

**Institute of Museum and Library Services
State Data Coordinator
2008 Conference
“Brave New World: Interactively Meeting about Library Statistics”
New State Data Coordinators Orientation, December 2, 2008
December 3-4, 2008
Beacon Hotel
Washington, DC**

Orientation for New State Data Coordinators was held on Tuesday, December 2 with the full conference beginning Wednesday, December 3 and ending on Thursday, December 4. SDCs from the following states attended the orientation: AR, CT, IA, KS, LA, ME, MO, NH, NJ, OH, SD, UT, and VA.

Welcome and Introductions. Dianne Carty presided. State Data Coordinators were asked to sit at tables with their Mentors.

All SDCs were present except from the following states: CO, DC, HI, MT, and NM.

The Conference began with introduction of the partners: IMLS: Mamie Bittner, Carlos Manjarrez, Mary Chute, Everett Henderson, Kim Miller, Michelle Farrell, Kevin Cherry, Terri Brown, Laurie Brooks, and James Lonergan); U.S. Census Bureau (Johnny Monaco, Patricia O’Shea, and Jen King); American Library Association (Denise Davis); and Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA)(Suzanne Miller) and was followed by an overview of IMLS Research and Statistical Program, Analysis Plans, Communication with IMLS, and an introduction to the new IMLS Library Statistics Working Group structure that replaces the form Steering Committees for the Public Library and State Library programs.

Communication tools: The Listserv and the [PLS WIKI](#) will be continued.

The Library Statistics Working Group structure:

- 5 COSLA representatives: Howard Boksenbaum (RI), Suzanne Miller (MN), Peggy Rudd, (TX) Jan Walsh (WA), Wayne Onkst (KY).
- 5 Elected State Data Coordinators: Ira Bray (CA), Dianne Carty (MA), Timothy Owens (NC), Frank Nelson (ID), and Hulen Bivins (AL). (Frank and Hulen elected to fill the 2 vacancies (see next topic).
- 5 representatives from the Research community: Denise Davis (ALA), John Bertot (U of MD), Martha Kyrillidou (ARL), Carol Tenopir (U. of TN) and Chris Walker (Local Initiative Support Corporation).

The Group will meet twice a year: December and June.

State Data Coordinator Candidates for the Library Statistics Working Group (Hulen Bivins (AL), Frank Nelson (ID), Edie Huffman (IN), Peter Haxton (KS), Alka Bhatnagar (NJ), and Rob Geiszler (VT) made brief presentations. State Data Coordinators were to return their ballots by 12:30 on

Thursday. Hulen Bivins and Frank Nelson were elected to fill the 2 SDC vacancies on the Library Statistics Working Group.

General Session: Discussion of new data elements proposal process and testing: Frank Nelson presented an overview of the data element proposal process (handout was included in Conference Packet). Mentors were asked to lead Round Table Discussions of the proposed new data elements, to identify any additional data items needed for consideration, and to identify any current data items for reconsiderations (revision of definition and/or deletion).

Proposed new data elements included:

Add Young Adult (YA) Programs and Attendance: Issues identified centered around, what interest there is in adding the data element (YALSA requested the addition of the data element just as the survey was frozen for the transition), how the data would be used nationally, how the demographic breakdown of the programming data elements (Children, Young Adult, Adult) might be expanded in the future (Seniors, Pre-K, other) and how it might impact on other data elements (Circulation, Collection, other service measures).

Revise the age breakdown for Children Programs and Attendance (change the definition to lower the age of Children from 0 – 14 to 0 – 12 with the age of Young Adults to be between the ages 12 through 18: Issues identified included the additional burden placed on libraries to collect this (even though many states are already collecting some variation of this), the recommendation that the age ranges be considered guidelines since that libraries will report what they consider programs Children and Young Adults, the need to look at other surveys to determine what different age breakdowns are being used, and the impact on current and future trend analysis. The group confirmed that libraries are to report all who attend the programs, not just the children or young adults that attend and that libraries are to include programming both within the library and those sponsored by the library but held outside the library building.

