3% (n=19)	73.3% (n=22)	40.0% (n=12)	42.9% (n=12)	32.1% (n=9)	51.6% (n=16)	32.3% (n=10)	10.3% (n=3)	16.7% (n=5)
Florida (n=475)	88.0% (n=418)	77.7% (n=369)	71.4% (n=317)	47.4% (n=210)	69.9% (n=309)	64.1% (n=284)	74.8% (n=353)	69.9% (n=329)	13.6% (n=63)	24.7% (n=114)
Georgia (n=320)	69.7% (n=223)	53.3% (n=170)	53.5% (n=168)	37.9% (n=119)	69.3% (n=224)	58.5% (n=189)	64.1% (n=207)	49.5% (n=160)	15.3% (n=49)	24.3% (n=78)
Hawaii (n=50)	36.7% (n=18)	30.6% (n=15)	83.7% (n=41)	73.5% (n=36)	100.0% (n=50)	74.0% (n=37)	28.6% (n=14)	22.4% (n=11)	66.7% (n=32)	68.8% (n=33)
Idaho (n=124)	89.1% (n=115)	70.8% (n=92)	46.5% (n=59)	26.0% (n=33)	37.8% (n=48)	26.8% (n=34)	79.4% (n=100)	62.2% (n=79)	22.0% (n=28)	24.4% (n=31)
Illinois (n=709)	66.2% (n=469)	38.6% (n=274)	63.6% (n=445)	40.7% (n=285)	63.2% (n=444)	40.4% (n=284)	54.6% (n=380)	38.4% (n=267)	49.6% (n=340)	34.7% (n=238)

Figure 84 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Audio Content		Video Content		Digitized Special Collections		Library Social Networking		Online Book Clubs	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Indiana (n=353)	72.8% (n=259)	51.4% (n=183)	51.8% (n=175)	34.0% (n=115)	61.0% (n=214)	47.3% (n=166)	66.5% (n=232)	48.6% (n=170)	53.1% (n=182)	46.4% (n=159)
Iowa (n=472)	47.1% (n=229)	40.2% (n=194)	3.7% (n=18)	22.7% (n=109)	10.8% (n=52)	52.1% (n=253)	26.7% (n=130)	10.0% (n=46)	7.0% (n=32)	7.0% (n=32)
Kansas (n=349)	85.0% (n=300)	44.8% (n=158)	60.1% (n=208)	30.1% (n=104)	33.1% (n=115)	19.1% (n=66)	53.3% (n=186)	21.8% (n=76)	15.2% (n=53)	12.6% (n=44)
Kentucky (n=165)	91.0% (n=152)	76.0% (n=127)	63.7% (n=102)	37.1% (n=59)	49.4% (n=79)	30.6% (n=49)	59.0% (n=92)	46.8% (n=73)	10.0% (n=16)	11.9% (n=19)
Louisiana (n=282)	85.7% (n=245)	64.3% (n=184)	57.9% (n=162)	38.8% (n=109)	54.4% (n=148)	32.4% (n=88)	58.3% (n=161)	41.7% (n=115)	35.6% (n=99)	41.9% (n=116)
Maine (n=255)	45.7% (n=116)	50.8% (n=129)	13.7% (n=35)	34.5% (n=88)	29.9% (n=76)	44.6% (n=111)	30.5% (n=76)	16.9% (n=40)	16.9% (n=40)	5.0% (n=12)
Maryland (n=150)	100.0% (n=150)	96.0% (n=144)	85.7% (n=126)	82.3% (n=121)	75.3% (n=113)	69.3% (n=104)	96.6% (n=141)	94.6% (n=139)	37.5% (n=54)	41.0% (n=59)
Massachusetts (n=340)	89.7% (n=314)	73.4% (n=257)	46.1% (n=158)	34.2% (n=117)	40.2% (n=140)	26.4% (n=92)	57.5% (n=200)	44.7% (n=156)	8.9% (n=30)	11.6% (n=39)
Michigan (n=532)	90.3% (n=484)	82.3% (n=441)	50.5% (n=269)	37.2% (n=198)	44.7% (n=240)	37.1% (n=199)	76.7% (n=412)	63.1% (n=339)	25.0% (n=130)	38.9% (n=203)
Minnesota (n=286)	60.8% (n=177)	49.1% (n=143)	81.0% (n=235)	74.1% (n=215)	71.9% (n=207)	69.4% (n=200)	56.0% (n=163)	49.5% (n=144)	63.5% (n=183)	63.3% (n=183)
Mississippi (n=214)	63.9% (n=138)	30.4% (n=66)	59.7% (n=129)	19.0% (n=41)	17.7% (n=38)	14.0% (n=30)	60.6% (n=132)	47.9% (n=104)	30.2% (n=64)	27.5% (n=58)
Missouri (n=283)	73.1% (n=207)	38.5% (n=109)	52.1% (n=147)	28.6% (n=81)	81.0% (n=234)	48.8% (n=141)	45.4% (n=127)	27.9% (n=78)	64.1% (n=180)	35.2% (n=99)
Montana (n=93)	88.0% (n=81)	62.6% (n=57)	55.3% (n=47)	14.3% (n=12)	25.6% (n=21)	19.3% (n=16)	62.6% (n=57)	37.0% (n=34)	12.9% (n=11)	12.9% (n=11)

Figure 84 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Audio Content		Video Content		Digitized Special Collections		Library Social Networking		Online Book Clubs	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
Nebraska (n=267)	64.6% (n=168)	23.2% (n=60)	57.4% (n=148)	13.1% (n=34)	56.4% (n=149)	30.7% (n=81)	51.9% (n=137)	22.6% (n=60)	28.6% (n=75)	16.0% (n=42)
Nevada (n=83)	81.9% (n=68)	69.9% (n=58)	58.5% (n=48)	45.1% (n=37)	69.9% (n=58)	63.9% (n=53)	87.5% (n=70)	75.0% (n=60)	2.4% (n=2)	68.3% (n=56)
New Hampshire (n=206)	86.4% (n=191)	67.7% (n=149)	31.2% (n=64)	10.7% (n=22)	20.0% (n=42)	16.1% (n=34)	58.9% (n=129)	38.5% (n=84)	14.7% (n=31)	13.3% (n=28)
New Jersey (n=353)	95.2% (n=340)	69.2% (n=247)	30.0% (n=84)	17.1% (n=48)	58.4% (n=205)	28.0% (n=98)	49.3% (n=139)	42.9% (n=121)	22.8% (n=79)	19.4% (n=67)
New Mexico (n=113)	80.5% (n=91)	40.7% (n=46)	67.3% (n=76)	25.7% (n=29)	8.8% (n=10)	--	49.6% (n=56)	21.2% (n=24)	22.5% (n=25)	22.5% (n=25)
New York (n=959)	95.2% (n=908)	82.2% (n=785)	58.3% (n=539)	36.5% (n=337)	63.6% (n=604)	46.0% (n=437)	78.7% (n=742)	53.5% (n=504)	46.4% (n=426)	45.9% (n=422)
North Carolina (n=311)	95.2% (n=298)	77.4% (n=243)	77.8% (n=242)	69.8% (n=217)	76.5% (n=238)	62.5% (n=195)	66.0% (n=202)	48.4% (n=148)	24.2% (n=70)	24.2% (n=70)
North Dakota (n=80)	71.6% (n=58)	27.5% (n=22)	67.5% (n=54)	27.5% (n=22)	52.5% (n=42)	27.5% (n=22)	46.8% (n=37)	21.5% (n=17)	42.1% (n=32)	26.3% (n=20)
Ohio (n=598)	90.4% (n=556)	73.9% (n=454)	86.6% (n=525)	73.4% (n=445)	87.3% (n=534)	73.2% (n=449)	74.5% (n=451)	60.0% (n=363)	68.3% (n=405)	62.9% (n=373)
Oklahoma (n=146)	72.8% (n=110)	50.3% (n=76)	60.1% (n=83)	26.8% (n=37)	35.1% (n=52)	27.7% (n=41)	59.5% (n=88)	36.5% (n=54)	12.9% (n=19)	10.9% (n=16)
Pennsylvania (n=409)	78.3% (n=310)	65.9% (n=261)	35.9% (n=140)	15.1% (n=59)	25.5% (n=98)	20.2% (n=78)	56.7% (n=229)	40.8% (n=165)	11.5% (n=43)	15.5% (n=58)
Rhode Island (n=62)	100.0% (n=60)	96.7% (n=58)	52.4% (n=33)	49.2% (n=31)	30.2% (n=19)	32.3% (n=20)	79.0% (n=49)	79.0% (n=49)	3.2% (n=2)	3.2% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=125)	75.2% (n=100)	54.5% (n=72)	35.6% (n=48)	11.9% (n=16)	19.3% (n=26)	11.9% (n=16)	46.7% (n=63)	41.5% (n=56)	19.2% (n=24)	16.1% (n=20)

Figure 84 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Audio Content		Video Content		Digitized Special Collections		Library Social Networking		Online Book Clubs	
	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely	Offers in Library	Offers Remotely
South Dakota (n=140)	78.8% (n=115)	37.9% (n=55)	53.1% (n=78)	18.4% (n=27)	35.4% (n=51)	14.6% (n=21)	40.1% (n=59)	23.3% (n=34)	28.7% (n=41)	14.0% (n=20)
Tennessee (n=224)	77.5% (n=179)	51.5% (n=119)	56.0% (n=121)	30.1% (n=65)	51.8% (n=116)	39.1% (n=88)	66.1% (n=144)	43.6% (n=95)	13.5% (n=28)	14.5% (n=30)
Texas (n=625)	80.3% (n=508)	46.8% (n=296)	53.8% (n=344)	24.1% (n=154)	37.0% (n=231)	25.3% (n=158)	56.7% (n=351)	40.4% (n=250)	17.8% (n=112)	21.8% (n=137)
Utah (n=108)	95.5% (n=105)	86.5% (n=96)	56.8% (n=63)	43.6% (n=48)	39.1% (n=43)	32.7% (n=36)	53.2% (n=58)	40.4% (n=44)	4.8% (n=5)	4.8% (n=5)
Vermont (n=168)	62.9% (n=110)	51.2% (n=84)	23.2% (n=38)	35.5% (n=59)	25.3% (n=42)	41.3% (n=66)	28.1% (n=45)	23.2% (n=38)	23.2% (n=38)	17.7% (n=29)
Virginia (n=244)	91.0% (n=222)	76.6% (n=187)	48.5% (n=117)	29.5% (n=71)	52.5% (n=124)	42.4% (n=100)	68.5% (n=161)	63.4% (n=149)	33.5% (n=72)	33.2% (n=71)
Washington (n=240)	85.7% (n=203)	76.8% (n=182)	63.4% (n=149)	38.0% (n=89)	24.1% (n=56)	12.4% (n=29)	83.0% (n=200)	66.0% (n=159)	25.6% (n=61)	25.6% (n=61)
Washington, DC (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)	96.0% (n=24)	96.0% (n=24)	92.0% (n=23)	8.0% (n=2)	8.0% (n=2)	--	--
West Virginia (n=144)	53.6% (n=81)	65.6% (n=99)	23.3% (n=35)	15.3% (n=23)	6.0% (n=9)	53.3% (n=80)	26.7% (n=40)	22.7% (n=34)	22.7% (n=34)	16.8% (n=25)
Wisconsin (n=418)	74.8% (n=311)	60.1% (n=250)	76.7% (n=320)	60.3% (n=254)	73.0% (n=305)	61.5% (n=257)	58.3% (n=245)	48.8% (n=205)	51.2% (n=206)	48.5% (n=195)
Wyoming (n=76)	93.4% (n=71)	78.9% (n=60)	68.0% (n=51)	45.3% (n=34)	63.0% (n=46)	60.8% (n=45)	47.9% (n=35)	43.1% (n=31)	27.1% (n=19)	32.9% (n=23)
National	82.9% (n=11,483)	61.9% (n=8,579)	60.0% (n=8,128)	38.5% (n=5,216)	53.3% (n=7,283)	40.6% (n=5,550)	61.9% (n=8,440)	46.7% (n=6,371)	30.8% (n=4,124)	30.7% (n=4,116)

Key: -- = No data to report; * = Insufficient data to report

Figure 84 (Parts 1 and 2) report the availability of services for remote or in-library use. It may be the case that some libraries did not report services offered to patrons via the Web that are not directly provided by the reporting libraries (e.g., licensed databases provided by the State Library Agency). The states with the highest percentage of libraries offering each type of service are:

- Digital/Virtual reference in-library and remotely: Maryland (100 percent);
- Licensed Databases In-library and Remotely: (100 percent) Washington DC (100 percent); Alabama (100 percent); Arizona (100 percent); Arkansas (100 percent); California (100 percent); Idaho (100 percent); Illinois (100 percent); Indiana (100 percent); Kansas (100 percent); Kentucky (100 percent); Louisiana (100 percent); Massachusetts (100 percent); Mississippi (100 percent); Missouri (100 percent); Montana (100 percent); Nebraska (100 percent); North Carolina (100 percent); North Dakota (100 percent); Oklahoma (100 percent); Rhode Island (100 percent); Tennessee (100 percent); Texas (100 percent); Utah (100 percent); Virginia (100 percent); Washington (100 percent); Wyoming (100 percent).
- E-Books in-library and remote: Maryland (100 percent); Hawaii (100 percent); Rhode Island (100 percent); Washington DC (100 percent);
 - Meanwhile, Mississippi (28.4 percent), New Mexico (34.9 percent), and Arkansas (41.1%) account for the lowest percentage of public library outlets offering e-books in-library
- Web/Business conferencing:
 - In-library: Hawaii (92.0 percent);
 - Remotely: West Virginia (64.5 percent);
- Online Instruction Courses/Tutorials:
 - In-library: Washington DC (100 percent); Maryland (88.4%);
 - Remotely: Washington DC (100 percent); West Virginia (88.6%);
- Homework Resources
 - In-library: Washington DC (100 percent); Maryland (100 percent); Alabama (100 percent); Rhode Island (100 percent)
 - Remotely: Washington DC (100 percent); Maryland (97.3 percent); Rhode Island (96.8 percent);
- Audio Content
 - In-library: Washington DC (100 percent); Maryland (100 percent); Rhode Island (100 percent);
 - Remotely: Washington DC (100 percent); Rhode Island (96.7 percent); Maryland (96.0 percent);
- Video Content
 - In-library: Washington DC (100 percent); Ohio (86.6 percent); Maryland (85.7 percent);
 - Remotely: Washington DC (96.0 percent); Maryland (82.3 percent); Minnesota (74.1 percent);
- Digitized Special Collections
 - In-library: Hawaii (100 percent); Washington DC (96.0 percent); Ohio (87.3 percent);
 - Remotely: Washington DC (92.0 percent); Hawaii (74.0 percent); Ohio (73.2 percent);
- Library Social Networking
 - In-library: Maryland (96.6 percent); Nevada (87.5 percent); Washington (83.0 percent);
 - Remotely: Maryland (94.6 percent); Rhode Island (79.0 percent); Nevada (75.0 percent);

