



iPAC

INFORMATION POLICY & ACCESS CENTER

2010-2011

PUBLIC LIBRARY FUNDING AND  
TECHNOLOGY ACCESS SURVEY:  
SURVEY FINDINGS AND RESULTS

JUNE 21, 2011

by

John Carlo Bertot, Ph.D.  
Director and Professor

Kathryn Sigler  
Graduate Research Associate

Elizabeth DeCoster  
Graduate Research Associate

Abigail McDermott  
Graduate Research Associate

Sarah M. Katz  
Graduate Research Associate

Lesley A. Langa  
Graduate Research Associate

Justin M. Grimes  
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 (Prarie du Chien Public Library), Robert Bocher (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Division for Libraries), Linda Crowe (Peninsula Library System), 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).

We also would like to thanks Dr. Charles R. McClure, who served as a consultant on this project. His expertise served the survey well and is much appreciated. Dr. McClure began these surveys in 1994, and he and John Carlo Bertot have conducted the surveys together since that time.

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

John Carlo Bertot, Kathryn Sigler, Elizabeth DeCoster, Abigail McDermott, Sarah M. Katz , Lesley A. Langa, & Justin M. Grimes.

**Table of Contents**

**List of Figures..... iii**

**Executive Summary..... 1**

**Extended Summary and Overview of Survey Findings..... 3**

**Public Access Connectivity and Infrastructure..... 3**  
     **Community Public Access ..... 3**  
     **Progress and Challenges with Public Access Technology Infrastructure..... 4**  
     **Quality of Public Access ..... 5**

**Helping Communities Get Back to Work and Supporting E-government..... 6**  
     **Employment and Job Seeking Support..... 6**  
     **E-government Support..... 7**

**Extensive Range of Library Services Provided..... 7**

**Moving Connectivity and Public Access Forward..... 8**  
     **Enhancing Public Access Infrastructure..... 8**  
     **Challenges Remain..... 8**

**Survey Methodology..... 9**

**Outlet (Branch) Versus System..... 11**

**Data Analysis..... 11**

**National Branch Data Tables..... 13**  
     **Public Access and Availability..... 13**  
     **Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Availability, Replacement, Support, & Use.....14**  
         Public Library Internet Connectivity Type, Speed, & Sufficiency..... 25  
     **Internet-Enabled Services Provided by the Library..... 30**  
         Importance of Public Internet Services..... 30  
         Technology Training Offered by Public Libraries ..... 35  
         Public Access Services Available to Users and Community..... 37  
     **Library E-government and Employment Services and Challenges..... 41**

**System (Administrative) Level Findings..... 51**  
     **E-rate Application Data..... 51**  
     **Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP).....53**  
     **Public Library Operating Budget Details..... 54**  
     **Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures..... 61**

**State Data Tables..... 66**

**About the Information Policy and Access Center.....171**

**About the Authors.....172**

**Appendix A: 2010-2011 Public Library Funding & Technology Access Survey..... 174**

**Recommended report citation:**

Bertot, J.C., Sigler, K., DeCoster, E., McDermott, A., Katz, S.M., Langa, L.A., & Grimes, J.M. (2011). *2010-2011 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>.

**Table of Figures**

Figure 1: Public Library Outlets and Survey Responses by Metropolitan Status..... 12

Figure 2: Public Library Outlets Change in Hours Open by Metropolitan Status..... 13

Figure 3: Public Library Outlets Offering Public Access to the Internet, by Metropolitan Status..... 13

Figure 4: Public Library Outlets as the Only Provider of Free Public Internet and Free Public Computer Access by Metropolitan Status..... 14

Figure 5: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Average, Average Age, and Metropolitan Status..... 14

Figure 6: Public Access Workstation Replacement Procedure, by Metropolitan Status..... 15

Figure 7: Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status..... 15

Figure 8: Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstations Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status..... 16

Figure 9: Public Access Workstations Additions, by Metropolitan Status..... 16

Figure 10: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Overall..... 17

Figure 11: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Urban..... 18

Figure 12: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Suburban..... 19

Figure 13: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops – Rural..... 20

Figure 14: Public Library Outlets Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by Metropolitan Status..... 21

Figure 15: Sources of IT Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status..... 22

Figure 16: Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan Status..... 23

Figure 17: Use of Public Internet Workstations by Metropolitan Status..... 23

Figure 18: Use of Wireless Internet Access in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status..... 24

Figure 19: Use of Patron Technology Training Classes in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status... 24

Figure 20: Use of Electronic Resources in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status..... 25

Figure 21: Availability of Fiber Optic Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status..... 25

Figure 22: Public Library Outlets Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services by Metropolitan Status..... 26

Figure 23: Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets over the last year, by Metropolitan Status..... 27

Figure 24: Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status..... 27

Figure 25: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status..... 28

Figure 26: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status.. 29

Figure 27: Public Library Outlets Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth by Metropolitan Status..... 29

Figure 28: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Overall..... 30

Figure 29: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Urban..... 32

Figure 30: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Suburban..... 33

Figure 31: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community – Rural..... 34