SDCs were required to cast their vote for the proposed data elements by 4:00pm Thursday. Result of Ballot for new data items. Both new data items proposed (YA Programming and YA Attendance) and the proposed definition revision (age of children) received sufficient endorsements by the states for the Library Statistics Working Group to proceed.

See attached for full report (page **Error! Bookmark not defined.**).

General Session: Existing data elements Q & A

- Registered Borrowers--Main issue is in regard to purging files. The three year suggestion is not mandatory. Ultimately, purging borrower files is a local decision.
- Downloadables (eAudio and eVideo)--a) Should OPAC requirement be relaxed to allow libraries to count access to NetLibrary or Overdrive by directly accessing database? b) Should multi-outlet libraries multiply the number of titles available via NetLibrary or Overdrive by the number of outlets? No real consensus was reached on a) although it was agreed that LSWG would review the issues in future meetings. For now, the OPAC requirement stands. There was general agreement on question b). Namely, to count downloads one time only at the administrative entity level.
- Databases--Time expired before a detailed discussion could take place. Something to discuss via Wiki?

General Session: Data Quality Assurance Status Report: A PowerPoint presentation by Alan Zimmerman included edit checks and why we have them, response rates, and the importance or determination of the current Legal Service Area figure. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was included in the Conference Packet.

Mentor Sessions: Mentor Groups were paired and asked to respond to an established group of questions (included in the Conference Packet) as well as identify other issues and concerns to be brought to the attention of the Library Statistics Working Group. The Library Statistics Program partners were invited to attend the Mentor Sessions as observers. Reports from the Mentor Sessions were presented at the Business Meeting on Thursday. (See page 10 for detail reports).

General Session: Kathy Pettit from the National Urban Institute presented a general session about the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership.

Keppel Awards Presentation: After brief remarks by Dr. Anne-Imelda Radice, the awards were presented. First to First Time SDC and Chief Officer recipients and then to those who have received the award previously. Thirty-six states received the Keppel Awards this year for timely and accurate FY2007 data submission.

Departing members of the Transition Team, Keith Lance, Libby Law and Alan Zimmerman, were given a warm send off by the State data Coordinators.

Business Meeting:

- Brief Mentor Feedback (see page 10 for detailed report)
- Announcement of new Library Statistics Working Group Members: Hulen Bivins and Frank Nelson were elected to fill the 2 SDC vacancies. Their terms will expire 12/11.
- The [SDC Job Description](#) was approved with minor revisions.

Link to:

- [Conference presentations.](#)
- [Keppel Award Presentation Photos](#)

Conference Plus and Minus

Plus:

1. Kim
2. IMLS committed to program
3. Dianne Carty!!!!
4. Helpful for new SDCs in every way
5. Vendor receptions and breakfast
6. Repeat concurrent sessions
7. Handouts for presentations
8. IMLS template for PowerPoint
9. Wiki for candidates and introductions
10. Data from other areas – looking at
11. flexibility

Minus

1. Keith, Libby and Al departure
2. Lack of signs (rooms directions)
3. Card swipe for security to rooms
4. Breakout accessibility
5. Pillars/barriers in meeting rooms
6. Too hot
7. Cost of internet access in hotel rooms
8. Smoking in room (downside)
9. Need more time (another ½ day)
10. Concurrent session repeat
11. Need ½ day data element walk through
12. Need refreshment variety
13. No Recycle
14. Lack of handouts for some sessions
15. No descriptions of concurrent sessions

Attachment: Data Element Roundtable Reports:

Keith Lance (representing CO) Mentor Group (present: AZ, DE, IL, IN, LA, TX)

1. How will YA data be used nationally
2. Impact of additional demographic breakdown in future. What additional age groups breakdown will this lead to in future? Pre-K; Seniors? What about outreach (programs held outside the library building)
3. Change children's age to 12... but local actually determine the program target group. Libraries are to report the number attending program is not limited to just those between the established age range.
4. Data element correlation with other data elements: Collection, Registration...)