- Online Book Clubs
 - In-library: Ohio (68.3 percent); Hawaii (66.7 percent); Missouri (64.1 percent);
 - Remotely: Hawaii (68.8 percent); Nevada (68.3 percent); Minnesota (63.3 percent)

Figure 85: Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Access and store content on USB or other portable devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	Connect to digital cameras and manipulate content	Burn CD/DVDs	Recreational gaming consoles, software, or websites	Access to mobile computing devices (e.g. netbooks)	Access to e-readers (e.g., Kindle, Nook)
	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers
Alabama (n=223)	91.0% (n=203)	81.3% (n=178)	60.9% (n=131)	49.3% (n=106)	54.0% (n=114)	22.2% (n=37)
Alaska (n=103)	83.5% (n=86)	88.2% (n=90)	62.9% (n=61)	64.0% (n=64)	34.0% (n=33)	35.4% (n=34)
Arizona (n=199)	98.5% (n=196)	73.9% (n=147)	62.8% (n=125)	67.8% (n=135)	32.1% (n=63)	15.1% (n=29)
Arkansas (n=169)	69.2% (n=117)	42.4% (n=72)	35.3% (n=60)	44.0% (n=74)	53.3% (n=89)	21.0% (n=35)
California (n=873)	92.4% (n=745)	43.7% (n=350)	22.7% (n=179)	64.0% (n=495)	66.0% (n=522)	22.6% (n=160)
Colorado (n=220)	96.4% (n=212)	71.6% (n=149)	62.9% (n=122)	83.6% (n=168)	39.5% (n=73)	47.8% (n=86)
Delaware (n=31)	100% (n=31)	66.7% (n=20)	48.4% (n=15)	62.5% (n=20)	60.0% (n=18)	20.7% (n=6)
Florida (n=473)	100% (n=473)	71.2% (n=336)	61.9% (n=293)	81.3% (n=383)	51.4% (n=232)	30.7% (n=115)
Georgia (n=323)	98.8% (n=319)	61.1% (n=196)	38.6% (n=124)	57.9% (n=187)	59.2% (n=190)	31.3% (n=99)
Hawaii (n=33)	93.9% (n=31)	20.0% (n=10)	30.0% (n=15)	34.0% (n=17)	63.8% (n=30)	78.7% (n=37)
Idaho (n=127)	98.4% (n=125)	74.8% (n=95)	53.5% (n=68)	63.0% (n=80)	36.8% (n=46)	18.9% (n=20)
Illinois (n=678)	89.2% (n=605)	64.0% (n=436)	52.6% (n=368)	68.3% (n=484)	58.6% (n=349)	56.8% (n=357)
Indiana (n=332)	93.1% (n=309)	66.0% (n=215)	53.7% (n=188)	80.3% (n=278)	57.1% (n=182)	41.7% (n=135)

Figure 85 (continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Access and store content on USB or other portable devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	Connect to digital cameras and manipulate content	Burn CD/DVDs	Recreational gaming consoles, software, or websites	Access to mobile devices (e.g. netbooks)	Access to e-readers (e.g., Kindle, Nook)
	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers
Iowa (n=490)	90.2% (n=442)	72.3% (n=348)	60.7% (n=295)	68.8% (n=337)	49.2% (n=241)	18.7% (n=90)
Kansas (n=353)	88.1% (n=311)	82.0% (n=292)	64.1% (n=225)	61.1% (n=217)	33.6% (n=119)	41.4% (n=146)
Kentucky (n=167)	100% (n=67)	59.5% (n=100)	63.2% (n=108)	74.2% (n=121)	32.1% (n=51)	48.2% (n=80)
Louisiana (n=288)	96.9% (n=279)	57.1% (n=161)	51.2% (n=144)	74.5% (n=213)	25.2% (n=72)	26.0% (n=67)
Maine (n=255)	86.3% (n=220)	63.9% (n=163)	66.1% (n=168)	43.1% (n=110)	28.3% (n=51)	38.0% (n=35)
Maryland (n=129)	99.2% (n=128)	32.0% (n=48)	45.0% (n=67)	87.3% (n=131)	68.3% (n=99)	41.0% (n=59)
Massachusetts (n=355)	88.2% (n=313)	62.5% (n=217)	56.0% (n=197)	63.5% (n=221)	44.2% (n=155)	49.0% (n=171)
Michigan (n=542)	98.25% (n=532)	83.2% (n=451)	66.7% (n=349)	64.9% (n=346)	44.1% (n=230)	32.6% (n=125)
Minnesota (n=290)	99.3% (n=288)	59.6% (n=119)	86.0% (n=251)	90.0% (n=262)	63.0% (n=126)	31.7% (n=86)
Mississippi (n=216)	88.0% (n=190)	68.1% (n=147)	68.9% (n=146)	76.9% (n=163)	48.0% (n=94)	39.5% (n=60)
Missouri (n=249)	71.9% (n=179)	64.2% (n=167)	57.3% (n=161)	73.6% (n=206)	53.5% (n=123)	51.0% (n=134)
Montana (n=94)	100% (n=94)	95.7% (n=90)	70.7% (n=65)	78.6% (n=66)	32.5% (n=27)	37.2% (n=29)
Nebraska (n=255)	87.1% (n=222)	72.0% (n=188)	67% (n=179)	70.0% (n=184)	42.9% (n=103)	40.5% (n=104)
Nevada (n=77)	100% (n=83)	51.8% (n=43)	30.5% (n=25)	48.2% (n=40)	84.1% (n=69)	13.4% (n=11)

Figure 85 (continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Access and store content on USB or other portable devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	Connect to digital cameras and manipulate content	Burn CD/DVDs	Recreational gaming consoles, software, or websites	Access to mobile devices (e.g. netbooks)	Access to e-readers (e.g., Kindle, Nook)
	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers
New Hampshire (n=221)	95.0% (n=210)	72.7% (n=157)	61.9% (n=135)	64.8% (n=140)	41.7% (n=90)	49.5% (n=107)
New Jersey (n=354)	98.0% (n=347)	71.1% (n=249)	60.1% (n=212)	75.4% (n=266)	71.4% (n=252)	22.9% (n=80)
New Mexico (n=113)	87.6% (n=99)	83.0% (n=93)	69.0% (n=78)	69.6% (n=78)	42.5% (n=48)	23.4% (n=25)
New York (n=970)	96.3% (n=934)	42.6% (n=411)	32.4% (n=311)	82.0% (n=777)	39.2% (n=376)	41.9% (n=390)
North Carolina (n=313)	89.1% (n=279)	76.8% (n=241)	73.2% (n=229)	53.7% (n=167)	50.8% (n=158)	27.7% (n=86)
North Dakota (n=76)	78.9% (n=60)	68.4% (n=52)	60.0% (n=48)	46.2% (n=36)	37.8% (n=28)	50.0% (n=36)
Ohio (n=531)	96.4% (n=512)	50.8% (n=297)	66.2% (n=402)	77.5% (n=474)	63.4% (n=333)	64.4% (n=339)
Oklahoma (n=152)	94.7% (n=144)	76.2% (n=115)	66.2% (n=102)	49.4% (n=76)	22.2% (n=26)	34.3% (n=114)
Pennsylvania (n=410)	92.9% (n=381)	75.2% (n=309)	48.2% (n=198)	72.5% (n=295)	45.1% (n=169)	34.3% (n=114)
Rhode Island (n=62)	90.3% (n=56)	93.5% (n=58)	83.9% (n=52)	83.9% (n=52)	60.7% (n=34)	32.0% (n=16)
South Carolina (n=135)	100% (n=135)	51.1% (n=69)	40.7% (n=55)	40.7% (n=55)	60.0% (n=72)	46.2% (n=54)
South Dakota (n=144)	79.9% (n=115)	62.5% (n=90)	47.6% (n=70)	47.6% (n=70)	67.7% (n=90)	36.4% (n=48)
Tennessee (n=232)	94.8% (n=220)	50.2% (n=111)	40.4% (n=88)	40.4% (n=88)	48.2% (n=108)	38.1% (n=82)
Texas (n=648)	94.3% (n=611)	63.9% (n=407)	53.7% (n=340)	53.7% (n=340)	40.3% (n=252)	24.9% (n=143)

Figure 85 (continued): Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State

State	Access and store content on USB or other portable devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	Connect to digital cameras and manipulate content	Burn CD/DVDs	Recreational gaming consoles, software, or websites	Access to mobile devices (e.g. netbooks)	Access to e-readers (e.g., Kindle, Nook)
	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers	Offers
Utah (n=112)	97.3% (n=109)	84.8% (n=95)	58.0% (n=65)	58.0% (n=65)	29.4% (n=32)	52.9% (n=54)
Vermont (n=170)	88.8% (n=151)	71.6% (n=121)	71.2% (n=121)	71.2% (n=121)	45.1% (n=74)	49.4% (n=79)
Virginia (n=241)	95% (n=229)	70.4% (n=169)	75.9% (n=186)	75.9% (n=186)	42.4% (n=97)	43.9% (n=98)
Washington (n= 239)	98.3% (n=235)	98.3% (n=235)	62.0% (n=147)	62.0% (n=147)	75.1% (n=157)	17.8% (n=31)
Washington, DC (n=25)	100% (n=25)	100% (n=25)	100% (n=25)	100% (n=25)	4.0% (n=1)	--
West Virginia (n=153)	92.8% (n=142)	92.8% (n=142)	66.9% (n=101)	45.0% (n=67)	38.2% (n=55)	47.0% (n=54)
Wisconsin (n=394)	97.2% (n=383)	97.2% (n=383)	59.4% (n=247)	19.0% (n=80)	39.0% (n=141)	68.6% (n=254)
Wyoming (n=75)	100% (n=75)	100% (n=75)	81.1% (n=60)	25.0% (n=19)	58.0% (n=40)	39.0% (n=16)
National	93.2% (n=12,656)	64.4% (n=8,770)	56.2% (n=7,725)	31.0% (n=4,268)	49.0% (n=6,328)	39.1% (n=4,734)

Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive

Key -- = No data to report

Figure 85 presents the six peripherals made available at public libraries. Washington, DC's public library system offers the greatest access to peripherals across its branches, reporting that 100 percent of the District's public libraries allow the public to connect USB devices and digital cameras to public access computers, as well as burn CDs or DVDs and play games at those terminals. Use of USBs and other portable devices is also allowed at 100 percent of libraries in Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, South Carolina, and Wyoming – five more states than last year. This year, Wyoming joins Washington, DC with 100 percent of libraries reporting that they allow users to connect digital cameras and manipulate content. Following Washington, DC in allowing patrons to burn CDs and DVDs is Minnesota (86.0 percent) for the second year

in a row. Minnesota (90.0 percent) also follows Washington, DC in access to recreational gaming. Nevada (84.1 percent) leads the nation in providing public library users with mobile devices, while Hawaii leads in providing users with e-readers (78.7 percent).

Figure 86: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e- government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
Alabama (n=233)	97.9% (n=228)	97.9% (n=228)	56.5% (n=131)	88.8% (n=207)	15.9% (n=37)	6.9% (n=16)	8.2% (n=19)	17.7% (n=41)	12.9% (n=30)	21.9% (n=51)	2.1% (n=5)
Alaska (n=90)	97.8% (n=88)	80.9% (n=72)	38.9% (n=35)	70.0% (n=63)	24.7% (n=22)	5.6% (n=5)	6.7% (n=6)	31.4% (n=27)	15.7% (n=14)	23.0% (n=20)	2.9% (n=3)
Arizona (n=155)	98.1% (n=152)	94.2% (n=145)	50.6% (n=78)	74.0% (n=114)	40.3% (n=62)	36.4% (n=56)	37.7% (n=58)	42.9% (n=66)	32.3% (n=50)	57.8% (n=89)	--
Arkansas (n=95)	96.8% (n=92)	88.4% (n=84)	43.2% (n=41)	85.3% (n=81)	17.9% (n=17)	--	7.4% (n=7)	42.9% (n=66)	3.2% (n=3)	34.0% (n=32)	--
California (n=694)	92.2% (n=640)	81.7% (n=567)	44.9% (n=311)	54.7% (n=379)	16.5% (n=114)	11.8% (n=82)	4.6% (n=32)	17.9% (n=124)	5.8% (n=40)	19.3% (n=138)	2.7% (n=19)
Colorado (n=209)	95.7% (n=200)	95.7% (n=200)	55.3% (n=115)	71.2% (n=148)	13.9% (n=29)	6.2% (n=13)	15.4% (n=32)	37.5% (n=78)	26.9% (n=56)	23.1% (n=48)	1.0% (n=2)
Delaware (n=32)	100% (n=32)	100% (n=32)	62.5% (n=20)	62. % (n=20)	25.0% (n=8)	9.7% (n=3)	22.6% (n=7)	45.2% (n=14)	25.0% (n=8)	40.6% (n=13)	--
Florida (n=455)	98.5% (n=448)	95.8% (n=436)	48.6% (n=221)	62.9% (n=286)	32.7% (n=148)	16.0% (n=73)	18.4% (n=84)	61.9% (n=280)	24.0% (n=109)	46.4% (n=211)	6.1% (n=28)
Georgia (n=310)	95.5% (n=296)	88.1% (n=274)	34.4% (n=107)	62.9% (n=195)	28.1% (n=87)	8.4% (n=26)	1.6% (n=5)	21.9% (n=68)	15.2% (n=47)	10.0% (n=31)	--

Figure 86 (continued): E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
Hawaii (n=49)	100% (n=49)	95.9% (n=47)	38.8% (n=19)	63.3% (n=31)	14.3% (n=7)	2.0% (n=1)	8.2% (n=4)	28.6% (n=14)	6.1% (n=3)	16.3% (n=8)	--
Idaho (n=123)	94.3% (n=116)	92.6% (n=113)	59.8% (n=73)	82.9% (n=102)	32.0% (n=39)	10.6% (n=13)	7.4% (n=9)	51.6% (n=63)	9.8% (n=12)	32.0% (n=39)	1.6% (n=2)
Illinois (n=685)	98.7% (n=676)	92.8% (n=636)	48.9% (n=335)	73.7% (n=505)	14.6% (n=100)	5.3% (n=26)	8.6% (n=59)	31.9% (n=216)	10.5% (n=72)	20.6% (n=141)	4.5% (n=20)
Indiana (n=350)	98.6% (n=345)	95.1% (n=332)	52.9% (n=185)	83.4% (n=291)	41.7% (n=146)	20.9% (n=73)	8.3% (n=29)	29.8% (n=104)	8.9% (n=31)	36.3% (n=127)	2.5% (n=9)
Iowa (n=429)	96.3% (n=413)	92.3% (n=395)	44.5% (n=191)	69.0% (n=296)	17.5% (n=75)	3.7% (n=16)	2.1% (n=9)	23.8% (n=101)	14.9% (n=64)	11.4% (n=48)	4.5% (n=20)
Kansas (n=292)	100% (n=292)	84.9% (n=247)	49.3% (n=144)	78.0% (n=227)	23.8% (n=69)	8.6% (n=25)	4.5% (n=13)	22.9% (n=67)	6.2% (n=18)	28.9% (n=86)	4.9% (n=15)
Kentucky (n=156)	100% (n=156)	89.7% (n=140)	42.9% (n=67)	67.9% (n=106)	3.8% (n=6)	2.6% (n=4)	5.1% (n=8)	23.6% (n=37)	--	18.6% (n=29)	--
Louisiana (n=265)	92.8% (n=246)	91.3% (n=241)	61.0% (n=161)	78.5% (n=208)	25.7% (n=68)	11.0% (n=29)	*	37.7% (n=100)	21.9% (n=58)	30.8% (n=82)	8.1% (n=23)
Maine (n=243)	95.1% (n=231)	93.0% (n=226)	44.4% (n=108)	70.4% (n=171)	7.0% (n=17)	--	2.5% (n=6)	32.9% (n=80)	5.0% (n=12)	25.9% (n=63)	--