Figure 32: Public Library Outlets Offering Formal or Informal Technology Training, Availability by Metropolitan Status..... 35

Figure 33: Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status..... 36

Figure 34: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Overall..... 37

Figure 35: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Urban..... 38

Figure 36: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Suburban..... 39

Figure 37: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users – Rural..... 40

Figure 38: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status..... 41

Figure 39: Challenges that Affect the Ability of Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs – Overall..... 42

Figure 40: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs – Urban..... 43

Figure 41: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs – Suburban..... 44

Figure 42: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Meet their E-Government Needs – Rural..... 45

Figure 43: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status..... 46

Figure 44: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Overall..... 47

Figure 45: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Urban..... 48

Figure 46: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Suburban..... 49

Figure 47: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs – Rural..... 50

Figure 48: Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount..... 51

Figure 49: Public Library Systems Receiving an E-Rate Discount by Category..... 51

Figure 50: Reasons Public Library Systems Did Not Apply for E-Rate Discounts..... 52

Figure 51: 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..... 52

Figure 52: BTOP and BIP Applications by Type..... 53

Figure 53: FY2011 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change..... 54

Figure 54: FY2012 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change..... 55

Figure 55: For Current Fiscal Year, Percentage of Public Library Systems that anticipate or experienced changes to their total operating budget..... 55

Figure 56: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 56

Figure 57: FY2011 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 57

Figure 58: FY2011 – Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 58

Figure 59: FY2012 – Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 58

Figure 60: FY2011 – Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 59

Figure 61: FY2012 – Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 59

Figure 62: FY2011 – Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 60

Figure 63: FY2012 – Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 60

Figure 64: Public Library System Payment of Technology Expenditures, by Metropolitan Status..... 61

Figure 65: FY2011 Public Library Systems Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status..... 61

Figure 66: FY2012 Public Library Systems Anticipated Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status..... 62

Figure 67: FY2011 Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 63

Figure 68: FY2011 – Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 64

Figure 69: FY2011 – Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 65

Figure 70: FY2011 – Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source..... 65

Figure 71: Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State..... 67

Figure 72: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access and Free Public Computer Access, by State..... 69

Figure 73: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations by Average Age, by State..... 72

Figure 74: Public Library Outlet Has a Replacement Policy or Procedure, by State..... 77

Figure 75: Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement Schedule, by State..... 79

Figure 76: Public Library Outlet Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by State..... 81

Figure 77: Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Public Access Internet Workstations, by State..... 84

Figure 78: Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by State..... 87

Figure 79: Public Library Outlet Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by State..... 91

Figure 80: Sources of IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by State..... 94

Figure 81: Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State..... 98

Figure 82: Public Library Outlet Change in Use of Public Access Technology, by State..... 101

Figure 83: Public Library Outlet Fiber Optic Internet Connection, by State..... 105

Figure 84: Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State..... 108

Figure 85: Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets Over the Last Year, by State..... 111

Figure 86: Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State..... 113

Figure 87: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection, by State..... 116

Figure 88: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State..... 118

Figure 89: Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State..... 121

Figure 90: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community, by State..... 125

Figure 91: Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State..... 129

Figure 92 (Part 1): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State... 132

Figure 92 (Part 2): Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Branches, by State... 134

Figure 93 (Part 1): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State..... 138

Figure 93 (Part 2): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State..... 142

Figure 94: Public Library Peripherals That are Available to Users, by State..... 146

Figure 95: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State..... 149

Figure 96: Challenges that affect the ability of the Public Library Outlets to help patrons meet their E-

Government needs, by State.....	155
Figure 97: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State.....	160
Figure 98: Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment, by State.....	166

## Executive Summary

Public libraries are critical community access points for public access technologies and Internet-enabled services:

- **Public Access Computers.** Libraries reported an average of 16.0 public access computers, up from 14.2 public access computers in 2009-2010 and 11.0 in 2008-2009.
- **Broadband Connectivity.** Libraries reported increased connectivity speeds, with 60.3 percent of libraries reporting connectivity speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps, up from 51.8 percent in 2009-2010 and 44.5 percent in 2008-2009. Nearly 25 percent (24.9 percent) of libraries report having connectivity speeds of 10Mbps or greater.
- **Wireless (Wi-fi) Access.** Libraries reported an increase in providing Wi-fi access to the Internet, with 85.7 percent of public library branches offering wireless Internet access, as compared to 82.2 percent in 2009-2010 and 76.4 percent in 2008-2009.
- **Databases, Homework Resources, E-Books, and Content.** Libraries continued to offer access to a number of digital resources, including licensed databases (99.8%, up from 95.0 percent in 2009-2010 and 89.6 percent in 2008-2009); homework resources (87.0 percent, down slightly from 88.2 percent 2009-2010 but up from 79.6 percent in 2008-2009); audio content, such as podcasts and audiobooks (82.8 percent, about the same as the 82.5 percent reported in 2009-2010 and up from 72.9 percent in 2008-2009); digital reference (76.9 percent, up from 72.3 percent in 2009-2010 and 62.4 percent in 2008-2009); e-books (67.2 percent, up from 65.9 percent in 2009-2010 and 55.4 percent in 2008-2009); social media tool use (e.g., blogs, Flixter, and Goodreads) – 60.1 percent of libraries report using social media technologies.
- **Employment support.** 90.9 percent of libraries reported providing access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources (up from 88.2 percent in 2009-2010), and 71.9 percent of libraries reported providing patrons with assistance in completing online job applications (up from 67.1 percent in 2009-2010). In addition, 74.5 percent of libraries reported offering software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials (up from 68.9 percent in 2009-2010).
- **E-government.** 80.7 percent of libraries reported providing assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services (up from 78.7 percent in 2009-2010), and 67.8 percent of libraries reported that staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms (up from 63.3 percent in 2009-2010). Nearly all public libraries – 89.7 percent – reported providing assistance to the public for understanding how to access and use e-government websites (up from 88.8 percent reported in 2009-2010).