Alan Zimmerman (WI) Mentor Group (present: KS, MI, MO, NY, OH, PA, VA)

1. How necessary are the YA data elements at the national level?
2. Conflict with local/state definitions. Should age breakdown for Children/YA be determined at the local level.
3. Do we need to catch a trend, are we behind the trend, has the trend passed, is the information needed for a future trend.

Flip Chart:

1. MO – Does not collect YA programming
2. NY – Counts based on target of program
3. Question from libraries regarding Programs – Pro
4. Program definition: for whom program targeted, not those actually attending.
5. Identify libraries providing programs – Pro
6. Little libraries have another element to collect – Con
7. Little libraries don't have (maybe) YA programs – Pro
8. What's the national importance/use of question?
9. Will changing age have local policy implications – Con
10. Should age be "recommendation" not hard & fast – Con
11. Possible conflict with existing data elements/methodology – Con
12. Trend over time – may be leveling – Con
13. Trend: may be seeing current and establishing a position for the future – Pro
14. Need to include outreach in the definition

Ira Bray (CA) Mentor Group (present: AK, AR, NV, OK, OR, WA)

1. Is this needed at the national level? State level? Local level?
2. Age breakdown already determined by some libraries (Summer reading club consortia definitions)
3. Impact of demographic breakdown on other data elements (Road to statistical hell...)
4. Data could be used as a potential advocacy at State/National levels.
5. Concern about impact on Children's programming trend data.
6. Small VS Large library issue – burden of adding a new data element.

Flip Chart

1. YA: Ages 12-18
2. How will it be used in National policy discussion?
3. Not the age of those attending for the identification of the targeted group. Count all who attend programs not just those within the age range of the targeted group.
4. How it can/will be used to promote/identify need for YA programming
5. Information is pertinent to all. National?
6. Validation of need for YA librarian
7. Will addition of breakdown of programming lead to additional breakdown of other data items, such as YA circulation. Road to hell is paved with good intentions.
8. Advocacy tool: Use of data for advocacy with legislature: Keep kids off the street – off the street.
9. Competing with Schools – Summer Reading Program for 0-5
10. Demonstrate preparing youth for the future
11. Teens springboard technology
12. Overkill for small libraries vs large libraries (PLDS collections)
13. Census – child data (skcw)

Recommend delete:

1. E-serials
2. E-books
3. Capital Income breakout

Frank Nelson (ID) Mentor Group (present: IA, MN, NE, ND, SD, UT, WY)

1. When and how will data be used at National Level
2. Is there an interest in this by YALSA?
3. Concern that additional of demographic breakdown for programming will lead to additional demographic breakdown for other data elements.
4. YAs are a recognized group and there is a need to track a new trend.
5. Continuity issue of Children's programming trend is valid but new issues must be addressed even when there is a break in a continuity trend.

Flip Chart:

1. Issue: Is there a national body of data about YA library service?
2. What does YALSA think? Do they collect the data any other way? Did they ask for the data? Where is the interest (push) to collect this data coming from. Note: Denise Davis responded that YALSA requested this addition several years ago, just as the survey was frozen for the transition. If the data is not added to PLSC, YALSA plans to do a separate survey – and yet another survey for libraries to complete.
3. Age: YALSA – YA = 12-18, Juvenile = 0-11, Tweens
4. Does this imply we will have:
 - Children Programming
 - Young Adult Programming
 - Adult Programming

Con: Snowball effect if we add breakdown for YA.

Dianne Carty (MA) Mentor Group (present: AL, FL, GA, KY, MD, SC)

1. Five states in Mentor Group already collect YA borrowers
2. Four of Five also collect YA programming
3. No conclusion by mentor group about how data will be used
4. Will data, if collected, translate into additional funds for service
5. If collected, there is a need for trend analysis
6. Broad focus for Children and YA and concern about impact of definition change for Children's Programming.
7. Pro: Advocacy for YA Programming, push libraries to do more YA programming, result in funding for more YA programming, new emphasis to promote programming for YA's need for more qualified YA librarians.
8. Con: Does data represent anything? How will it be used? What will be the impact on YA demographics on other data elements? How difficult is it to collect from a lot of the libraries.