Figure 86 (continued): E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
Maryland (n=150)	97.3% (n=146)	96.0% (n=144)	81.3% (n=122)	85.4% (n=129)	25.3% (n=38)	12.7% (n=19)	*	67.3% (n=101)	26.0% (n=39)	9.3% (n=14)	3.3% (n=5)
Massachusetts (n=316)	100% (n=316)	92.4% (n=292)	41.9% (n=132)	56.6% (n=179)	6.3% (n=38)	1.6% (n=5)	2.8% (n=9)	10.4% (n=33)	5.7% (n=18)	14.2% (n=45)	5.5% (n=18)
Michigan (n=546)	96.2% (n=525)	92.8% (n=506)	42.8% (n=233)	77.6% (n=423)	17.6% (n=96)	5.5% (n=30)	7.9% (n=43)	18.9% (n=103)	6.4% (n=35)	16.8% (n=92)	2.9% (n=16)
Minnesota (n=281)	94.3% (n=265)	81.9% (n=230)	37.5% (n=105)	77.9% (n=219)	5.3% (n=15)	11.4% (n=32)	7.9% (n=22)	16.0% (n=45)	2.2% (n=6)	14.2% (n=38)	3.1% (n=9)
Mississippi (n=209)	95.2% (n=199)	90.4% (n=189)	37.5% (n=78)	53.8% (n=112)	5.8% (n=12)	8.6% (n=18)	1.4% (n=3)	31.1% (n=65)	4.3% (n=9)	5.7% (n=12)	1.9% (n=4)
Missouri (n=273)	98.9% (n=270)	93.0% (n=254)	48.0% (n=131)	66.3% (n=181)	12.8% (n=35)	7.3% (n=20)	2.2% (n=6)	27.8% (n=76)	12.1% (n=33)	18.3% (n=50)	2.2% (n=6)
Montana (n=85)	95.3% (n=81)	94.0% (n=79)	51.2% (n=43)	78.8% (n=67)	2.4% (n=2)	4.7% (n=4)	4.7% (n=4)	17.1% (n=14)	8.3% (n=7)	16.7% (n=14)	5.7% (n=5)
Nebraska (n=233)	93.6% (n=218)	87.9% (n=204)	45.1% (n=105)	65.9% (n=153)	8.6% (n=20)	6.0% (n=14)	2.2% (n=5)	33.6% (n=78)	8.3% (n=19)	22.6% (n=52)	5.1% (n=12)
Nevada (n=79)	100% (n=79)	100% (n=79)	65.8% (n=52)	75.0% (n=60)	6.3% (n=5)	3.8% (n=3)	1.3% (n=1)	51.2% (n=41)	--	31.3% (n=25)	1.3% (n=1)
New Hampshire (n=185)	94.1% (n=174)	83.8% (n=155)	34.6% (n=64)	57.8% (n=107)	8.6% (n=16)	1.1% (n=2)	1.6% (n=3)	10.3% (n=19)	4.3% (n=8)	12.2% (n=23)	2.6% (n=5)

Figure 86 (continued): E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e- government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
New Jersey (n=319)	100% (n=319)	99.1% (n=315)	68.2% (n=217)	77.0% (n=245)	16.7% (n=53)	10.4% (n=33)	26.6% (n=85)	16.7% (n=53)	11.9% (n=38)	19.6% (n=63)	2.1% (n=7)
New Mexico (n=104)	100% (n=104)	97.1% (n=100)	63.5% (n=66)	92.3% (n=96)	25.0% (n=26)	17.5% (n=18)	34.6% (n=36)	29.8% (n=31)	4.8% (n=5)	27.9% (n=29)	7.5% (n=8)
New York (n=932)	98.4% (n=917)	90.7% (n=846)	54.7% (n=510)	77.4% (n=721)	35.2% (n=328)	28.3% (n=264)	2.9% (n=27)	29.6% (n=276)	4.1% (n=38)	36.6% (n=341)	1.1% (n=10)
North Carolina (n=285)	100% (n=285)	97.2% (n=277)	47.0% (n=134)	64.2% (n=183)	14.4% (n=41)	7.0% (n=20)	3.5% (n=10)	25.5% (n=70)	12.3% (n=35)	19.3% (n=55)	1.7% (n=5)
North Dakota (n=62)	96.8% (n=60)	83.9% (n=52)	40.3% (n=25)	58.1% (n=36)	16.1% (n=10)	3.2% (n=2)	--	14.5% (n=9)	12.9% (n=8)	29.0% (n=18)	3.1% (n=2)
Ohio (n=603)	98.7% (n=595)	93.9% (n=566)	51.4% (n=310)	75.0% (n=452)	32.0% (n=193)	20.1% (n=121)	13.3% (n=80)	41.0% (n=245)	25.5% (n=154)	28.4% (n=172)	3.5% (n=21)
Oklahoma (n=153)	96.7% (n=148)	96.7% (n=148)	56.2% (n=86)	89.9% (n=123)	27.6% (n=42)	16.4% (n=25)	3.3% (n=5)	12.5% (n=19)	3.3% (n=5)	29.4% (n=45)	1.9% (n=3)
Pennsylvania (n=378)	93.8% (n=355)	86.3% (n=326)	40.4% (n=153)	67.0% (n=254)	8.4% (n=32)	1.6% (n=6)	8.4% (n=32)	24.3% (n=92)	3.3% (n=13)	18.5% (n=71)	7.1% (n=28)
Rhode Island (n=62)	90.3% (n=56)	85.7% (n=54)	66.1% (n=41)	80.6% (n=50)	--	3.2% (n=2)	8.1% (n=5)	30.6% (n=19)	8.1% (n=5)	44.4% (n=28)	4.8% (n=3)
South Carolina (n=125)	90.4% (n=113)	92.9% (n=117)	56.0% (n=70)	71.2% (n=89)	15.1% (n=19)	13.5% (n=17)	13.5% (n=17)	22.0% (n=27)	11.9% (n=15)	36.0% (n=45)	--

Figure 86 (continued): E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
South Dakota (n=129)	94.6% (n=122)	87.6% (n=113)	36.4% (n=47)	69.0% (n=89)	5.4% (n=7)	1.6% (n=2)	1.6% (n=2)	17.3% (n=22)	5.4% (n=7)	6.1% (n=8)	9.2% (n=13)
Tennessee (n=225)	98.7% (n=222)	90.2% (n=203)	57.3% (n=129)	88.1% (n=199)	38.1% (n=86)	5.8% (n=13)	5.8% (n=13)	41.3% (n=92)	8.8% (n=20)	25.3% (n=57)	1.7% (n=4)
Texas (n=583)	97.1% (n=566)	90.6% (n=528)	47.7% (n=278)	68.3% (n=398)	19.2% (n=112)	14.9% (n=87)	14.9% (n=89)	26.6% (n=154)	6.9% (n=40)	24.2% (n=141)	3.4% (n=20)
Utah (n=104)	98.1% (n=102)	98.1% (n=102)	49.0% (n=51)	75.0% (n=78)	20.2% (n=21)	7.7% (n=8)	7.7% (n=8)	20.2% (n=21)	2.9% (n=3)	19.2% (n=20)	--
Vermont (n=151)	93.4% (n=141)	86.1% (n=130)	44.1% (n=67)	70.9% (n=107)	8.6% (n=13)	1.3% (n=2)	1.3% (n=2)	22.5% (n=34)	4.0% (n=6)	25.8% (n=39)	2.6% (n=4)
Virginia (n=246)	99.2% (n=244)	94.3% (n=233)	62.6% (n=154)	70.3% (n=173)	30.0% (n=74)	23.9% (n=59)	23.9% (n=59)	37.4% (n=92)	19.9% (n=49)	35.8% (n=88)	--
Washington (n= 257)	96.1% (n=247)	98.4% (n=253)	39.3% (n=101)	61.9% (n=159)	2.3% (n=6)	*	*	47.9% (n=123)	*	3.1% (n=8)	*
Washington, DC (n=24)	100% (n=24)	95.8% (n=23)	91.7% (n=22)	82.6% (n=19)	4.2% (n=1)	--	--	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=147)	100% (n=147)	99.3% (n=146)	41.9% (n=62)	63.9% (n=94)	8.8% (n=13)	4.8% (n=7)	4.8% (n=7)	20.4% (n=30)	6.8% (n=10)	15.6% (n=23)	3.4% (n=4)

Figure 86 (continued): E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Assists patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Assists patrons in understanding how to access and use government Web sites	Assists patrons in understanding government programs and services	Assists patrons completing government forms	Develop guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government resources	Offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs and completing electronic forms	Offers translation services for forms and services in other languages	Partners with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Works with government agencies to help the agencies improve their Web sites and/or e-government services	Has at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services	Other
Wisconsin (n=416)	90.4% (n=376)	84.8% (n=352)	53.0% (n=220)	65.1% (n=271)	20.7% (n=86)	7.2% (n=30)	7.2% (n=30)	28.0% (n=116)	5.0% (n=21)	19.9% (n=83)	1.4% (n=6)
Wyoming (n=73)	95.9% (n=70)	95.9% (n=70)	46.6% (n=34)	59.5% (n=44)	12.5% (n=9)	1.4% (n=1)	1.4% (n=1)	22.2% (n=16)	4.2% (n=3)	4.2% (n=3)	1.4% (n=1)
National	96.6% (n=12,607)	91.8% (n=11,976)	50.0% (n=6,528)	70.7% (n=9,230)	20.6% (n=2,686)	11.2% (n=1,457)	7.8% (n=1,020)	30.9% (n=4,017)	11.0% (n=1,438)	23.6% (n=3,078)	3.0% (n=400)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive											
Key *=Insufficient data to report											
-- = No data to report											

The E-government roles and services played by public libraries is presented in Figure 86. This year saw a substantial increase in the provision of E-government services within public library branches across the U.S. While last year only Washington, DC reported that 100% of library branches provide assistance in applying and accessing E-government services, this year ten states have joined the District of Columbia with 100% in that category: Delaware, Hawaii, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, and West Virginia. Delaware (100 percent), Nevada (100 percent), and West Virginia (99.3 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries providing assistance in accessing and using E-government websites. Maryland (81.3 percent) is well above the national average of 50 percent have when it comes to libraries assisting with understanding government programs and services. The highest percentages of libraries assisting with online government forms are Oklahoma (89.9 percent) and Arizona (88.8 percent). Indiana (41.7 percent) and Arizona (40.3 percent) have the highest

percentages of libraries developing tools to assist patrons with E-government. For the second year in a row, Arizona (36.4 percent) and New York (28.3 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries offering E-government training classes. The highest percentages of libraries offering translations services for E-government are in Arizona (37.7 percent) and New Mexico (34.6 percent). Maryland (67.3 percent) and Florida (61.9 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries partnering with government agencies and others to provide E-government services again. Colorado (26.9 percent), Maryland (26.0 percent), and Ohio (25.5 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries working with government agencies to improve E-government services and Websites. Finally, Florida (46.4 percent) and Rhode Island (44.4 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries with at least one staff member with significant expertise in providing E-government services.

Figure 87: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete e-government needs	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some e-government services	Other
Alabama (n=264)	2.9 (n=226)	2.3 (n=226)	2.4 (n=231)	2.5 (n=229)	3.5 (n=212)	3.3 (n=216)	2.8 (n=201)	--
Alaska (n=106)	3.1 (n=91)	2.8 (n=89)	3.7 (n=91)	1.9 (n=85)	3.5 (n=81)	3.6 (n=86)	2.7 (n=75)	2.5 (n=3)
Arizona (n=202)	2.7 (n=196)	2.3 (n=194)	2.0 (n=196)	1.7 (n=194)	3.3 (n=196)	3.1 (n=193)	2.5 (n=183)	--
Arkansas (n=172)	4.1 (n=167)	3.5 (n=170)	3.4 (n=170)	2.0 (n=167)	4.0 (n=168)	3.7 (n=170)	3.3 (n=102)	5.0 (n=2)
California (n=962)	3.7 (n=838)	3.3 (n=816)	2.8 (n=826)	2.0 (n=737)	3.7 (n=822)	3.7 (n=829)	2.9 (n=778)	1.9 (n=11)
Colorado (n=233)	2.4 (n=216)	2.2 (n=216)	2.2 (n=220)	1.7 (n=218)	3.3 (n=222)	3.2 (n=222)	2.1 (n=208)	4.0 (n=2)
Delaware (n=33)	2.7 (n=32)	2.8 (n=32)	1.6 (n=32)	2.0 (n=29)	3.8 (n=33)	3.6 (n=32)	2.5 (n=29)	--
Florida (n=501)	3.1 (n=387)	3.0 (n=394)	2.4 (n=397)	1.7 (n=397)	3.5 (n=397)	3.1 (n=389)	3.1 (n=379)	4.7 (n=5)
Georgia (n=385)	3.3 (n=303)	2.6 (n=295)	2.9 (n=320)	2.2 (n=311)	3.6 (n=316)	3.6 (n=318)	3.1 (n=296)	5.0 (n=3)
Hawaii (n=51)	2.8 (n=38)	3.5 (n=50)	1.0 (n=1)	3.6 (n=49)	3.1 (n=50)	3.2 (n=50)	3.1 (n=48)	2.37 (n=46)
Idaho (n=138)	2.4 (n=121)	1.8 (n=121)	2.1 (n=126)	1.8 (n=117)	2.8 (n=126)	2.9 (n=129)	2.2 (n=129)	3.0 (n=2)