Libraries also continued to indicate that they face challenges in supporting their public access technology services and resources in key areas:

- **Sufficiency.** Even with the increase in public access computers and bandwidth, 44.9 percent of libraries (down slightly from 45.1 percent in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speeds are insufficient some or all of the time and 76.2 percent of libraries (up from 73.5 percent in 2009-2010) reported that they had fewer public access computers to meet demand some or all of the time.
- **Cost.** Libraries reported cost factors (78.8 percent, down slightly from 79.8 percent reported in 2009-2010) as a challenge in maintaining, sustaining, and enhancing their public access technology infrastructure.

- **Buildings.** Library buildings continue to 1) lack adequate electrical outlets to support either the addition of workstations or support user-owned laptops; 2) lack cabling to wire/connect more workstations; and 3) are at space capacity and challenged to add more public access computers without decreasing collections.
- **Staff.** Libraries reported challenges with adequate staff for providing e-government and employment support, as well as with access to technology staff. 47.6 percent (up from 43.7 percent in 2009-2010) of rural libraries report that it is the library director that provides IT support, as compared to 75.5 percent (essentially unchanged from 75.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) of urban libraries that report IT support provided by system-level IT staff.
- **Reduced hours.** Libraries also reported a reduction in hours open, with 15.9 percent reporting a reduction in hours (this is on top of 14.5 percent reporting a reduction in hours in 2009-2010). Nearly 32 percent (31.7 percent) of urban libraries reported a reduction in hours open (an increase from 23.7 percent reported in 2009-2010), impacting the public's access to public access technologies, services, and resources.

The results from the 2010-2011 survey continue to show a trend that surfaced with the 2008-2009 survey: libraries provide and enhance their public access services where possible, but remain unable to fully meet demand as they are increasingly challenged by meeting employment and e-government service demands; reduced hours, now cumulative over three years due to economic recession; staff expertise and availability constraints; and continued reduced funding.

## **Extended Summary and Overview of Survey Findings**

The national survey provided insights into issues related to the current state of public access technology and Internet-enabled services that public libraries provide to the communities that they serve. The following discussion presents selected findings from the survey and their implications. The 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>.

### **Public Access Connectivity and Infrastructure**

Public libraries offer a range of public access technology and Internet access services to the public. Libraries employ a range of strategies to maintain, upgrade, and make available public access resources and services. The survey findings show that public libraries provide an impressive array of 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. And yet, libraries responding to the survey reported challenges in terms of the availability of computers and adequate broadband capacity – indicating that the enhancements over the last three years still fall short of meeting demand and needs.

### **Community Public Access**

Public libraries continue to provide important public access computing and Internet access in their communities:

- 99.3 percent of public library branches offer public Internet access (see Figure 3), consistent with the 99.0 percent reported in 2009-2010 and 98.7 percent in 2008-2009.
- 64.5 percent of library branches report that they are the only provider of free public computer and Internet access in their communities (see Figure 4), down slightly from the 66.6 percent reported in 2009-2010 and 71.4 percent reported in 2008-2009.
- Overall, public library branches report an average of 16.0 public access computers (see Figure 5), up from 14.2 in 2009-2010 and 11.0 in 2008-2009. Rural libraries reported an average of 9.6 public access computers, up slightly from 9.2 computers reported in 2009-2010 and from 7.6 workstations in 2008-2009. Suburban libraries reported an average of 19.6 public access computers, up from 15.8 computers in 2009-2010 and 12.7 computers reported in 2008-2009. Urban libraries reported an average of 28.0 public access computers, up from an average of 25.4 computers in 2009-2010 and 18.7 reported in 2008-2009.
- 85.7 percent of public library branches offer wireless Internet access, up from 82.2 percent reported in 2009-2010 and 76.4 percent reported in 2008-2009 (see Figure 26).
- 33.4 percent of libraries report public access connection speeds of 1.6Mbps-10Mbps (identical to the percentage reported in 2009-2010), followed by 22.7 percent that report public access connection speeds of 1.5Mbps (down from 27.4 percent reported in 2009-2010), 12.8 percent 10.1Mbps-30Mbps (up from 9.0 percent reported in 2009-2010), 12.1 percent greater than 30Mbps (up from 9.4 reported in 2009-2010), and 12.0 percent less than 1.5Mbps (down from 14.8 reported in 2009-2010) (see Figure 32). 43.0 percent of rural libraries report public access speeds of 1.5Mbps or less (down from 53.0 percent reported in 2009-2010, marking the first time that more rural libraries – 48.6 percent – reported connectivity speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps), while 86.3 percent of urban libraries (up from 77.2 percent in 2009-2010) and 65.1 percent of suburban

libraries (up from 55.4 percent in 2009-2010) reported public access speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps.<sup>1</sup>

It is upon this core infrastructure of public access computers, broadband, and Wi-fi that public libraries are able to build their public access services and resources.