Flip Chart:

1. All states in group are considering change needed, are already collecting YA programs.
2. Age breakdown question:
3. AL: YA 13-18
4. SC: YA 15 – 18
5. FL: YA 15 – 18
6. MD: YA 15 – 18
7. KY: YA 15+

Question: What will be done with the data? Will it translate into more funding for libraries?

1. Some state use as trend data.
2. This would broaden focus from children to youth.
3. This impacts on the circulation definition.

Pro:

- Advocacy for YA programming
- Push from local constituents
- Reflects how using budget
- New emphasis on YA user group
- Advocate for YA librarians
- Evolving/leading the way in use of new technologies

Con:

- Consistency of data (trend based on children's age definition)
- Issue with circulation & holdings
- Some libraries will not participate
- Mess up some of the Census trends

Timothy Owens (NC) Mentor Group (present: CT, ME, MS, NJ, NH, RI, TN, VT)

1. How important is it at the National Level?
2. Has YALSA expressed a need for the data?
3. Offers a potential for standardizing the definition.
4. Potentially valuable for other agencies (schools, community groups, other)
5. Demonstrates the importance of YA programming in libraries.
6. Are we opening Pandora' box? (impact on demographic breakdown on other data elements)
7. Burden on local libraries.
8. Four in Mentor Group already collect YA programming.

Flip chart:

1. Different States collect YA as children's and some as adult and some not at all.
2. Target age overlap (Children 14 & under. YA 12 – 18)
3. Are YA circulation and collection needed?
4. Is this important at the national level?
- 5.

Pro:

- Already collected by many states and adding to PLS would standardize the definition across states, eliminating the mixed reporting at present.
- The data would be valuable to some other agencies
- Shows libraries are important to the age group
- Data is important in planning: space, collection, community.

Con:

- Where will segmentation stop?

Census

1. Expressed need for quality data and trend continuity importance.
2. Also recognizes that things change and that new trends are established.
3. The addition of the new data item will not mess up the current data. It starts a new trend.

Flip Chart:

1. Impact of change on Census:
2. Adding YA may affect total & children data (may affect imputation)
3. Our base numbers for imputing children/total will change.
4. Year-to-year data may not be comparable
5. Affect editing parameters

Denise Davis (ALA)

1. YALSA requested the addition of the data element about 4 years ago and no action was taken because the program was in transition (NCES to IMLS) so no changes were possible.
2. PLDS does a YA supplemental section to the survey every 5 years – primarily a Yes/No report.
3. Data is needed at the national level to avoid “an yet additional survey of public libraries”. If data element(s) are not added, YALSA will likely do a separate survey.

Additional Discussion Issues

1. Carlos Manjarrez: Warehouse paradigm VS evolving virtual access.
2. Missing piece of Library Survey picture: Consortia. How can/should this be addressed. Consider including consortia in PLS survey (issue multi-type consortia)
3. Registered Borrowers: Concern about definition 3-year purge requirement. Other issues include resident borrowers VS non-resident borrowers. What about revising the definition to request the number of active borrowers (those using the library within the last 5 years)?
4. Capital VS Operating definition. Some libraries co-mingle funds and use operating funds for capital expenses since they do not receive designated funds for capital.
5. Need to look at other studies to determine what age breakdowns are currently being used.
6. YA information is currently included in Education, Public Safety and Health surveys. Library data could add valuable information about YA activities outside of school.