Figure 87 (continued): Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete e-government needs	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some e-government services	Other
Illinois (n=761)	2.7 (n=679)	2.9 (n=697)	2.7 (n=323)	2.7 (n=667)	2.8 (n=670)	2.7 (n=688)	2.7 (n=675)	1.8 (n=349)
Indiana (n=430)	2.6 (n=354)	2.5 (n=362)	2.1 (n=231)	2.5 (n=357)	3.3 (n=355)	2.9 (n=357)	3.0 (n=325)	1.6 (n=129)
Iowa (n=548)	2.4 (n=453)	2.0 (n=426)	2.0 (n=457)	1.6 (n=422)	3.6 (n=457)	3.8 (n=461)	2.5 (n=404)	3.4 (n=11)
Kansas (n=374)	2.6 (n=344)	2.1 (n=316)	2.4 (n=340)	1.8 (n=336)	3.2 (n=351)	3.5 (n=353)	2.6 (n=320)	1.5 (n=4)
Kentucky (n=192)	2.5 (n=168)	2.4 (n=171)	2.2 (n=167)	1.8 (n=164)	3.1 (n=171)	3.3 (n=167)	3.0 (n=151)	--
Louisiana (n=317)	3.1 (n=280)	2.7 (n=269)	2.3 (n=281)	2.3 (n=265)	4.1 (n=282)	4.1 (n=284)	3.9 (n=282)	--
Maine (n=278)	2.3 (n=226)	2.4 (n=214)	1.9 (n=214)	1.7 (n=226)	3.3 (n=237)	3.4 (n=231)	2.2 (n=203)	5.0 (n=6)
Maryland (n=179)	3.4 (n=125)	2.8 (n=126)	2.5 (n=126)	1.8 (n=126)	3.1 (n=149)	2.6 (n=149)	2.0 (n=147)	--
Massachusetts (n=458)	2.7 (n=329)	2.5 (n=321)	2.1 (n=329)	1.6 (n=287)	3.7 (n=315)	3.5 (n=318)	2.5 (n=297)	3.6 (n=11)
Michigan (n=653)	2.8 (n=517)	3.1 (n=521)	2.4 (n=532)	2.0 (n=527)	3.9 (n=526)	3.6 (n=526)	3.1 (n=511)	4.0 (n=11)

Figure 87 (continued): Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete e-government needs	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some e-government services	Other
Minnesota (n=353)	2.9 (n=261)	3.1 (n=263)	2.1 (n=118)	3.0 (n=273)	3.2 (n=270)	2.6 (n=276)	2.7 (n=274)	1.8 (n=154)
Mississippi (n=236)	3.3 (n=218)	2.6 (n=209)	3.6 (n=216)	2.1 (n=209)	3.8 (n=202)	3.9 (n=203)	3.3 (n=209)	5.0 (n=1)
Missouri (n=342)	2.5 (n=277)	2.9 (n=285)	1.4 (n=86)	2.9 (n=282)	2.2 (n=280)	2.2 (n=281)	2.4 (n=277)	1.8 (n=196)
Montana (n=104)	2.3 (n=85)	2.1 (n=86)	2.2 (n=86)	1.4 (n=78)	2.4 (n=81)	3.6 (n=86)	2.4 (n=81)	4.5 (n=4)
Nebraska (n=285)	2.4 (n=246)	2.5 (n=253)	2.1 (n=170)	2.3 (n=246)	2.8 (n=248)	2.8 (n=247)	2.5 (n=239)	2.0 (n=78)
Nevada (n=84)	3.7 (n=83)	3.3 (n=83)	2.2 (n=82)	1.7 (n=81)	3.2 (n=83)	3.0 (n=82)	2.6 (n=65)	--
New Jersey (n=422)	2.4 (n=326)	2.2 (n=333)	1.9 (n=336)	1.8 (n=319)	3.0 (n=326)	2.8 (n=322)	2.4 (n=315)	--
New Hampshire (n=237)	2.4 (n=211)	2.1 (n=205)	2.0 (n=218)	1.4 (n=196)	3.2 (n=207)	3.5 (n=206)	2.2 (n=194)	4.5 (n=6)
New Mexico (n=123)	3.2 (n=106)	3.0 (n=96)	2.8 (n=108)	2.4 (n=98)	4.0 (n=107)	3.3 (n=107)	3.4 (n=104)	--
New York (n=1,052)	3.2 (n=935)	2.7 (n=819)	2.5 (n=946)	1.6 (n=874)	3.0 (n=930)	2.9 (n=905)	2.1 (n=851)	3.0 (n=10)

Figure 87 (continued): Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete e-government needs	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some e-government services	Other
North Carolina (n=376)	2.8 (n=295)	2.7 (n=295)	2.1 (n=293)	1.9 (n=283)	3.7 (n=291)	3.4 (n=282)	3.0 (n=270)	2.4 (n=14)
North Dakota (n=86)	2.2 (n=76)	2.8 (n=78)	1.7 (n=44)	2.7 (n=76)	2.3 (n=74)	2.6 (n=78)	2.5 (n=76)	2.0 (n=40)
Ohio (n=707)	2.7 (n=587)	3.0 (n=591)	2.7 (n=212)	2.9 (n=575)	3.0 (n=610)	2.8 (n=610)	3.0 (n=598)	1.5 (n=396)
Oklahoma (n=190)	3.3 (n=153)	3.0 (n=151)	2.4 (n=156)	2.3 (n=151)	3.8 (n=151)	3.4 (n=149)	2.7 (n=146)	1.0 (n=2)
Pennsylvania (n=603)	2.3 (n=387)	2.0 (n=375)	2.2 (n=388)	1.9 (n=380)	3.9 (n=395)	3.6 (n=396)	2.6 (n=347)	--
Rhode Island (n=72)	2.3 (n=60)	2.3 (n=60)	1.5 (n=62)	1.5 (n=62)	2.8 (n=62)	2.8 (n=62)	2.6 (n=58)	--
South Carolina (n=189)	3.7 (n=135)	3.1 (n=135)	2.2 (n=135)	1.7 (n=135)	3.9 (n=129)	3.9 (n=129)	2.5 (n=118)	--
South Dakota (n=160)	2.5 (n=132)	2.6 (n=129)	2.3 (n=96)	2.5 (n=129)	3.0 (n=131)	3.0 (n=137)	2.4 (n=131)	1.7 (n=35)
Tennessee (n=288)	3.0 (n=227)	2.6 (n=223)	2.4 (n=226)	1.8 (n=221)	3.9 (n=229)	3.3 (n=225)	2.6 (n=217)	5.0 (n=2)
Texas (n=825)	2.9 (n=620)	2.5 (n=596)	2.4 (n=614)	2.0 (n=594)	3.7 (n=619)	3.6 (n=624)	2.9 (n=580)	3.0 (n=7)

Figure 87 (continued): Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-Government needs, by State (1 = Least Important, 5 = Most Important)

<i>States</i>	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete e-government needs	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some e-government services	Other
Utah (n=118)	2.4 (n=112)	2.6 (n=114)	2.4 (n=114)	2.0 (n=116)	3.5 (n=116)	3.3 (n=116)	2.9 (n=114)	--
Vermont (n=181)	2.5 (n=164)	2.6 (n=166)	2.1 (n=120)	2.1 (n=153)	3.0 (n=160)	3.2 (n=164)	2.0 (n=149)	1.8 (n=40)
Virginia (n=374)	3.1 (n=242)	2.7 (n=242)	2.7 (n=240)	2.3 (n=221)	3.3 (n=238)	3.3 (n=238)	2.5 (n=195)	--
Washington (n=322)	2.7 (n=213)	2.7 (n=213)	2.1 (n=215)	1.7 (n=211)	3.3 (n=213)	3.8 (n=208)	2.6 (n=198)	--
Washington, DC (n=27)	3.1 (n=25)	3.1 (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	--
West Virginia (n=156)	2.9 (n=150)	2.3 (n=132)	2.7 (n=148)	2.7 (n=148)	2.8 (n=143)	3.6 (n=146)	3.8 (n=148)	3.2 (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=451)	2.6 (n=397)	3.3 (n=411)	2.9 (n=170)	3.1 (n=399)	2.9 (n=411)	3.1 (n=419)	2.5 (n=407)	1.7 (n=235)
Wyoming (n=76)	2.9 (n=66)	2.1 (n=63)	2.3 (n=67)	1.4 (n=55)	3.4 (n=67)	4.0 (n=69)	2.2 (n=63)	2.7 (n=1)
National	2.9 (n=13,298)	2.7 (n=13,137)	2.3 (n=11,420)	2.2 (n=13,012)	3.3 (n=13,451)	3.3 (n=13,543)	2.7 (n=12,675)	5.3 (n=13,265)
Key -- = No data to report								

Figure 87 indicates the challenges that public libraries face in providing E-government services. Not having enough staff with the necessary expertise to meet patrons needs for E-government services was the top rated challenge nationally, and for most states as well. Libraries not having the enough staff to meet patrons' needs was rated highest by libraries in Arkansas; Iowa; Louisiana; Michigan; Mississippi; New Mexico; Pennsylvania; South Carolina; Tennessee; and Texas. Libraries in Arkansas rated having too few workstations the biggest challenge, while libraries in California and Washington, DC had it tied at the top with other challenges. Workstation time limits were rated the most important challenge by libraries in Illinois, and tied with too few workstations in Washington, DC. Libraries in Alaska rated the slow connection speed as the most important challenge and libraries in West Virginia identified liability issues as the biggest challenge to providing E-government services.

Figure 88: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Provides access to jobs databases and other resources	Provides access to civil service exam materials	Helps patrons complete online job applications	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications	Helps patrons develop business plans and other materials	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials	Offers classes on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.	Offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials	Other
Alabama (n=239)	100% (n=239)	85.7% (n=204)	81.6% (n=195)	40.6% (n=97)	25.1% (n=60)	10.9% (n=26)	25.9% (n=62)	78.2% (n=187)	2.9% (n=7)
Alaska (n=90)	90.0% (n=81)	50.5% (n=46)	54.9% (n=50)	27.5% (n=25)	12.1% (n=11)	13.3% (n=12)	5.5% (n=5)	53.4% (n=47)	8.8% (n=8)
Arizona (n=188)	93.1% (n=117)	68.1% (n=128)	68.4% (n=128)	59.0% (n=111)	35.1% (n=66)	44.1% (n=83)	47.3% (n=89)	86.7% (n=163)	2.7% (n=5)
Arkansas (n=122)	95.9% (n=117)	63.9% (n=78)	87.7% (n=107)	41.0% (n=50)	9.8% (n=12)	4.1% (n=5)	14.3% (n=17)	73.8% (n=90)	13.9% (n=17)
California (n=823)	96.1% (n=791)	85.1% (n=700)	45.4% (n=374)	19.2% (n=158)	7.0% (n=58)	10.0% (n=82)	22.9% (n=187)	76.4% (n=616)	1.6% (n=13)
Colorado (n=220)	91.4% (n=201)	81.3% (n=178)	83.6% (n=184)	43.4% (n=95)	30.6% (n=67)	27.4% (n=60)	35.8% (n=77)	86.6% (n=187)	1.4% (n=3)
Delaware (n=33)	100% (n=33)	87.9% (n=29)	78.8% (n=26)	54.5% (n=18)	21.2% (n=7)	30.3% (n=10)	45.5% (n=15)	87.9% (n=29)	3.0% (n=1)
Florida (n=459)	97.2% (n=446)	85.4% (n=392)	69.1% (n=317)	35.9% (n=165)	27.0% (n=124)	12.0% (n=55)	63.2% (n=290)	93.7% (n=416)	2.0% (n=9)
Georgia (n=320)	91.6% (n=293)	85.6% (n=274)	77.5% (n=248)	32.5% (n=104)	20.9% (n=67)	20.6% (n=66)	36.6% (n=117)	70.4% (n=209)	5.3% (n=17)
Hawaii (n=49)	83.7% (n=41)	95.9% (n=47)	59.2% (n=29)	6.1% (n=3)	16.3% (n=8)	6.1% (n=3)	10.4% (n=5)	66.7% (n=32)	2.0% (n=1)
Idaho (n=132)	96.2% (n=127)	80.9% (n=106)	78.6% (n=103)	44.3% (n=58)	24.2% (n=32)	5.3% (n=7)	13.0% (n=17)	72.5% (n=95)	2.3% (n=3)
Illinois (n=710)	83.2% (n=591)	61.1% (n=433)	79.4% (n=563)	27.9% (n=198)	13.5% (n=96)	20.8% (n=148)	33.6% (n=235)	78.0% (n=539)	4.7% (n=33)
Indiana (n=358)	90.2% (n=323)	67.5% (n=241)	62.7% (n=224)	33.5% (n=120)	23.0% (n=82)	25.5% (n=91)	22.2% (n=79)	79.3% (n=279)	3.4% (n=12)
Iowa (n=457)	82.7% (n=378)	34.4% (n=157)	72.2% (n=330)	35.4% (n=162)	7.7% (n=35)	6.8% (n=31)	12.5% (n=57)	62.6% (n=286)	3.3% (n=15)
Kansas (n=318)	84.6% (n=269)	62.3% (n=198)	72.6% (n=231)	28.9% (n=92)	7.6% (n=24)	9.7% (n=31)	15.0% (n=47)	61.1% (n=192)	2.2% (n=7)
Kentucky (n=168)	91.7% (n=154)	77.4% (n=130)	80.4% (n=135)	38.1% (n=64)	4.8% (n=8)	8.3% (n=14)	47.8% (n=77)	92.8% (n=142)	3.0% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=283)	98.2% (n=278)	85.5% (n=242)	68.2% (n=193)	26.2% (n=74)	22.3% (n=63)	22.3% (n=63)	35.3% (n=100)	90.0% (n=253)	--
Maine (n=238)	85.3% (n=203)	53.8% (n=128)	77.2% (n=183)	24.4% (n=58)	9.7% (n=23)	7.2% (n=17)	16.9% (n=40)	53.2% (n=126)	12.2% (n=29)
Maryland (n=149)	100% (n=149)	100% (n=149)	87.9% (n=131)	36.9% (n=55)	42.3% (n=63)	45.6% (n=68)	46.1% (n=65)	87.1% (n=128)	*