### ***Progress and Challenges with Public Access Technology Infrastructure***

The 2010-2011 survey asked libraries to identify issues regarding the ability of public libraries to provide and maintain their public access Internet and technology services. As with the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 surveys, respondents reported a range of challenges with their costs; buildings; 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. Figures 10-24 show the challenges and progress regarding public library public access technologies:

- **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 (see Figures 10-13). Just as with the 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 surveys, libraries reported cost factors more highly (78.7 percent, versus 79.8 percent in 2009-2010 and 77.4 percent in 2008-2009) than space limitations (77.2 percent, versus 75.1 percent in 2009-2010 and 75.9 percent in 2008-2009). 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, with libraries rating those as the most important issues (4.3 out of 5 for cost factors and 4.2 out of 5 for availability of space, with 5 being most important).
- **Building Infrastructure Inadequacy.** Respondents reported that library buildings lack 1) cabling to wire/connect more workstations, and 2) adequate electrical outlets to support either the addition of workstations or support user-owned laptops (see Figures 10-13).
- **Technology Support Staff.** Public libraries in general rely on non-technical staff to support their public access computers and Internet access. This is particularly true for rural public libraries, though urban public libraries are more likely to have access to technology staff (see Figure 15). As such, 47.6 percent of rural libraries report that it is the library director that provides IT support (versus 43.7 percent in 2009-2010 and 47.2 percent in 2008-2009), as compared to 75.5 percent of urban libraries that report IT support provided by system-level IT staff (versus 75.3 percent in 2009-2010 and 72.2 percent in 2008-2009).
- **Keeping computers in service.** Slightly more than half of libraries (52.1 percent) reported that that it takes two or more days to get a public access computer back into service when it goes down (versus 47.2 percent in 2009-2010 and 48.5 percent in 2008-2009). A clear majority of urban and suburban libraries had a turn around time of two or less days (78.5 percent for urban libraries and 71.7 percent for suburban libraries), but nearly a third (31.8 percent) of rural libraries indicated that it could take two or more days to get a computer back into service (see Figure 14).
- **More Usage of Library Infrastructure and Services.** In all (see Figures 17-20), 69.8 percent of public libraries reported increased use of public access computers (versus 75.7 percent of libraries

---

<sup>1</sup> Direct comparisons to the 2008-2009 survey are difficult due to the change in broadband categories adopted for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 surveys. However, in general, libraries reported higher connectivity speeds.

in 2009-2010), 75.3 percent reported increased use of Wi-fi, (versus 71.1 percent in 2009-2010), 27.6 percent reported increased use of training services (versus 26.3 percent in 2009-2010), and 49.8 percent reported increased use of electronic resources (versus 45.6 percent in 2009-2010).

- **More Computer Congestion.** More libraries in 2010-2011 reported insufficient numbers of workstations some or all of the time (76.2 percent, versus 73.5 percent in 2009-2010) (see Figure 15). This is in spite of an increase in the average number of public access computers reported by libraries, but consistent with the increased computer usage reported.
- **More wireless (Wi-fi) access.** Libraries reported an increase in providing wi-fi access to the Internet, with 85.7 percent of public library branches offering wireless Internet access, as compared to 82.2 percent in 2009-2010 and 76.4 percent in 2008-2009 (see Figure 26).
- **More Broadband.** 33.4 percent of libraries report public access connection speeds of 1.6Mbps-10Mbps (identical to the percentage reported in 2009-2010), followed by 22.7 percent that report public access connection speeds of 1.5Mbps (down from 27.4 percent reported in 2009-2010), 12.8 percent 10.1Mbps-30Mbps (up from 9.0 percent reported in 2009-2010), 12.1 percent greater than 30Mbps (up from 9.4 reported in 2009-2010), and 12.0 percent less than 1.5Mbps (down from 14.8 reported in 2009-2010) (see Figure 32). 43.0 percent of rural libraries report public access speeds of 1.5Mbps or less (down from 53.0 percent reported in 2009-2010, marking the first time that more rural libraries – 48.6 percent – reported connectivity speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps), while 86.3 percent of urban libraries (up from 77.2 percent in 2009-2010) and 65.1 percent of suburban libraries (up from 55.4 percent in 2009-2010) reported public access speeds of greater than 1.5Mbps.<sup>2</sup>
- **Still Broadband Congestion.** Even with the increase in public access computers and bandwidth, 44.9 percent of libraries (down slightly from 45.1 percent in 2009-2010) reported that their connection speed is insufficient some or all of the time (see Figure 24).