Attachment: Mentor Session Report

Keith Lance (representing CO) and Frank Nelson (ID)

(present: AZ, DE, IL, IN, LA, TX, IA, MN, ND, NE, SD, UT, WY)

1. What are your concerns about the transition?/How do you feel the transition is going?

- How quickly can we get the statistics
- IMLS seems more committed to program than NCLIS
- Important to take a fresh look at the program since it has been frozen for the past 3 years.
- Involve technology changes in future: searchable state data base integrated with public library data and promote use of statistics through U-tube training for use of data
- opportunity to market what libraries are doing well
- Need to analyze current data elements in terms of correlation and identify what we should be counting
- Develop a Consumer Confidence Index for Libraries similar to the Gross National Product

2. How did the FY2007 data submission go with WebPLUS?

- local libraries struggle with providing "number of databases"
- concern with databases provided by consortia

3. What were your experiences with newer data elements?

- warehouse paradigm VS evolving virtual access
- Consider including consortia in PLS survey (issue multi-type consortia)
- Registered Borrowers: concern about 3-year purge requirement, alternate proposals: resident borrowers and non-resident borrowers, what about revising definition to request number of active borrowers in the past 5 years.
- Capital VS Operating definition. Some libraries co-mingle funds or do not receive designated funds for capital and use operating funds for capital expenses

4. Do you anticipate any problems with the upcoming FY2009 data submission to Census? What kind of help do you think you'll need to get past those problems?

- make sure Bibliostat uses latest file to pre-fill field

5. What developing trends are you seeing in your state? Are we collecting the right stuff at the national level or is PLS missing the boat? Do you collect statewide statistics that you feel should be collected at the national level?

Did not really have time to discuss # 6, 7, 8

Mentors: Dianne Carty (MA) and Al Zimmerman (WI)

(present: AL, FL, GA, KY, MD, SC, KS, MI, MO, NY, OH, PA, VA)

1. What are your concerns about the transition?/How do you feel the transition is going?
 - scarcity of information
 - less active role of SDC
 - loss of Cynthia Ramsey and no communication of the change
 - telephone conference calls were useless
 - COSLA was promised definite dates for '08 data release and did not happen
 - compression of SDC conference
 - number of researchers on LSWG
 - last year's (2007) SDC orientation was not good
2. How did the FY2007 data submission go with WebPLUS?
 - problem with downloadable numbers
 - need communication between states when they change data collection methods
 - need flexibility to talk and accessibility to other SDCs, especially in neighboring states
4. Do you anticipate any problems with the upcoming FY2009 data submission to Census? What kind of help do you think you'll need to get past those problems?
 - matching problems
 - Trends, collecting right stuff:
 - users of wifi
 - disconnect between Internet users and pc's owned by library
 - green libraries
 - database counts
7. Is the mentor structure helpful to you? How can we make it more helpful?
 - neighboring state SDC intervention for new SDC's
 - newsletter—what's new?
 - Wiki—what's new?
 - Minutes of LSWG for all to see
8. Any other comments or suggestions?
 - reimbursement issues—not enough heads up; no taxi fares covered
 - shortening of schedule not good
 - no breakfast or snacks—again a heads up needed
 - agenda for conference needed much, much sooner for state travel approval
 - need IMLS commitment to continue future PLSC conferences

Mentors: Timothy Owen (NC) and Ira Bray (CA)

(present: CT, ME, MS, NJ, NH, RI, TN, VT, AK, AR, NV, OK, OR, WA)

1. What are your concerns about the transition?/How do you feel the transition is going?

- Not hearing much about it from IMLS,
- Concerned about the lack of definition going forward. The structure and processes were well-defined before, but now there is little or nothing.
- Concern that data collection will be top-down, i.e., elements dictated by IMLS rather than grassroots-driven
- Not certain that make-up of working group (state librarians and SDCs on the same level) is the most effective. [Did state librarians feel left out and want to have more involvement in process?]
- Focus on community-based analysis and GIS work is a positive
- Appreciate Carlos' "positive" approach to data and how this fits into other data sets.
- Note that IMLS has vested interest in this data
- Considering the alternative after NCES abandoned support for the survey folks are grateful IMLS stepped up to take it on.

2. How did the FY2007 data submission go with WebPLUS?

- Used Bibliostat, so everything was OK
- Great support from Census, Jen was helpful and nice
- There were problems with sending e-mail to census from state e-mail accounts
- Have to re-learn the system each year, but Census is great
- Lots of edit checks, especially with addresses. Would like some way to address those during upload rather than repetitive importing / uploading of spreadsheet until match is clean

3. What were your experiences with newer data elements?

- Adding downloadables to audio and video was a positive
- Clarification that audio / video have to be in catalog has helped
- Already collecting registered borrowers, so no problem there
- Alaska has concerns about borrowers due to the high number of tourists. What is status of edit checks?
- For those libraries that use manual systems for borrower information, data is questionable.