Figure 88 (continued): Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Provides access to jobs databases and other resources	Provides access to civil service exam materials	Helps patrons complete online job applications	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications	Helps patrons develop business plans and other materials	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials	Offers classes on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.	Offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials	Other
Massachusetts (n=324)	83.6% (n=271)	66.2% (n=215)	68.5% (n=222)	16.9% (n=55)	7.4% (n=24)	8.9% (n=29)	23.7% (n=77)	68.8% (n=216)	3.7% (n=12)
Michigan (n=507)	99.0% (n=502)	87.4% (n=442)	80.1% (n=406)	26.8% (n=136)	15.8% (n=80)	20.7% (n=105)	42.2% (n=212)	83.8% (n=425)	1.0% (n=5)
Minnesota (n=281)	91.5% (n=257)	70.4% (n=197)	76.1% (n=213)	20.4% (n=57)	11.8% (n=33)	10.0% (n=28)	19.8% (n=55)	62.9% (n=171)	1.1% (n=3)
Mississippi (n=212)	95.8% (n=203)	86.7% (n=183)	78.8% (n=167)	29.7% (n=63)	6.6% (n=14)	13.3% (n=28)	14.2% (n=30)	78.2% (n=165)	1.0% (n=2)
Missouri (n=277)	96.8% (n=268)	81.3% (n=226)	82.7% (n=230)	24.5% (n=68)	9.0% (n=25)	10.8% (n=30)	16.3% (n=45)	82.0% (n=228)	*
Montana (n=90)	95.6% (n=86)	60.0% (n=54)	84.4% (n=76)	27.8% (n=25)	2.2% (n=2)	5.6% (n=5)	10.0% (n=9)	76.7% (n=66)	2.2% (n=2)
Nebraska (n=251)	76.9% (n=193)	43.2% (n=108)	76.9% (n=193)	17.1% (n=43)	11.2% (n=28)	10.0% (n=25)	12.0% (n=30)	52.2% (n=131)	4.0% (n=10)
Nevada (n=82)	97.6% (n=80)	85.5% (n=71)	86.7% (n=72)	13.3% (n=11)	16.9% (n=14)	45.8% (n=38)	50.6% (n=42)	100% (n=83)	2.4% (n=2)
New Hampshire (n=209)	82.3% (n=172)	37.3% (n=78)	76.1% (n=159)	14.3% (n=30)	5.2% (n=11)	7.7% (n=16)	19.6% (n=41)	55.7% (n=112)	1.4% (n=3)
New Jersey (n=357)	97.2% (n=347)	90.2% (n=322)	73.7% (n=263)	39.5% (n=141)	17.6% (n=63)	12.6% (n=45)	48.7% (n=174)	77.2% (n=268)	2.8% (n=10)
New Mexico (n=113)	82.3% (n=93)	50.0% (n=56)	83.9% (n=94)	13.3% (n=15)	6.3% (n=7)	15.9% (n=18)	37.2% (n=42)	90.2% (n=101)	4.5% (n=5)
New York (n=958)	96.2% (n=822)	94.7% (n=906)	81.8% (n=784)	44.8% (n=429)	33.6% (n=322)	36.5% (n=349)	43.8% (n=417)	82.3% (n=771)	13.8% (n=132)
North Carolina (n=283)	97.2% (n=275)	83.3% (n=235)	77.3% (n=218)	41.3% (n=117)	13.1% (n=37)	24.0% (n=68)	37.5% (n=105)	86.6% (n=245)	5.3% (n=15)
North Dakota (n=74)	89.2% (n=66)	62.2% (n=46)	78.4% (n=58)	28.0% (n=21)	8.1% (n=6)	5.3% (n=4)	17.8% (n=13)	66.7% (n=48)	2.7% (n=2)
Ohio (n=619)	97.3% (n=602)	93.5% (n=579)	79.1% (n=489)	46.8% (n=289)	23.1% (n=143)	35.9% (n=222)	39.2% (n=236)	83.4% (n=513)	3.9% (n=24)
Oklahoma (n=156)	85.3% (n=133)	67.7% (n=105)	83.3% (n=130)	32.3% (n=50)	34.6% (n=54)	39.0% (n=60)	30.0% (n=56)	82.1% (n=128)	3.2% (n=5)
Pennsylvania (n=400)	80.5% (n=322)	71.0% (n=284)	67.0% (n=268)	13.3% (n=53)	10.8% (n=43)	12.9% (n=50)	12.9% (n=50)	69.7% (n=278)	5.3% (n=21)
Rhode Island (n=61)	90.2% (n=55)	58.3% (n=35)	75.0% (n=45)	20.0% (n=12)	8.3% (n=5)	16.4% (n=10)	41.7% (n=25)	80.0% (n=48)	3.3% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=135)	100% (n=135)	75.6% (n=102)	78.5% (n=106)	54.1% (n=73)	19.3% (n=26)	16.4% (n=22)	45.9% (n=62)	75.6% (n=102)	8.9% (n=12)

Figure 88 (continued): Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State

States	Provides access to jobs databases and other resources	Provides access to civil service exam materials	Helps patrons complete online job applications	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications	Helps patrons develop business plans and other materials	Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials	Offers classes on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.	Offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials	Other
South Dakota (n=142)	85.2% (n=121)	66.2% (n=94)	78.2% (n=111)	23.2% (n=33)	4.2% (n=6)	9.9% (n=14)	18.3% (n=26)	63.1% (n=89)	4.2% (n=6)
Tennessee (n=233)	90.1% (n=210)	81.2% (n=190)	88.0% (n=205)	47.6% (n=111)	26.2% (n=61)	35.5% (n=83)	41.3% (n=92)	90.6% (n=211)	3.4% (n=8)
Texas (n=679)	92.5% (n=627)	76.1% (n=516)	84.2% (n=572)	45.7% (n=310)	15.6% (n=106)	16.5% (n=112)	33.9% (n=228)	78.1% (n=525)	2.5% (n=17)
Utah (n=114)	92.1% (n=105)	78.8% (n=89)	72.8% (n=83)	4.4% (n=5)	15.8% (n=18)	--	28.1% (n=32)	66.7% (n=76)	--
Vermont (n=163)	81.0% (n=132)	36.0% (n=59)	73.2% (n=120)	12.8% (n=21)	13.4% (n=22)	14.0% (n=23)	11.6% (n=19)	59.1% (n=97)	6.1% (n=10)
Virginia (n=242)	88.8% (n=215)	91.3% (n=220)	91.3% (n=221)	58.1% (n=140)	38.8% (n=94)	44.8% (n=108)	49.4% (n=119)	68.2% (n=165)	2.1% (n=5)
Washington (n=217)	97.2% (n=211)	71.9% (n=156)	86.6% (n=188)	35.5% (n=77)	17.0% (n=37)	14.3% (n=31)	58.7% (n=128)	89.4% (n=194)	--
Washington, DC (n=25)	100% (n=25)	8.0% (n=2)	96.0% (n=24)	79.2% (n=19)	64.0% (n=16)	12.0% (n=3)	12.0% (n=3)	8.7% (n=2)	--
West Virginia (n=148)	90.5% (n=134)	83.8% (n=124)	85.8% (n=127)	36.5% (n=54)	6.8% (n=10)	4.1% (n=6)	5.4% (n=8)	82.4% (n=122)	2.7% (n=4)
Wisconsin (n=428)	97.4% (n=417)	79.0% (n=336)	83.0% (n=356)	43.7% (n=187)	6.5% (n=28)	7.7% (n=33)	26.8% (n=114)	78.9% (n=333)	4.4% (n=19)
Wyoming (n=75)	84.0% (n=63)	72.0% (n=54)	67.1% (n=51)	34.7% (n=26)	8.0% (n=6)	14.9% (n=11)	8.0% (n=6)	59.2% (n=45)	--
National	91.8% (n=12,131)	75.3% (n=9,946)	75.7% (n=10,002)	33.1% (n=4,378)	17.0% (n=2,247)	18.3% (n=2,420)	31.2% (n=4,081)	76.6% (n=9,974)	4.0% (n=528)

Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive

Key *=Insufficient data to report

-- = No data to report

Figure 88 presents the job seeking services offered by public libraries. 100 percent of libraries in Alabama, Delaware, Washington, DC, South Carolina report the highest percentages of providing access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources, while 28 other states reported that over 90 percent of their libraries offer such resources. The highest percentages of assisting patrons complete online job applications were reported by libraries in Virginia (91.3 percent) and Washington, DC (96.0 percent). The highest percentages of libraries collaborating with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications were reported in Washington, DC (79.2 percent) and Arizona (59.0 percent). Libraries in Washington, DC (79.2 percent) and Virginia (38.8 percent) reported the highest percentages of helping patrons to develop business plans and other materials to start businesses. Libraries in Nevada

(45.8 percent) and Arizona (44.1 percent) reported the highest percentages of collaboration with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses. The highest percentages of libraries offering classes on job seeking strategies were reported in Florida (63.2 percent) and Washington (58.7 percent), with the national average increasing by 5.8 percent this year. Libraries in Nevada (100 percent), Florida (93.7 percent), and Kentucky (92.8 percent) reported the highest percentages of offering software and other resources to help patrons create résumés and other employment materials.

Figure 89: Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete job applications, seek job information, etc.	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	Other
Alabama (n=229)	2.8 (n=203)	2.3 (n=206)	2.5 (n=229)	2.6 (n=195)	3.6 (n=212)	3.2 (n=213)	2.6 (n=200)	--
Alaska (n=73)	2.9 (n=72)	2.9 (n=70)	3.5 (n=78)	1.8 (n=72)	3.2 (n=71)	3.4 (n=73)	2.5 (n=68)	--
Arizona (n=179)	3.0 (n=163)	2.8 (n=168)	2.1 (n=164)	2.0 (n=179)	3.3 (n=166)	2.8 (n=167)	2.4 (n=167)	5.0 (n=3)
Arkansas (n=151)	3.9 (n=142)	3.5 (n=151)	3.4 (n=145)	2.4 (n=144)	3.7 (n=135)	3.4 (n=129)	3.2 (n=71)	--
California (n=744)	3.3 (n=687)	3.5 (n=744)	2.7 (n=724)	2.0 (n=663)	3.6 (n=743)	3.5 (n=679)	2.9 (n=675)	3.1 (n=8)
Colorado (n=216)	2.5 (n=171)	2.4 (n=191)	2.0 (n=200)	1.8 (n=201)	3.2 (n=216)	2.9 (n=184)	2.0 (n=185)	5.0 (n=1)
Delaware (n=29)	2.7 (n=27)	2.7 (n=32)	1.7 (n=26)	2.4 (n=26)	3.7 (n=29)	3.2 (n=24)	2.5 (n=26)	--
Florida (n=348)	2.9 (n=319)	3.0 (n=320)	2.3 (n=342)	1.7 (n=348)	3.5 (n=348)	2.8 (n=346)	3.5 (n=320)	4.0 (n=4)
Georgia (n=324)	3.1 (n=223)	2.7 (n=276)	2.8 (n=296)	2.2 (n=265)	3.4 (n=294)	3.1 (n=280)	3.0 (n=263)	5.0 (n=2)
Hawaii (n=46)	3.6 (n=40)	2.9 (n=34)	3.1 (n=43)	3.5 (n=41)	3.2 (n=46)	--	3.0 (n=44)	2.7 (n=44)
Idaho (n=119)	2.2 (n=109)	1.8 (n=111)	1.9 (n=106)	1.6 (n=95)	2.6 (n=105)	2.6 (n=119)	2.1 (n=109)	1.0 (n=6)
Illinois (n=608)	3.1 (n=633)	2.6 (n=597)	2.5 (n=602)	2.1 (n=591)	3.3 (n=608)	3.2 (n=293)	2.5 (n=605)	1.7 (n=309)
Indiana (n=324)	2.8 (n=305)	2.2 (n=309)	2.3 (n=322)	2.0 (n=324)	3.1 (n=316)	3.4 (n=203)	2.6 (n=272)	1.5 (n=109)
Iowa (n=405)	2.4 (n=388)	2.2 (n=380)	2.1 (n=391)	1.7 (n=398)	3.6 (n=405)	3.7 (n=390)	2.4 (n=361)	--
Kansas (n=307)	2.5 (n=307)	2.3 (n=280)	2.5 (n=279)	2.0 (n=289)	3.3 (n=305)	3.3 (n=300)	2.4 (n=264)	1.0 (n=2)
Kentucky (n=152)	2.2 (n=147)	2.6 (n=140)	2.0 (n=147)	1.9 (n=143)	3.1 (n=144)	3.2 (n=152)	2.7 (n=135)	--
Louisiana (n=257)	3.1 (n=234)	2.7 (n=235)	2.2 (n=236)	2.4 (n=226)	3.8 (n=253)	3.7 (n=253)	3.5 (n=257)	--

Figure 89: Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete job applications, seek job information, etc.	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	Other
Maine (n=237)	2.4 (n=220)	2.4 (n=203)	1.9 (n=208)	1.8 (n=214)	3.2 (n=226)	3.3 (n=237)	2.0 (n=208)	--
Maryland (n=133)	3.2 (n=130)	2.7 (n=129)	2.5 (n=133)	1.6 (n=133)	3.2 (n=120)	2.7 (n=128)	1.5 (n=129)	--
Massachusetts (n=304)	2.6 (n=270)	2.5 (n=270)	2.1 (n=281)	1.8 (n=261)	3.7 (n=294)	3.2 (n=304)	2.4 (n=259)	--
Michigan (n=481)	2.7 (n=449)	3.0 (n=439)	2.5 (n=474)	2.2 (n=468)	3.6 (n=477)	3.3 (n=481)	2.7 (n=452)	1.0 (n=5)
Minnesota (n=239)	3.2 (n=239)	2.7 (n=208)	2.5 (n=205)	2.7 (n=231)	3.2 (n=227)	3.3 (n=91)	2.1 (n=212)	1.8 (n=145)
Mississippi (n=210)	3.4 (n=183)	2.7 (n=186)	3.6 (n=191)	2.3 (n=189)	4.0 (n=177)	3.8 (n=176)	3.1 (n=164)	5.0 (n=1)
Missouri (n=245)	3.0 (n=238)	2.5 (n=245)	2.1 (n=226)	2.0 (n=239)	3.0 (n=229)	3.0 (n=64)	2.0 (n=230)	2.1 (n=173)
Montana (n=92)	2.3 (n=74)	2.3 (n=79)	2.2 (n=66)	1.7 (n=74)	3.5 (n=70)	3.2 (n=72)	2.4 (n=63)	4.0 (n=2)
Nebraska (n=235)	2.6 (n=214)	2.3 (n=235)	2.0 (n=227)	1.9 (n=215)	3.1 (n=210)	3.3 (n=148)	2.2 (n=191)	2.1 (n=71)
Nevada (n=82)	3.6 (n=74)	3.1 (n=82)	2.2 (n=48)	2.1 (n=79)	3.2 (n=68)	2.7 (n=73)	2.8 (n=60)	5.0 (n=2)
New Hampshire (n=195)	2.4 (n=185)	2.0 (n=161)	1.9 (n=179)	1.5 (n=175)	3.3 (n=195)	3.4 (n=184)	2.0 (n=163)	5.0 (n=3)
New Jersey (n=318)	2.4 (n=307)	2.2 (n=307)	1.9 (n=305)	1.9 (n=254)	3.0 (n=314)	2.7 (n=318)	2.2 (n=290)	--
New Mexico (n=101)	2.8 (n=101)	2.7 (n=83)	2.7 (n=100)	2.2 (n=88)	3.5 (n=86)	2.7 (n=82)	2.6 (n=84)	3.0 (n=3)
New York (n=850)	3.3 (n=814)	2.8 (n=731)	2.4 (n=850)	2.0 (n=772)	3.3 (n=837)	2.7 (n=845)	2.2 (n=771)	4.9 (n=122)
North Carolina (n=254)	2.8 (n=248)	2.8 (n=240)	2.1 (n=254)	2.4 (n=249)	3.6 (n=244)	3.3 (n=248)	2.9 (n=219)	4.2 (n=5)
North Dakota (n=72)	2.6 (n=68)	1.9 (n=71)	1.9 (n=68)	1.8 (n=58)	3.2 (n=70)	3.1 (n=28)	2.1 (n=72)	1.8 (n=34)
Ohio (n=546)	3.2 (n=534)	2.6 (n=529)	2.9 (n=536)	2.5 (n=541)	3.4 (n=531)	3.6 (n=168)	2.3 (n=546)	1.5 (n=334)