Together, these data further 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 clearly 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 is being outpaced by demand.

### **Quality of Public Access**

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):

---

<sup>2</sup> Direct comparisons to the 2008-2009 survey are difficult due to the change in broadband categories adopted for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 surveys. However, in general, libraries reported higher connectivity speeds.

- 44.9 percent of libraries reported that their connection speed is insufficient some or all of the time (down slightly from 45.1 percent in 2009-2010, and down substantially from 59.6 percent in 2008-2009) (see Figure 24). Urban libraries (55.0 percent, versus 47.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) are slightly less likely than suburban libraries (56.7 percent, versus 57.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) and rural libraries (53.1 percent, versus 54.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) to report that their connection speeds are sufficient to meet patron needs at all times.
- 29.4 percent (nearly identical to the 29.5 percent reported in 2009-2010 and up from 22.9 percent in 2008-2009) of libraries reported that though they have an interest in increasing their current Internet speed, they cannot afford to do so (see Figure 25).
- 76.2 percent of libraries (up slightly from 73.5 percent in 2009-2010, but down from the 81.2 percent reported in 2008-2009) reported that they had fewer public access computers to meet demand some or all of the time (see Figure 15). This is despite libraries having added an average of 1.8 computers since 2009-2010 and an average of five computers since 2008-2009.
- 79.7 percent (nearly identical to the 79.3 percent reported in 2009-2010, and down slightly from the 82.4 percent reported in 2008-2009) of public libraries report that their wireless connections share the same bandwidth as their public desktop computers, though 23.9 percent (nearly the same as the 23.2 percent reported in 2009-2010) indicate that they use bandwidth management techniques (see Figure 27).

Overall, 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, libraries continue to struggle to keep up with demands on public access services and resources. The data show that urban libraries in particular are struggling to meet demand. Also, libraries continue to diminish the quality of public access through the sharing of bandwidth with wireless connectivity in order to accommodate more users. Though the provision of Wi-fi has alleviated some congestion in terms of computer availability, public libraries are affecting the quality of their public access technology environment through network congestion – as indicated both by the still high reported broadband congestion and reported sharing of the library’s connection with the Wi-fi connection – particularly in the rural libraries (68.9 percent, with only 15.9 percent reporting that they use traffic management techniques).

### **Helping Communities Get Back to Work and Supporting E-government**

Libraries offer substantial and critical support to those seeking employment and engaging in E-government activities. Responding libraries indicated that they provide a number of resources and services to assist individuals seek employment, apply for employment, and interact with government agencies.

Providing essential scaffolding through which employment and E-government services is a range of technology and Internet training content and classes (see Figures 32 and 33). Nearly 80 percent (78.8 percent, up from the 76.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) of libraries report providing point-of-use technology training, while 38.0 percent (up slightly from the 37.0 percent reported in 2009-2010) provide formal training classes (58.8 percent of urban libraries, down slightly from the 59.2 percent reported in 2009-2010). In terms of libraries that report offering formal classes:

- 92.9 percent provide general computer skills training;
- 93.5 percent provide general Internet use training;
- 81.9 percent provide general online/Web searching training; and
- 79.5 percent provide general software (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation) training.

### ***Employment and Job Seeking Support***

Public libraries support job seekers in a number of ways, including (see Figures 43-47):

- 90.9 percent (up from the 88.2 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources;
- 77.0 percent (up from the 74.9 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide access to civil service examination materials, a figure that increases to 90.1 percent (up from 85.7 percent in 2009-2010) in urban libraries;
- 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;
- 71.9 percent (up from the 67.1 percent in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide patrons with assistance in completing online job applications;
- In providing these job-seeking services, 55.9 percent (down from the 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 43.4 percent (down from the 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 government services and resources through a range of E-government services, such as (see Figures 38-42):

- 89.7 percent (up slightly from 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;
- 80.7 percent (up from the 78.7 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing E-government services;
- 67.8 percent (up from the 63.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) of reporting libraries indicate that staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms;
- 29.4 percent (down from 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;
- 55.7 percent (down from 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 and 50.5 percent (down from 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.

### ***Extensive Range of Library Services Provided***

Public libraries intermediate and/or provide access to a wide range of online services and resources (see Figure 34), including:

- Licensed databases (99.8 percent, versus 95.0 percent in 2009-2010 and 89.6 percent in 2008-2009);
- Homework resources (87.0 percent, versus 88.2 percent in 2009-2010 and 79.6 percent in 2008-2009);

- Audio content, such as podcasts and audiobooks (82.8 percent, versus 82.5 percent in 2009-2010 and 72.9 percent in 2008-2009);
- Digital reference (76.9 percent, versus 72.3 percent in 2009-2010 and 62.4 percent in 2008-2009); and
- E-books (67.2 percent, versus 65.9 percent in 2009-2010 and 55.4 percent in 2008-2009).