4. Do you anticipate any problems with the upcoming FY2009 data submission to Census? What kind of help do you think you'll need to get past those problems?

- Expect edit checks with borrowers as well as e-books and audio materials
- Help from mentors will be needed and is valued highly.

5. What developing trends are you seeing in your state? Are we collecting the right stuff at the national level or is PLS missing the boat? Do you collect statewide statistics that you feel should be collected at the national level?

- Young Adults
- Stop collecting e-books
- Foreign language materials (CA collects every 3 years, but this is difficult item and there are issues)
- Gaming? =programs already collected?
- Will this survey be asked to take on elements from Gates survey?
- Gates method of measuring broadband speed to building is flawed, needs to be measured at user workstation (sample speeds to get average, use web based speed measurement tool).
- Tracking grants – databases, integrating LSTA reporting with survey data. Works for public libraries, but not non-public LSTA grantees.
- Federated library systems/reference centers providing direct service, how should this work? They do not meet library definition but provide library services.
- Drop electronic subscriptions
- Literacy – some have state programs, but not all
- Tracking corporate / planned giving as trend
- What about other methods for collection – fast-track or snapshots for some elements instead of adding everything to the PLS

6. How do you deal with non-respondents?

- Pester by e-mail and phone
- Letter to library board
- Give “star rewards”: platinum for early, gold for on-time
- Withhold state grants
- Chocolate
- Call the mayor
- Intern from library school will be sent into field
- Stripped-down survey with just core elements for those very challenged.

7. Is the mentor structure helpful to you? How can we make it more helpful?

- This is one of the strengths of the program

8. Any other comments or suggestions?

- In-person meeting is important.
- Conference is valuable, especially in giving the new SDCs an opportunity to interact with experienced SDCs
- Would like to consider other locations for conference, alternate years in the west.

- Would like list of non-conference events (BUG mtg, receptions, etc.), informal communication if needed given constraints on IMLS as govt agency

Conference Evaluation

Public Library Statistics Cooperative (PLSC) SDC EVALUATION Form New SDC Session December 2 December 3-4, 2008

31 returns

45 states attended Conference/ 12 states attended New Data Coordinator Session

		1	2	3	4	5
Hotel Logistics	actual # answered	Low				High
a. Hotel accommodations	30		5	13	8	4
b. Location	30		3	13	9	5
c. Meeting room arrangements	30			6	12	12

Tuesday, December 2, 2007

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 1. General Session: introductions & Conference Overview; SDC Job Description & Data Submission Timeline; PLS Wiki - Dianne Carty, Timothy Owens & Frank Nelson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
1. Material covered was relevant to my needs	9				7	2
2. Information was communicated effectively	9		1	2	4	2

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 2. General Session: WebPLUS Data Files Overview - Al Zimmerman	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
6. Material covered was relevant to my needs	9			2	5	2
7. Information was communicated effectively	9	1			6	2

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 3. General Session: Hands-on WebPLUS Demo - Michael Freeman, Census	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
11. Material covered was relevant to my needs	8			2	5	1
12. Information was communicated effectively	8			3	3	2

Wednesday, December 3, 2007

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 4. General Session: Welcome & Introductions (Partner Introductions); IMLS Overview of New Library Statistics Working Group; Introduce SDC Candidates - Dianne Carty, IMLS Staff	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
16. Material covered was relevant to my needs	30	1	1	8	16	4
17. Information was communicated effectively	30		1	8	17	4

Session 5. General Session: Discussion of new data element proposal process and testing - Frank Nelson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
21. Material covered was relevant to my needs	30			6	15	9
22. Information was communicated effectively	30			7	16	7