Figure 89 (continued): Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

States	Too few workstations to meet patron demand	Workstation time limits do not allow enough time for patrons to complete job applications, seek job information, etc.	Connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Web sites, forms or services	Not enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	Staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	Liability issues prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	Other
Oklahoma (n=144)	3.4 (n=131)	3.3 (n=146)	3.0 (n=144)	2.4 (n=143)	3.9 (n=143)	3.1 (n=131)	3.1 (n=141)	
Pennsylvania (n=363)	2.2 (n=363)	1.9 (n=335)	2.1 (n=340)	1.9 (n=339)	3.6 (n=340)	3.5 (n=320)	2.4 (n=310)	1.5 (n=8)
Rhode Island (n=55)	2.1 (n=54)	2.0 (n=50)	1.3 (n=55)	1.4 (n=51)	2.5 (n=53)	2.2 (n=50)	2.6 (n=52)	--
South Carolina (n=124)	3.7 (n=116)	3.2 (n=114)	2.0 (n=118)	1.7 (n=117)	4.3 (n=124)	3.1 (n=120)	2.1 (n=115)	--
South Dakota (n=130)	2.6 (n=121)	2.2 (n=117)	2.3 (n=119)	2.0 (n=111)	3.2 (n=126)	3.4 (n=79)	2.1 (n=111)	1.8 (n=29)
Tennessee (n=199)	2.9 (n=197)	2.6 (n=182)	2.6 (n=179)	1.8 (n=193)	3.8 (n=199)	3.1 (n=188)	2.5 (n=179)	5.0 (n=5)
Texas (n=606)	2.9 (n=583)	2.5 (n=573)	2.4 (n=566)	2.0 (n=586)	3.8 (n=586)	3.2 (n=606)	2.6 (n=524)	1.0 (n=2)
Utah (n=104)	2.3 (n=87)	2.2 (n=100)	2.4 (n=99)	1.9 (n=104)	3.2 (n=101)	2.7 (n=96)	2.5 (n=96)	--
Vermont (n=145)	2.7 (n=138)	2.3 (n=137)	2.2 (n=139)	1.6 (n=135)	3.3 (n=145)	3.4 (n=110)	2.0 (n=137)	1.3 (n=29)
Virginia (n=215)	3.1 (n=212)	2.6 (n=192)	2.6 (n=195)	2.2 (n=206)	3.2 (n=215)	3.2 (n=209)	2.3 (n=183)	--
Washington (n=208)	2.8 (n=208)	2.5 (n=155)	2.3 (n=204)	1.7 (n=194)	3.3 (n=196)	3.3 (n=206)	2.5 (n=198)	--
Washington, DC (n=25)	3.0 (n=25)	3.0 (n=22)	3.0 (n=18)	3.0 (n=18)	3.0 (n=22)	3.0 (n=19)	3.0 (n=25)	--
West Virginia (n=155)	2.8 (n=121)	2.3 (n=117)	2.7 (n=127)	3.0 (n=135)	3.4 (n=124)	3.4 (n=127)	3.0 (n=104)	5.0 (n=2)
Wisconsin (n=381)	3.4 (n=361)	2.5 (n=337)	2.6 (n=381)	2.3 (n=342)	3.5 (n=353)	3.3 (n=151)	2.5 (n=350)	1.9 (n=208)
Wyoming (n=71)	2.7 (n=67)	2.5 (n=64)	2.4 (n=65)	1.8 (n=56)	3.4 (n=63)	3.5 (n=67)	1.8 (n=55)	1.0 (n=1)
National	3.0 (n=11,643)	2.6 (n=11,454)	2.4 (n=11,798)	2.1 (n=11,569)	3.4 (n=11,917)	3.2 (n=9,908)	2.5 (n=11,090)	3.7 (n=2,012)
Key -- = No data to report								

The challenges that affect public libraries' abilities to provide job seeking services (Figure 89) are similar to those that libraries face when providing E-government services (Figure 87). The highest nationally rated challenge is insufficient staff. Only libraries in Alaska, South Dakota and Wyoming rate lack of staff

expertise higher. Libraries in Alabama, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming rate lack of staff expertise equally high as insufficient staff, while libraries in Alaska and Mississippi rate their low connections speed equally challenging and libraries in Arkansas and Hawaii rate too few workstations as their other top challenge.

About the Information Policy and Access Center

The Information Policy & Access Center (iPAC) is a response to the pressing need for research on the processes, practices, policies, and social issues that govern access to information in our increasingly digital information society. We at iPAC are committed to studying what policies and/or technologies lead to equitable and inclusive information access, a digitally literate population, an informed and engaged public, or access Internet-enabled resources and technologies, among key examples.

iPAC aspires to be an innovative and forward-looking research and education facility that explores social, policy, and technology aspects of information access and use across cultural institutions, government agencies, and other information-based organizations; communities; and populations.

iPAC focuses on three major areas of research and education:

- Libraries, Cultural, and Public Institutions – Research on institutions, such as public libraries, school library media centers, archives, museums, and government agencies that are the sources of information, resources, services, and unifying space within their communities.
- Policy – Analysis of the policies that shape the ways in which these institutions can serve their communities, as well as the roles of these institutions as access points for and providers of government and other information and services in society.
- Diverse Populations – Advocacy and emphasis on the ways in which institutions and policies can promote inclusive information access and services for individuals and communities, including the underserved, underrepresented, and disadvantaged by embracing innovative approaches to diversity.

Through these core aspects of cultural institutions, iPAC seeks to contribute to scholarship and the information professions at the international and national levels, while also serving the local needs of libraries and other cultural institutions in the Washington, DC metropolitan area and the state of Maryland.

About the Authors

John Carlo Bertot serves as Co-Director of the Information Policy & Access Center (ipac.umd.edu) in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland. He serves as the survey manager for the Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study survey, and is the architect of the survey's design, methodology, Web-enabled data collection tool, and data analysis. His research spans library and government agency technology planning and evaluation, information and telecommunications policy, and E-government. His work has been funded by the U.S. Institute for Museum and Library Studies (IMLS), the National Science Foundation, the American Library Association, (ALA), and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Bertot serves as chair of the International Standards Organization (ISO) Library Performance Indicator Working Group. Bertot is a member of the ALA Ad Hoc Subcommittee on E-government, and is president of the Digital Government Society of North America. Bertot also is editor of *Library Quarterly* and *Government Information Quarterly*. Most recently, Bertot was funded by an IMLS National Leadership Grant to explore library and government agency collaborative partnerships for E-government services. More information regarding Bertot is available at <http://terpconnect.umd.edu/~jbertot>.

Ruth Lincoln is a second-year MLS student in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland and a graduate research associate at iPAC. Her current projects include PLFTAS data analysis and reports and the design and development of the e-government partnerships website. She is one of 20 digital government librarian program scholarship recipients funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (more information on the program is available at <http://ipac.umd.edu/our-work/government-information-service-21st-century>). Ruth completes her MLS degree in July 2012.

Abigail McDermott worked as a Graduate Research Associate at iPAC from August 2010 to May 2012, supporting the PLFTAS research project during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 cycles. She also designed, developed, and oversaw the launch of the center's Website (<http://ipac.umd.edu/>) and served as conference coordinator for the first Digital Government Society annual meeting on the University of Maryland-College Park campus (Dg.o 2011). She graduates from the College of Information Studies in July 2012 with her Masters degree in Library Science with a focus on E-Government. Her research interests include green libraries and reforming copyright law.

Kaitlin Peterson is a first year Masters of Library Science with a concentration on diverse populations student at the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland. She is also a graduate assistant at iPAC. She is currently working on the PLFTAS data analysis, executive summary, and briefs. Kaitlin's research interests include how libraries are and can be active parts of communities, as well as how they can best assist individuals in a slowly recovering economy.

Brian Real is a PhD student in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland. He currently holds a Master's degrees in Communication from Johns Hopkins University (2008) and Library Science from the University of Maryland (2011). Brian has previously worked for the Calvert County Public Library system as a Public Services Librarian and for the University of Maryland's Nonprint Media Services Library as a graduate assistant. In addition to his position as a Graduate Research Associate with iPAC, Brian currently works as the graduate assistant for the Graduate Field Committee in Film Studies (www.film.umd.edu).

Appendix A: 2011-2012 Public Library Funding & Technology Access Survey

50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611-2795
USA

Telephone (312) 944-6780
Fax (312) 440-9374
TDD (312) 944-7298
E-mail: ala@ala.org
<http://www.ala.org>

ALA American Library Association

Dear Library Director:

Since 2006, the American Library Association, with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, has conducted a national study of public library public access funding and technology. This Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study builds on previous studies conducted since 1994.

We thank you for your participation in the past, and hope that you will continue to participate in these important surveys. Last year, the study sampled and received responses from all states and the District of Columbia, however, the survey did not receive enough responses from four states for analysis purposes. Our goal for this year is full participation by **all 50 states**, which will provide the greatest impact for advocacy efforts at the local, state, and national levels.

Data from the study will help your library:

- Identify the impacts of your library's public computer and Internet access on the community;
- Benchmark your library's public access technologies and communicate progress and challenges to your funders; and
- Support efforts to inform and educate stakeholders – policymakers, foundations, elected officials, trustees, and the media – about the value of libraries and issues related to sustaining public library technology services.

Recent study data has been cited in hundreds of media outlets including *USA Today*, the *Washington Post*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and *Huffington Post*. Data has been used in Congressional and state-level testimony, as well as in comments to agencies like the Federal Communications Commission.

The study produces a range of advocacy tools such as PR templates, issue briefs, handouts, mashups, and more from the data you provide. Produced collaboratively by the ALA and the Information Policy & Access Center at the University of Maryland, these tools can be accessed via <http://www.ala.org/plinternetfunding>. Again, we greatly appreciate your participation and look forward to sharing the results of the survey and additional research beginning in 2012.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SURVEY(S) by November 11, 2011.

The national public library survey that follows this letter is managed by the Information Policy & Access Center at the University of Maryland. Please call or e-mail the Information Policy & Access Center at (301) 405-9445 or <ipac.umd@gmail.com> with any questions you might have regarding the survey.

Kind Regards,



Keith Fiels
Executive Director

2011 National Survey of Public Library Funding and Technology Access

The American Library Association (ALA) and the Information Policy & Access Center in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland, with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, are surveying a national sample of public libraries regarding their Internet connectivity, computing resources, and technology funding. Dr. John Carlo Bertot, co-director of the Information Policy & Access Center at the University of Maryland, manages the survey. You may access the survey at **<http://www.plinternetsurvey.org>**.

The survey Web site provides specific instructions for completing the Web survey. The survey contains questions about specific library system branches, as well as system-wide questions. We realize that public libraries in each state are organized differently and that the term “system” can mean something different from state to state. By system we mean the central authority for the library – that is, the entity that makes budget decisions, applies for E-rate, and makes other management decisions. We do not use the term “system” to mean regional cooperatives or other forms of federated libraries. If your library system has branches, you may be asked to complete questions regarding some of your branches prior to answering questions about your entire system. By branch, we mean a building that is open to the public and provides services to the community (e.g., lends books, offers public access to the Internet and computers, other). Your library and the branches selected to participate (if applicable) were selected randomly. If you wish to complete the survey for the additional branches in your system (again, if applicable), you will be given the opportunity to do so. **IMPORTANT: To facilitate completion of the Web-based survey, the branch and system questions are presented separately. PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH PARTS OF THE SURVEY.** A glossary of key terms is available beginning on page 18 and on the survey Web site.

Complete the survey, and enter to win an Amazon Kindle

To participate in the 2011 survey, please go to **<http://www.plinternetsurvey.org>** and follow the “Take the Survey” button. You will need to enter your library’s survey ID number (located on the back of the postcard form sent to your library). The survey ID number has a total of two letters followed by four numbers, and is your FSCS library number as assigned by the state library. If you cannot remember and/or locate your library’s survey ID number, the survey Web site provides a link to locate your library ID by state and city. If you prefer, you may complete this print version of the survey and mail/fax your responses back (the contact information is located at the end of the survey).

The survey is not timed. You may complete part of it, save your answers, and return to it at a later time. You may also answer part of the survey and have other members of your library staff answer other parts, if appropriate. Please be sure to complete the survey by **NOVEMBER 11, 2011**. Once completed, you will be able to print or save the answers you provided and keep a copy for your own records.

If you have any questions or issues regarding the survey, please call (301) 405-9445 or e-mail ipac.umd@gmail.com.

LIBRARY BRANCH LEVEL QUESTIONS (Sections A & B)

Section A: Availability, Connectivity & Access (Questions 1-12)

1. Please indicate whether THIS LIBRARY BRANCH is **open to the public**: (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is permanently closed
<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is temporarily closed
<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is open (please go to question 2)

2. In the current fiscal year, the **total average hours per typical week** that THIS LIBRARY BRANCH is **open to the public** has: (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Increased since last fiscal year
<input type="radio"/>	Decreased since last fiscal year
<input type="radio"/>	Stayed the same as last fiscal year

3. Does THIS LIBRARY BRANCH offer **public Internet access**? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	No (thank you, please return the survey)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes (please go to question 4)

4. Is THIS LIBRARY BRANCH the only **free of charge public computer and Internet access venue** in the library's service area? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes , the library is the only place in the community that provides free public computer and Internet access services
<input type="radio"/>	No , there are other places in the community that provide free public computer and Internet access services (e.g., community technology centers)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

5. Please indicate **the number and age of the PUBLIC Internet workstations/laptops** available at THIS LIBRARY BRANCH (include in the count library-provided laptops and multi-purpose workstations that allow access to the Internet. Exclude staff workstations and those that only access the library's Web-based Online Public Access Catalogs). **Even if you cannot estimate the ages of the workstations, please provide the total number of workstations.** (ENTER THE APPROPRIATE NUMBERS IN THE BLANKS)

Number of Public Internet Workstations/Laptops	Average Public Internet Workstation/Laptop Age (please determine age as of September 1, 2011)
_____ TOTAL public Internet workstations/laptops	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops less than 1 year old
	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops 1 year old
	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops 2 years old
	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops 3 years old
	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops 4 years old
	_____ public Internet workstations/laptops 5 years or older

6. When a **public access computer** at THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **goes out of service** for any reason other than a computer requiring rebooting, on average, how long does it take to get it back into service? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Less than one day
<input type="radio"/>	One day
<input type="radio"/>	Two days
<input type="radio"/>	More than two days
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

7. **During a typical day**, does THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **have people waiting to use its public Internet workstations?** (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes, there are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them throughout a typical day (e.g., there are almost always patrons waiting to use them)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, there are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day (e.g., during the morning, during lunch time, or evenings)
<input type="radio"/>	No, there are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day

8. Please describe **any change in the use** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH's **public access technology** as compared to twelve (12) months ago: (MARK ONE ● ONLY for each option)

Use of public Internet workstations	<input type="radio"/> Stayed the same <input type="radio"/> Increased <input type="radio"/> Decreased <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Don't know	Use of patron technology training classes	<input type="radio"/> Stayed the same <input type="radio"/> Increased <input type="radio"/> Decreased <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Don't know
Use of library Wi-Fi (wireless) Internet access (if library offers Wi-Fi)	<input type="radio"/> Stayed the same <input type="radio"/> Increased <input type="radio"/> Decreased <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Don't know	Use of library electronic resources (e.g., e-books, databases)	<input type="radio"/> Stayed the same <input type="radio"/> Increased <input type="radio"/> Decreased <input type="radio"/> Not applicable <input type="radio"/> Don't know