Libraries seem to be holding steady, and in some cases increasing, access to digital content and resources, while ensuring the availability of access in a time of increased usage, bandwidth, infrastructure, necessary to support these services for millions of library users.

### **Moving Connectivity and Public Access Forward**

Public libraries continue to hold the line, and in some cases increase, their public access Internet services, resources, and infrastructure. The survey shows, however, that the ability of libraries to do so is waning. Moreover, one needs to look at the ability of libraries to offer their communities quality public access technology services in the context of the cumulative affect of the economic downturn – libraries are now reporting successive years of budget cuts and reduced hours all precisely at the same time that they report increased usage and demand.

### **Enhancing Public Access Infrastructure**

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:

- 22.7 percent (up from 13.3 percent reported in 2009-2010 and 16.7 percent reported in 2008-2009) of public library branches plan to add more public access computers within the next year. Slightly more rural libraries (24.4 percent) report that they will be adding public access computers than urban and suburban libraries (22.8 percent and 20.3 percent, respectively (see Figure 9);
- 22.9 percent of public libraries have a workstation/laptop replacement schedule that essentially occurs every three years (as compared to 27.3 percent in 2009-2010 and 15.9 percent in 2008-2009), 36.4 percent of public libraries have a workstation/laptop replacement schedule that occurs every four years (up from 28.8 percent in 2009-2010 and 18.4 percent in 2008-2009), and 27.6 percent of public libraries have a workstation/laptop replacement schedule that occurs every five years (down from 31.6 percent in 2009-2010 and up from 14.2 percent reported in 2008-2009) (see Figure 7); and
- 5.9 percent of libraries plan to add wireless access within the next year, which means that if they do so, by the end of 2011 about 91 percent of public libraries will offer wireless access (see Figure 26). Thus, wireless access is rapidly approaching ubiquity within the public libraries and becoming a core service.

These data demonstrate that libraries do consider the need for continual upgrades and replacements to their public access technology infrastructure. The data indicate, however, that planning, addition, and replacement horizons are overall increasing, while firm upgrades and replacements are slipping and that time horizons are extending. The data, therefore, show that libraries intend to keep their existing public access infrastructure in use for longer time periods, a likely situation due to budget decreases and/or anticipated budget decreases.

### **Challenges Remain**

Challenges remain as public libraries enhance their public access computing and Internet access services:

- 15.9 percent (versus 14.5 percent in 2009-2010) of libraries reported a decrease in hours open since last year, with 31.7 percent (a substantial jump from 23.7 percent reported in 2009-2010) of urban libraries reporting a decrease in hours open, 17.1 percent (versus 16.3 percent in 2009-2010) of suburban libraries reporting a decrease in hours open, and 9.5 percent (versus 10.1 percent in 2009-2010) of rural libraries reporting a decrease in hours open (see Figure 2);
- 68.4 percent (versus 62.5 percent in 2009-2010) of public library branches have no plans to add workstations in the next year (see Figure 9), largely due to cost factors (78.7 percent reported as important or most important), space factors (77.2 percent reported as important or most important), and the availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure (54.4 percent reported as important or most important);
- 44.9 percent of libraries reported that their connection speeds are insufficient some or all of the time (down slightly from 45.1 percent in 2009-2010, and down substantially from 59.6 percent in 2008-2009) (see Figure 24). Urban libraries (55.0 percent, versus 47.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) are slightly less likely than suburban libraries (56.7 percent, versus 57.9 percent reported in 2009-2010) and rural libraries (53.1 percent, versus 54.3 percent reported in 2009-2010) to report that their connection speeds are sufficient to meet patron needs at all times;
  - Just 22.0 percent (down from 23.2 percent reported in 2009-2010) of libraries reported an increase in connectivity speeds in the last year, while 76.4 percent (down from 74.6 percent reported in 2009-2010) of libraries reported that their connection speed stayed the same (see Figure 23). Urban libraries (27.0 percent) were more likely than suburban (22.1 percent) and rural (20.2 percent) to report an increase in connection speed. Connectivity enhancements are therefore largely occurring in few, mostly urban, public libraries. Important to note, however, is that the connection speed increases are pushing libraries increasingly beyond the more predominant 1.5Mbps connectivity speed reported just a few years ago.
- 19.4 percent (versus 20.7 percent in 2009-2010 and 26.0 percent in 2008-2009) of respondents reported that their current connection is the maximum speed that they can acquire, 29.4 percent (versus 29.5 percent in 2009-2010 and 22.9 percent in 2008-2009) cannot afford to increase their bandwidth, and 16.0 percent (versus 16.1 percent in 2009-2010 and 14.7 percent in 2008-2009) indicated that they could increase their bandwidth but had no plans to do so (see Figure 25).

Thus, public libraries continue to report that they are unable to meet patron demands for services due to inadequate technology infrastructure, costs associated with operating and maintaining that infrastructure, and bandwidth quality/availability issues – but not for lack of trying to maintain and enhance their services.