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 6. General Session: Report Out - discussion of new data element proposals process - Frank Nelson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
26. Material covered was relevant to my needs	27			3	17	7
27. Information was communicated effectively	27			4	16	7

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 7. General Session: Data Quality Assurance Status Report - Al Zimmerman	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
31. Material covered was relevant to my needs	27	1	0	3	16	7
32. Information was communicated effectively	26	0	0	2	17	7

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 8. Concurrent Session I: IMLS Compare Public Libraries & Data Place tools - Everett Henderson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
36. Material covered was relevant to my needs	14	0	0	3	8	3
37. Information was communicated effectively	14	1	0	6	5	2

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 9. Concurrent Session I: Return on Investment - Keith Lance	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
41. Material covered was relevant to my needs	4	0	0	1	2	1
42. Information was communicated effectively	4	0	0	0	3	1

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 10. Concurrent Session I: Using PLS Data to Support Advocacy - Hulen Bivins	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
46. Material covered was relevant to my needs	10	0	0	3	3	4
47. Information was communicated effectively	10	0	0	2	2	6

Session 11. Breakout Session: Mentor Groups	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
51. Material covered was relevant to my needs	29	0	1	2	11	15
52. Information was communicated effectively	29	0	0	4	11	14

Session 12. Concurrent Session II: Using WebPLUS (not hands-on) - Michael Freeman & Census Staff	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
56. Material covered was relevant to my needs	7	0	0	3	3	1
57. Information was communicated effectively	7	0	1	2	2	2

Session 13. Concurrent Session II: Local Use of Data - SDC Candidates - Peter Haxton	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
61. Material covered was relevant to my needs	6	0	0	1	4	1
52. Information was communicated effectively	6	0	0	1	4	1

Session 14. Concurrent Session II: State Library Agency Survey - Suzanne Miller & Denise Davis	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
66. Material covered was relevant to my needs	13	0	0	5	7	1
67. Information was communicated effectively	13	0	0	4	7	2

Session 15. General Session: Kathy Pettit, National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
71. Material covered was relevant to my needs	28	2	3	11	5	7
72. Information was communicated effectively	28	0	3	9	8	8

Session 16. Concurrent Session III: Samplings Better Than Nothing - Carlos Manjarrez	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
76. Material covered was relevant to my needs	11	0	0	2	6	3
77. Information was communicated effectively	11	0	0	2	7	2

Session 17. Concurrent Session III: Library Journal (LJ) Index - Keith Lance	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
81. Material covered was relevant to my needs	6	0	0	0	4	2
82. Information was communicated effectively	6	0	0	0	4	2

Session 18. Concurrent Session III: Local Use of Data - Dianne Carty & Edie Huffman	actual # answered	1	2	3	4	5
		strongly disagree → strongly agree				
86. Material covered was relevant to my needs	7	0	1	0	5	1
87. Information was communicated effectively	6	0	1	0	4	1

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 19. Concurrent Session IV: Looking at Census Figures & Legal Service Area - Carlos Manjarrez	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
91. Material covered was relevant to my needs	9	0	2	1	4	2
92. Information was communicated effectively	9	0	0	2	4	3

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 20. Concurrent Session IV: Using Excel - Al Zimmerman & Timothy Owens	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
96. Material covered was relevant to my needs	4	0	0	0	4	0
97. Information was communicated effectively	4	0	0	0	4	0

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 21. Concurrent Session IV: Showing us what you are doing in your state! - SDCS: Susan Vittitow, Ann Reed, Ira Bray & Frank Nelson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
101. Material covered was relevant to my needs	12	0	0	1	4	7
102. Information was communicated effectively	12	0	0	1	4	7

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 22. General Session: Existing data elements Q&A - Frank Nelson	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
106. Material covered was relevant to my needs	25	0	0	4	8	13
107. Information was communicated effectively	25	0	1	5	10	9

		1	2	3	4	5
Session 23. General Session: Business Meeting	actual # answered	strongly disagree → strongly agree				
111. Material covered was relevant to my needs	16	0	1	1	5	9
112. Information was communicated effectively	16	0	0	2	5	9