9. Please indicate **the maximum speed** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'S subscribed (e.g., from the library's Internet service provider) **public access Internet connection**: (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	768Kbps (kilobits/second) or less
<input type="radio"/>	769Kbps – 1.4Mbps (megabits/second)
<input type="radio"/>	1.5Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	1.6Mbps – 3.0Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	3.1Mbps – 4.0Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	4.1Mbps – 6.0Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	6.1Mbps – 10Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	10.1Mbps – 20Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	20.1Mbps – 30Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	30.1Mbps – 40Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	40.1Mbps – 99.9Mbps
<input type="radio"/>	100Mbps or greater
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know (If you do not know your library's connection speed, please contact an individual or group who may know before checking "Don't know")

10. Given the **observed uses** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'S **public Internet access services by patrons**, does the library branch's **public Internet service connection speed meet patron needs**? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time
<input type="radio"/>	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs some of the time
<input type="radio"/>	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

11. Is **wireless (Wi-Fi) Internet access available** (e.g., with patron laptops, PDAs, or other wireless devices) at THIS LIBRARY BRANCH? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes, wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch and when the library is closed (e.g., in the library parking lot)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch but not available when the library is closed
<input type="radio"/>	No, wireless access is not currently available for public use within this library branch, but there are plans to make it available to the public within the next year (please go to question 13)
<input type="radio"/>	No, wireless access is not currently available for public use within this library branch, and there are no plans to make it available to the public within the next year (please go to question 13)

12. If applicable, does the **library branch's wireless connection share the same bandwidth/connection** as the library's public Internet workstations? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations in this branch share the same bandwidth/connection with no bandwidth management techniques (e.g., packet shaping, packet prioritization) to manage data transmission
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations in this branch share the same bandwidth/connection, but with bandwidth management techniques (e.g., packet shaping, packet prioritization) to manage data transmission
<input type="radio"/>	No, the public wireless connection in this branch is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/ connection
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know (If you do not know if the connection in this branch is shared, please contact an individual or group who may know before checking "Don't know")

Section B: Services Related to Computer and Internet Access (Questions 13-20)

13. Please identify **extent** of agreement that the below **public Internet services are important to the community** that THIS LIBRARY BRANCH serves: (1=Least Important; 5=Most Important; NA=Not Applicable)

<input type="radio"/>	Provide services for job seekers	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide access to government information and services (e.g., unemployment benefits, tax forms, Medicare information, or paying traffic tickets)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide computer and Internet skills training	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide education resources and databases for K-12 students	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide education resources and databases for students in higher education	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide education resources and databases for home schooling	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide information for college applicants	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide health and wellness databases and information (e.g., consumer health, nutrition, exercise)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide information about the library's community	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide information or databases regarding investments	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Provide services to immigrant populations	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4	5	NA

14. Please identify what **formal** or **informal information technology training classes** THIS LIBRARY BRANCH offers to its patrons: (MARK ALL ● THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The library offers formal (e.g., with a set curriculum and lesson plan) information technology training classes directly to its patrons (please go to question 15)
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers patrons one-on-one information technology training sessions by appointment with library staff (please go to question 16)
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers informal point-of-use technology assistance (e.g., one-on-one help with Web browsing, using library databases, etc., when patrons ask) (please go to question 16)
<input type="radio"/>	The library provides access to online training material (e.g., Web-based tutorials, Web-based presentations, online technology services such as ElementK, etc.) (please go to question 16)
<input type="radio"/>	The library does not offer any technology training (please go to question 16)

15. Please identify the **formal technology-based training classes** THIS LIBRARY BRANCH has **offered to its patrons** in the last twelve (12) months: (MARK ALL ● THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	General computer skills (e.g., how to use a mouse and keyboard, printing)
<input type="radio"/>	General computer software use (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation)
<input type="radio"/>	General Internet use (e.g., set up e-mail, Web browsing)
<input type="radio"/>	General online/Web searching (e.g., using Google, Yahoo or others to locate information)
<input type="radio"/>	Using the library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)
<input type="radio"/>	Using online databases (e.g., using commercial databases to search and find content)
<input type="radio"/>	Safe online practices (e.g., not divulging personal information)
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing online government information (e.g., Medicare, taxes, how to complete forms)
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing online job-seeking and career-related information
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing online health and wellness information (e.g., consumer health, nutrition)
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing online investment information
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing genealogy information
<input type="radio"/>	Accessing consumer information (e.g., product value, safety, reliability, warranty information)
<input type="radio"/>	Digital photography, software, and online applications (e.g., Photoshop, Flickr)
<input type="radio"/>	Social media (e.g., blogging, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube)
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

16. Please identify the **services that the library makes available to users** either in THIS LIBRARY BRANCH or remotely (e.g., via Web site). Include services that the library may not provide or pay for directly (e.g., statewide databases, digital reference): (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

Resources	Library Does Not Offer Service	Library Offers Service On-site (e.g., to users of library's public workstations)	Library Offers Service Remotely (e.g., to home computer users via library's website)
Digital reference/Virtual reference	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Licensed databases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E-books	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online instructional courses/tutorials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Homework resources (e.g., tutor.com, databases)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online book clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 player, flash drive, other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Provides access to recreational gaming consoles, software, or Web sites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Provides access to mobile computing devices (e.g., netbooks, laptops)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Provides access to e-readers for accessing e-books (e.g., Kindle, Nook)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

17. Please indicate the **e-government roles and services** THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **provided to its patrons** during the last twelve (12) months: (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Library staff provided assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services (e.g., completing Medicare Part D, unemployment benefits, social services benefits forms; applying for licenses; accessing tax forms)
<input type="radio"/>	Library staff provided assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use e-government Web sites (e.g., assistance navigating the Web site)
<input type="radio"/>	Library staff provided assistance to patrons for understanding government programs and services (e.g., helping users understand programs such as Medicare Part D; immigration/residency requirements)
<input type="radio"/>	Library staff provided assistance to patrons for completing government forms (e.g., unemployment benefits, social services, filing immigration or visa forms)
<input type="radio"/>	The library developed guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government Web sites and services
<input type="radio"/>	The library offered training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs, and completing electronic forms (e.g., U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service InfoPass appointment system, State Children's Health Insurance Program - SCHIP)
<input type="radio"/>	The library offered translation services for forms and services in other languages
<input type="radio"/>	The library partnered with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services
<input type="radio"/>	The library worked with government agencies (local, state, or federal) to help the agencies improve their websites and/or e-government services
<input type="radio"/>	The library had at least one staff member with expertise and skills in the provision of e-government services
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

18. Please indicate the **extent to which the below challenges affect the ability** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **to help patrons meet their e-government needs**: (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree; N/A= Not Applicable)

The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their e-government forms, seek government information, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Web sites, forms, or services	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their e-government needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron e-government needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some e-government services	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4	5	NA

19. Please describe how THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **helps patrons seek employment**: (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The library provides access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources
<input type="radio"/>	The library provides access to civil service exam materials
<input type="radio"/>	The library helps patrons complete online job applications
<input type="radio"/>	Library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons seek or attain employment (e.g., complete online job applications, receive employment or other training, other)
<input type="radio"/>	The library helps patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses
<input type="radio"/>	Library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers classes (either by librarians or others working with the library) on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

20. Please indicate **the extent to which the below challenges affect the ability** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **to help patrons meet their job seeking needs**: (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree; N/A= Not Applicable)

The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Web sites, forms, or services	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4	5	NA

LIBRARY SYSTEM LEVEL QUESTIONS**Section C. Replacement, Upgrades, Support, and Services (Questions 21-29)**

21. Please identify if the library has a public Internet workstation/laptop **replacement policy or procedure**:
(MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes , this library has a replacement schedule (please go to question 22)
<input type="radio"/>	No , the library replaces public Internet workstations on an as-needed basis (e.g., when cannot be repaired, no longer operational, or funding is available) (please go to question 24)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know (please go to question 24)

22. Please specify the library's **public Internet workstation/laptop replacement schedule**: (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Every year
<input type="radio"/>	Every 2 years
<input type="radio"/>	Every 3 years
<input type="radio"/>	Every 4 years
<input type="radio"/>	Every 5 years
<input type="radio"/>	Other (Please specify):

23. Will the library be able to **maintain its public access workstation/laptop replacement schedule within the next year**? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	No, the library will not be able to maintain its replacement or addition schedule within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, and the library plans to replace _____ workstations/laptops within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, but the library does not know how many workstations/laptops it will replace within the next year at this time
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

24. Does the library **plan to ADD to the total number of** public Internet workstations or laptops in the coming year? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes the library plans to ADD public workstations/laptops within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	No, the library does not plan to ADD workstations/laptops within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Unsure at this time if the library will be adding any workstations within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

25. If applicable, **please identify the number of public access workstations the library added and/or replaced** in the last year and/or will add/replace in the next year due to National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (**BTOP**) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (**BIP**) award(s):

	Number of workstations/laptops added/replaced in the last year due to BTOP or BIP award(s)
	Number of workstations/laptops to be added/replaced in the next year due to BTOP or BIP award(s)
<input type="radio"/>	N/A

26. Please identify **the most important factors** that affect the library's ability or plans to **add more public Internet workstations**: (1=Least Important; 5=Most Important; NA=Not Applicable)

Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops						
Availability of space	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Cost factors	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4	5	NA

27. Please indicate who provides **information technology (IT) support** (e.g., troubleshooting workstation problems, contracting for Internet connectivity, managing the library Web page) for the library: (MARK ALL • THAT APPLY)

Source of IT Support	
<input type="radio"/>	Public service staff
<input type="radio"/>	Library director
<input type="radio"/>	Building-based IT staff (e.g., IT specialists assigned to library branches, if applicable)
<input type="radio"/>	System-level IT staff (e.g., IT specialists assigned to library branches, if applicable)
<input type="radio"/>	Library consortia or other library organization (please identify):
<input type="radio"/>	County/City IT staff
<input type="radio"/>	State telecommunications network staff
<input type="radio"/>	State library IT staff
<input type="radio"/>	Outside vendor/contractor
<input type="radio"/>	Volunteer(s)
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

28. Please indicate whether the library **makes use of the below social media technologies** for either internal library use or for external purposes to engage its community: (MARK ALL ● THAT APPLY)

Social Media Technologies	Internal Library Use (e.g., staff training, development, communication)	External Use (e.g., communicating with library users, general publics, marketing)
Communication (e.g., Blogger, WordPress, Vox, Twitter)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social networking (e.g., Facebook, hi5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration (e.g., PBWorks, Wetpaint)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bookmarking (e.g., CiteULike, Delicious, Google Reader)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
News (e.g., Digg, Mixx, Newsvine)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Video Sharing (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Openfilm)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Photography (e.g., Flickr, Zoomr)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Location (e.g., Foursquare, Facebook places)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Events (e.g., Meetup.com, Eventful)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. Please indicate whether the library **makes use of mobile technologies** and/or services: (MARK ALL ● THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The library's website is optimized for mobile device access (e.g., "m.mylibrary.org")
<input type="radio"/>	The library has developed smartphone apps (e.g., iPhone, iPad, Android) for access to library services and content
<input type="radio"/>	The library uses scanned codes (e.g., QR codes or Microsoft Tag codes) for access to library services and content
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

Section D: Funding and Staffing Public Access (Questions 30-44)

30. Did the library apply for E-rate discounts during the July 1, 2011, E-rate funding year? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Yes (If yes, please go to question 32)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, another organization applied on the library's behalf (If yes, please go to question 32)
<input type="radio"/>	No (If no, please go to question 31)
<input type="radio"/>	Unsure (If unsure, skip to question 33)

31. If the library **did not apply for E-rate discounts in 2011**, it was because: (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The E-rate application process is too complicated
<input type="radio"/>	The library staff did not feel that the library would qualify
<input type="radio"/>	Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate in the program
<input type="radio"/>	The library receives E-rate discounts as part of a consortium, so therefore does not apply individually
<input type="radio"/>	The library was denied funding in the past and thus is discouraged from applying in subsequent years
<input type="radio"/>	The library did not apply because of the need to comply with CIPA's (Children's Internet Protection Act) filtering requirements
<input type="radio"/>	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

32. If this library is, or will be, **receiving E-rate discounts during the July 1, 2011 E-rate funding year**, please indicate for which services the library receives E-rate funds: (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Internet connectivity
<input type="radio"/>	Telecommunications service
<input type="radio"/>	Internal connection costs

33. Did the library **apply directly** (e.g., submit its own application) **or as part of a larger application** (e.g., state, regional, local) and receive a National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) award(s)? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	No (if no, please go to question 35)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, the library applied directly (if yes, please go to question 34)
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, the library was included in an application submitted by another entity (e.g., city, county, consortium, state, etc.) (if yes, please go to question 34)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know (if don't know, please go to question 35)

34. If the library received either Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) funding, please indicate the type of grant proposal funded (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY):

<input type="radio"/>	Public computer center
<input type="radio"/>	Sustainable broadband
<input type="radio"/>	Broadband infrastructure (e.g., middle mile)
<input type="radio"/>	State Broadband and Data Development (SBDD)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

35. Does the library **currently receive, or anticipate receiving in the next two years**, any of the following funding sources **to operate the library**? (MARK **●** ALL THAT APPLY)

	FY2012 (or current fiscal year)	FY2013 (or next fiscal year)
Local/county	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State (including state aid to public libraries or state-supported tax programs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Federal (e.g., LSTA, E-rate discounts)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Federal (Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP))	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fees/Fines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Donations/local fund raising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Government grants (local, state, or national level)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

36. For the **fiscal years 2012 (or current fiscal year) and 2013 (or next fiscal year)**, please mark whether the total library operating budget remained (and is anticipated to remain) the same, increased or decreased and in what amount (MARK ONE **●** ONLY FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR)

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
Fiscal Year 2012 (or current fiscal year) Operating Budget	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/>
Fiscal Year 2013 (or next fiscal year) Operating Budget	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/>

37. For the **current fiscal year**, please indicate whether the library anticipates, or has already experienced, **interim (e.g., mid-year) changes** to its total operating budget (MARK ONE **●** ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Total operating budget for the current fiscal year has/will remain(ed) unchanged
<input type="radio"/>	Total operating budget for the current fiscal year has/will decrease(d)
<input type="radio"/>	Total operating budget for the current fiscal year has/will increase(d)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

38. For the **last three fiscal years**, please indicate the library's **cumulative budget increase or decrease**:
(MARK ONE ● ONLY)

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
Cumulative change in operating budget over last three fiscal years	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1%-10% <input type="radio"/> 10.1%-15% <input type="radio"/> 15.1%-20% <input type="radio"/> 20.1%-25% <input type="radio"/> 25.1%-30% <input type="radio"/> 30.1%-35% <input type="radio"/> 35.1%-40% <input type="radio"/> Increased more than 40%	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1%-10% <input type="radio"/> 10.1%-15% <input type="radio"/> 15.1%-20% <input type="radio"/> 20.1%-25% <input type="radio"/> 25.1%-30% <input type="radio"/> 30.1%-35% <input type="radio"/> 35.1%-40% <input type="radio"/> Decreased more than 40%	<input type="radio"/>

39. For the **last three fiscal years**, please indicate the library's **cumulative staff increase or decrease**: (FILL IN/MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY as appropriate)

	Total number of FTEs three years ago	Total number of FTEs this year
Cumulative change in FTEs (full-time equivalents) over last three fiscal years	_____	_____
If the FTEs increased, is this due to new permanent FTE positions?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the FTEs decreased, is this due to permanent reductions in FTEs?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the FTEs decreased, is this due to temporary (i.e., hiring freezes) reductions in FTEs?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Other (please specify):		

40. For the **last three fiscal years**, please indicate the library's **cumulative increase or decrease in hours open to the public**: (FILL IN/MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY as appropriate)

	Total number of hours open three years ago	Total number of hours open this year
Cumulative change in hours open to the public over last three fiscal years	_____	_____
If the hours increased, is this due to the opening of a new branch (es)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the hours increased, is this due to an increase in FTEs/staff?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the hours increased, is this due to an increase in the library's operating budget?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the hours decreased, is this due to the closure of a branch(es)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the hours decreased, is this due to a reduction in FTEs/staff?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If the hours decreased, is this due to a decrease in the library's operating budget?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Other (please specify):		

41. Please indicate in **whole dollars the library's total operating expenditures** (actual or anticipated) for Salaries, Collections, and Other Expenditures for **fiscal years 2012 (or current fiscal year) and 2013 (or next fiscal year)**.