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. These constraints, particularly regarding bandwidth and public access computers, occur in the context of the \$7.2 billion distributed in 2010 and 2011 as part of 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), respectively. 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. Depending on the project scope, it may be that library infrastructure improves substantially, but at little to no cost to the public libraries.

### **Survey Methodology**

The 2010-2011 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 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 status<sup>3</sup> (urban, suburban or rural). The survey also included assessment questions for selected public libraries recipients of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grants.

The survey team received a list of Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grant recipient libraries. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation selected the libraries for its grant program according to its own criteria, and participating libraries were required to complete the survey as part of the grant program. So as not to skew the survey data or create any response biases, the survey 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.

As a sample frame, the study team used the 2008 public library dataset available from the U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), which was the most recent public release file available in June 2010. Bookmobile and Books by Mail service outlets were removed from the file, leaving 16,745 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 6,311 outlets. This sample was in addition to the libraries in the Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grant programs.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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 2010 and November 2010. After a number of follow-up reminders and other strategies, the survey received a total of 5,462 responses for a response rate of 86.5 percent. Another 2,971 Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grant library responses were added for a total of 8,433 responses for analysis purposes.<sup>4</sup> Figure 1 shows that the responses are representative of the population. 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 3,601 system/administrative responses out of a sample of 5,005 for a response rate of 71.9 percent. The high 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 (administrative questions focusing on E-rate applications, BTOP/BIP grant applications, 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 29 of the survey explored outlet-level issues (e.g., Internet connectivity, speed of connection, workstations, employment and e-government services, etc.). Questions 30 through 42 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 29 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. Upon completing the system/administrative questions, Opportunity Online hardware and broadband grant recipients were asked an additional set of questions regarding the grant program. The analysis of system- and outlet-level data required different approaches, considerations and weighting schemes for national and state analysis.

---

<sup>4</sup> If applicable, not all branches of a library system were part of the Opportunity Online grant programs. The online survey system enabled the respondents to complete surveys for all of their branches if they so desired, and a number of responding libraries did so.

**Data Analysis**

The survey used weighted analysis to generate national and state data estimates. As such, the analysis uses the responses from the 8,433 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.

<b>Figure 1: Public Library Outlets and Survey Responses by Metropolitan Status</b>		
	<b>Responding Facilities as a Proportion of Survey Respondents</b>	<b>Facilities as a Proportion of National Population</b>
<b>Metropolitan Status</b>		
Urban	18.1% (1,529 of 8,433)	17.2% (2,890 of 16,745)
Suburban	33.4% (2,819 of 8,433)	34.8% (5,833 of 16,745)
Rural	48.4% (4,085 of 8,433)	47.9% (8,022 of 16,745)
Overall	<b>100.0%</b> (8,433 of 8,433)	<b>100.0%</b> (16,745 of 16,745)
Overall Response Rate = 86.5%*		
*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**

<b>Figure 2: Public Library Outlets Change in Hours Open by Metropolitan Status</b>				
	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			
<b>Hours Open</b>	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Hours increased since last fiscal year	3.8% (n=102)	5.8% (n=319)	6.9% (n=528)	6.0% (n=949)
Hours decreased since last fiscal year	31.7% (n=850)	17.1% (n=939)	9.5% (n=734)	15.9% (n=2,524)
Hours stayed the same since last fiscal year	64.5% (n=1,729)	77.1% (n=4,233)	83.6% (n=6,439)	78.1% (n=12,401)
Weighted missing values, n=635				

The percentage of libraries reporting decreased hours open rose again this year, from 14.5 percent to 15.9 percent (Figure 2). However, the change is not as drastic as it was between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, when the percentage of libraries reporting decreased hours jumped from 4.5 percent to 14.5 percent. Urban public libraries saw the largest reductions in hours (-8 percent) compared with suburban and rural public library outlets. The number of public library outlets reporting increased hours held relatively steady, with only a .6 percent decline.

<b>Figure 3: Public Library Outlets Offering Public Access to the Internet, by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>Metropolitan Status</b>				
Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall	
99.5% (n=2,746)	99.4% (n=5,628)	99.3% (n=7,779)	99.3% (n=16,153)	
Weighted missing values, n=248				

Virtually all public library outlets (99.3 percent) provide public access to the Internet (Figure 3). This figure continues to increase slightly across-the-board; the 2009-2010 survey reported that 99.0 percent of libraries provided access.

**Figure 4: 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	47.6% (n=1,281)	61.0% (n=3,383)	72.8% (n=5,648)	64.5% (n=10,312)
No	35.7% (n=960)	24.4% (n=1,353)	18.2% (n=1,413)	23.1% (n=3,727)
Do not know	13.8% (n=370)	11.9% (n=662)	6.3% (n=487)	9.4% (n=1,519)
Other	2.9% (n=77)	2.7% (n=149)	2.7% (n=212)	2.7% (n=438)

Weighted missing values, n=157

As Figure 4 shows, fewer libraries (64.5 percent) report that they are the only provider of free public Internet and computer access compared with 66.6 percent last year. Consistent with previous studies, rural libraries report that they are the only provider of free public access more frequently than urban and suburban public libraries (72.8 percent as compared to 47.6 percent and 61.0 percent, respectively). The largest change occurred with urban libraries, which reported that 53.6 percent of these outlets are the only provided of free public Internet and computer access in 2009-2010 (-6.0 percent this year).