	Fiscal Year 2012 (or current fiscal year) Expense Category		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures (including contractual services)
TOTAL (all sources)	\$	\$	\$
	<input type="radio"/> N/A	<input type="radio"/> N/A	<input type="radio"/> N/A

	Fiscal Year 2013 (or current fiscal year) Expense Category		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures (including contractual services)
TOTAL (all sources)	\$	\$	\$
	<input type="radio"/> N/A	<input type="radio"/> N/A	<input type="radio"/> N/A

42. Did the library receive financial support for its **technology expenditures** from outside entities on behalf of the library during the current fiscal year (FY2012)? “On behalf of” support includes services paid directly by another government office or another entity **for** the library (e.g., IT technicians, equipment purchases, etc.). Technology expenditures include staff salaries, any outside vendors providing IT services or support, hardware/software, and telecommunications costs. (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	The library pays directly for all of its technology costs
<input type="radio"/>	The library pays directly for some of its technology costs
<input type="radio"/>	The library does not pay directly for any of its technology costs (e.g., all IT staff, hardware and telecommunications costs are paid for by the city, county, or other source)

43. Does the library expect its **total technology expenditures** for FY2012 (or current fiscal year) and FY 2013 (or next fiscal year) to increase, decrease or remain the same? If increasing or decreasing, please mark the anticipated amount of change.

	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
Fiscal Year 2012 (or current fiscal year) Technology Budget	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/>
Fiscal Year 2013 (or next fiscal year) Technology Budget	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/> Up to 2% <input type="radio"/> 2.1% - 4% <input type="radio"/> 4.1% - 6% <input type="radio"/> 6.1-10% <input type="radio"/> More than 10%	<input type="radio"/>

44. Please indicate in **whole dollars your library’s total technology-related operating expenditures** (actual or anticipated) for Salaries, Outside Vendors, Computer Hardware/Software, and Telecommunications and expenditures from various funding sources for **fiscal year 2012 (or current fiscal year)**. **To the extent possible, please EXCLUDE expenditures for staff hardware/software.**

	Fiscal Year 2012 (or current fiscal year) Technology Expense Category			
	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Computer Hardware/ Computer Software	Telecommunications
TOTAL (all sources)	\$	\$	\$	\$

GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS	
Bandwidth/Connectivity Speed	The speed or capacity of a data transmission rate, usually measured in bits per second (i.e., Kbit/s or MBit/s).
Bandwidth Management	A process for measuring, controlling, and managing communications/data transmission of a computer network (e.g., packet shaping, packet prioritizing).
BIP	BIP is the acronym for the Broadband Initiatives Program administered by the Rural Utilities Services (RUS) at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Initiatives program is a competitive grant program established by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009 (Stimulus Bill) that awards loans, grants, or loan/grant combinations to applicants for servicing the rural communities in expanding and increasing the quality of access to broadband services.
Broadband	A term used to describe high-speed Internet access.
BTOP	BTOP is the acronym for the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Agency (NTIA) of the Department of Commerce. BTOP is a competitive grant program awarding ARRA (Stimulus Bill) for support in the deployment of broadband infrastructure, enhancing and expanding public computer centers, encouraging sustainable adoption of broadband service, and developing and maintaining a nationwide public map of broadband service capability and availability.
CIPA (Children's Internet Protection Act)	A Federal law requiring the use of filters on public Internet workstations when the library receives either LSTA or E-rate (see below) funds.
Collections	The library collection consists of all documents provided by a library for its users. Collections comprise documents held locally and remote resources for which permanent or temporary access rights have been acquired. Notes: Access rights may be acquired by the library itself, by a consortium and/or through external funding.
Computer hardware	The physical components that make up a computer.
Computer software	The programs that are run on a computer.
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	The provision of interactive reference services for patrons via email, chat, or other electronic means.
E-books	Digital documents, licensed or not, where searchable text is prevalent, and which can be seen as analogous to a printed text (based on NISO Standard Z39.7 definition, see http://www.niso.org/emetrics).
E-government	The use of technology, predominantly the Internet, as a means to deliver government services to citizens, businesses, and other entities.
E-rate Funds	Funding provided by the federal government through the Universal Service Fund to libraries to cover expenses associated with Internet access.
Federal Funding	This includes all federal government funds distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including federal money distributed by the state.
Firewall	A method for restricting or blocking unauthorized access on a computer network.
Fiscal Year	A financial 12-month period as reckoned for reporting, accounting, and/or taxation purposes (i.e., the date range that a library uses in reporting to local government agencies).
Formal Technology Training Classes	Technology training classes offered or sponsored by the library with a set curriculum and course instructor. The class may occur in the library or in another facility, and the instructor may or may not be a member of the library staff.

GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS

Funding Sources	<p>Local/county government - Includes all tax and non-tax receipts designated by the community, district, or region and available for expenditure by the library. The value of any contributed or in-kind services or the value of any gifts and donations are excluded.</p> <p>State - All funds distributed to the library by State government for expenditure by the library, except for federal money distributed by the State. This includes funds from such sources as penal fines, license fees, and mineral rights.</p> <p>Federal - All federal government funds distributed to the library for expenditure by the library, including federal money distributed by the State.</p>
Information Technology Training	Formal or informal training sessions that cover specific topics (e.g., Web browser basics, Internet searching, basic computing skills).
Kbps	Kilobits per second.
Library Branch	A library facility. In the case of some public libraries, there is only one facility. Other public libraries have several facilities, which are sometimes referred to as branches of a library system. A branch has at least all of the following: 1. Separate quarters; 2. An organized collection of library materials; 3. Paid staff; and 4. Regularly scheduled hours for being open to the public.
Library System	Any independent library, or group of libraries, under a single director or a single administration. Note 1: The term "independent" does not imply legal or financial independence but only that the library is a recognizably separate unit, typically within a larger organization. Note 2: Typically the administrative unit is an organization containing a central/main library, branch libraries, and administrative functions.
Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)	Through the Grants to States program, the Institute of Museum and Library Services provides funds to State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) using a population-based formula. State libraries may use the appropriation to support statewide initiatives and services. They also may distribute the funds through subgrant competitions or cooperative agreements to public, academic, research, school, and special libraries in their state. (see http://www.ims.gov/programs/programs.shtm)
Licensed Databases	Collection of electronically stored data or unit records (facts, bibliographic data, and texts) with a common user interface and software for the retrieval and manipulation of the data. Licensed databases are those typically contracted through a vendor by the library for patron access (e.g., Gale, Ebsco, ProQuest). (Based on NISO Standard Z39.7 definition, see http://www.niso.org/emetrics)
Local Funding	This includes all local government funds designated by the community, district, or region and made available for expenditure by the public library. Does not include the value of any contributed or in-kind services or the value of any gifts and donations, library fines, fees, or grants. Does not include state, federal, or other funds passed through local government for library use. Report these funds with state government revenue or federal government revenue, as appropriate.
Mbps	Megabits per second.
Mobile Device Optimized	A website designed primarily with the limitations of mobile devices, such as less computing power, slower internet connectivity, and smaller screens, in mind.
Mobile Technologies	Handheld devices such as smartphones, PDAs, tablets, or other handheld devices with internet connectivity.
“On behalf of”	An outside agency or organization pays directly for the support and no funding passes through the library operating budget.
Online Public Access Catalogs (OPACs)	An electronic catalog of library materials and/or services that patrons can access.

GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS

Operating Expenses/Budget	<p>Current and recurrent costs necessary for the provision of library services, such as personnel, library materials, binding, supplies, repair or replacement of existing furnishings and equipment, and costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of the physical facility.</p> <p>Operating expense categories include:</p> <p>Salaries/benefits - All monies paid before deductions to all library staff paid from library's budget (reporting unit's budget) for work performed. This definition INCLUDES employee fringe benefits. Professional staff are staff members doing work that requires professional education (the master's degree or its equivalent) in the theoretical and scientific aspects of librarianship; also, in some libraries, staff performing professional level tasks who, though not librarians, have equivalent education and training in related fields (e.g., archives, computer sciences, business administration, education). Also include paid support staff and paid student workers.</p> <p>Collections - All expenditures for materials purchased or leased for use by the public, such as print materials (including microforms), machine-readable materials, audio-visual materials, etc.</p> <p>Other expenditures - Operating expenditures not included in any other expenditure subcategory. (Also called Miscellaneous Expenditures).</p>
Other Expenditures	This includes all expenditures other than those reported for Total Salaries Expenditures and Total Collection Expenditures. Note: Includes expenses such as binding, supplies, repair or replacement of existing furnishings and equipment; and costs of computer hardware and software used to support library operations or to link to external networks, including the Internet. Report contracts for services, such as costs of operating and maintaining physical facilities, and fees paid to a consultant, auditor, architect, attorney, etc.
Outside Vendor	A service supplier (e.g., technical support, computer repair) who is not directly associated with the library.
PDA (Personal Digital Assistant)	A hand-held computing device.
Public Internet Workstations	A workstation (a computer and related components that are capable of displaying graphical images, pictorial representations, and/or other multi-media formats) within the library outlet that provides public access to the Internet, including those that provide access to a limited set of Internet-based services such as online databases. This includes circulating laptops.
Recreational gaming	Recreational gaming includes consoles like Xbox, Playstation, or Wii; software like The Sims; or Web sites like Runescape. It does not refer to gambling.
Smartphone App	Software designed to run on a smarthpone (a mobile phone with advanced computing functions such as mobile internet access, touchscreens, and GPS navigation).
State Funding	This includes all funds distributed to public libraries by State government for expenditure by the public libraries, except for federal money distributed by the state. This includes funds from such sources as penal fines, license fees, and mineral rights. Note: If operating revenue from consolidated taxes is the result of state legislation, the revenue should be reported under state revenue (even though the revenue may be from multiple sources).

GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS

Technology Expenditures	<p>Funds allocated specifically for the costs associated with information technology.</p> <p>Expenditures include <i>Computer Hardware, Software, Supplies, and Maintenance Expenditures, and Electronic Access Expenditures</i>.</p> <p><i>Telephone lines</i> can be included as a Technology-Related Expenditure only if they are used to provide Internet access.</p> <p><i>Computer Hardware, Software, Supplies, and Maintenance Expenditures</i> are defined as expenditures from the library budget for computer hardware and software used to support library operations, whether purchased or leased, mainframe or microcomputer. Includes expenditures for maintenance and for equipment used to run information service products when that expenditure can be separated from the price of the product.</p> <p><i>Electronic Access Expenditures</i> are defined as all operating expenditures from the library budget associated with access to electronic materials and services. These expenditures include computer hardware and software used to support library operations, whether purchased or leased, mainframe and microcomputer. Includes expenditures for maintenance. Includes expenditures for services provided by national, regional, and local bibliographic utilities, networks, consortia and commercial services. Includes all fees and usage costs associated with such services as OCLC or electronic document delivery. Excludes capital expenditures.</p>
Telecommunications	Includes any expenditures related to providing Internet connectivity, including the installation, configuration, and ongoing costs related to a telecommunication circuit. This includes Internet connection types such as DSL, cable, a leased line (i.e. frame relay), and fiber optics. Also included would be any network support charges related to this circuit and any costs for hardware needed to make the connection, such as routers, CSU/DSUs, or other telecommunications equipment.
Typical Week/Day	A "typical day" is a time that is neither unusually busy nor unusually slow. A "typical week" is a week in which the library is open regular hours (not holiday weeks).
USB (universal serial bus)	A common computer interface for attaching peripherals (e.g., printers) or devices (e.g., flash drives, digital cameras) to a computer.
Wireless (Wi-Fi) Internet Access	Internet access that does not require a direct connection (typically Ethernet) for access. Most typically, wireless access adheres to the IEEE 802.11 standard for interoperability and compatibility.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

For questions concerning the survey, please contact:

Information Policy & Access Center

College of Information Studies

University of Maryland

4105 Hornbake Building, South Wing

College Park, MD 20742

(301) 405-9445 phone

(301) 314-8620 fax

<ipac.umd@gmail.com> e-mail



INFORMATION POLICY & ACCESS CENTER

The Information Policy and Access Center (iPAC) is a response to the pressing need for research on the processes, practices, policies, and social issues that govern access to information in our increasingly digital information society. We at iPAC are committed to studying what policies and/or technologies lead to equitable and inclusive information access, a digitally literate population, an informed and engaged public, or access Internet-enabled resources and technologies, among key examples.

iPAC aspires to be an innovative and forward-looking research and education facility that explores social, policy, and technology aspects of information access and use across cultural institutions, government agencies, and other information-based organizations; communities; and populations.

iPAC focuses on three major areas of research and education:

- Libraries, Cultural, and Public Institutions – Research on institutions, such as public libraries, school library media centers, archives, museums, and government agencies that are the sources of information, resources, services, and unifying space within their communities.
- Policy – Analysis of the policies that shape the ways in which these institutions can serve their communities, as well as the roles of these institutions as access points for and providers of government and other information and services in society.
- Diverse Populations – Advocacy and emphasis on the ways in which institutions and policies can promote inclusive information access and services for individuals and communities, including the underserved, underrepresented, and disadvantaged by embracing innovative approaches to diversity.

Through these core aspects of cultural institutions, iPAC seeks to contribute to scholarship and the information professions at the international and national levels, while also serving the local needs of libraries and other cultural institutions in the Washington, DC metropolitan area and the state of Maryland.