### **Public Access Technology Infrastructure: Availability, Replacement, Support, & Use**

**Figure 5: 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	11.6 (n=627)	8.6 (n=1,599)	4.1 (n=2,748)	6.5 (n=4,975)
1 year old	15.6 (n=667)	6.9 (n=1,510)	4.0 (n=2,098)	6.9 (n=4,276)
2 years old	13.2 (n=822)	8.3 (n=1,862)	4.4 (n=2,650)	7.1 (n=5,334)
3 years old	13.2 (n=907)	9.1 (n=1,995)	4.5 (n=2,731)	7.6 (n=5,632)
4 years old	13.7 (n=756)	8.2 (n=1,680)	4.2 (n=2,379)	7.1 (n=4,815)
5 years old	14.1 (n=654)	9.2 (n=1,626)	4.5 (n=3,056)	7.1 (n=5,337)
Overall	28.0 (n=2,319)	19.6 (n=5,081)	9.6 (n=7,269)	16.0 (n=14,669)

As in previous years, urban libraries have more workstations (28.0) than suburban (19.6) and rural (9.6) libraries, and few computers were added to rural libraries in the past year (the average was 9.2 in 2009-2010)(Figure 5). It is encouraging to see that the average number of computers in each age category increased this year, a reversal of the declines seen in all but two categories between the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 surveys. In addition, libraries reported more new computers this year (6.5 workstations less than 1 year old) than in 2009-2010 (4.6 workstations less than 1 year old).

**Figure 6: Public Access Workstation Replacement Procedure, by Metropolitan Status**

Replacement Procedure	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes, library has a replacement schedule	60.7% (n=1,538)	53.4% (n=2,857)	30.7% (n=2,326)	43.5% (n=6,722)
No (As Needed)	38.8% (n=985)	45.9% (n=2,456)	68.1% (n=5,159)	55.6% (n=8,599)
Don't Know	*	*	1.2% (n=90)	*

Weighted missing values, n=687  
**Key:** \* : Insufficient data to report

Overall, a majority of public libraries (55.6 percent) do not have replacement schedules and replace their workstations as needed (Figure 6). There is a stark difference between the replacement policy schedules between urban and rural libraries when compared by metropolitan status. The majority of urban libraries (60.7 percent) and suburban libraries (53.4 percent) have an established replacement policy whereas a majority of rural libraries (68.1 percent) do not. However, the overall percentage of library outlets with a replacement schedule did increase from last year (+3.6 percent).

**Figure 7: Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status**

Schedule	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Every year	-	*	4.1% (n=94)	1.8% (n=117)
Every 2 years	*	*	3.0% (n=69)	1.4% (n=95)
Every 3 years	16.7% (n=253)	23.5% (n=662)	26.3% (n=609)	22.9% (n=1,524)
Every 4 years	45.8% (n=696)	40.3% (n=1,138)	25.4% (n=589)	36.4% (n=2,422)
Every 5 years	30.3% (n=459)	25.7% (n=726)	28.0% (n=648)	27.6% (n=1,833)
Other	6.8% (n=104)	8.9% (n=252)	13.2% (n=306)	10.0% (n=663)

Weighted missing values, n=68  
**Key:** - No data to report  
**Key:** \* : Insufficient data to report

A majority of public libraries (86.9 percent) replace workstations every three-to-five years (Figure 7). More urban libraries replace their public access workstations every four years than every five years, a switch from last year when 32.9 percent reported replacements every four years, and 39.1 percent reported replacements every five years. The same shift was reported among suburban library outlets.

**Figure 8: Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstations Replacement Schedule, by Metropolitan Status**

Schedule	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes, able to maintain schedule	11.7% (n=166)	18.6% (n=476)	23.3% (n=493)	18.6% (n=1,135)
Yes, but the library branch does not know how many workstations/laptops they will replace	53.2% (n=754)	51.5% (n=1,316)	50.2% (n=1,064)	51.5% (n=3,134)
No, not able to maintain schedule	22.8% (n=323)	25.0% (n=639)	18.7% (n=397)	22.3% (n=1,359)
Don't Know	12.3% (n=174)	4.8% (n=122)	7.8% (n=165)	7.6% (n=461)
The average number of workstations that the library plans to replace within the next year	12.2 (n=227)	9.8 (n=563)	4.3 (n=571)	7.9 (n=1,361)
Weighted missing values, n=633				

Of the 43.5 percent of public libraries with a replacement schedule (Figure 6), 22.3 percent do not have the ability to maintain their replacement schedule (Figure 8). Libraries reported an average of 7.9 public access workstations are scheduled to be replaced within the next year, substantial drop from the average number of scheduled replacements reported in the 2009-2010 survey (18.7).

**Figure 9: Public Access Workstations Additions, by Metropolitan Status**

Schedule	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes	22.8% (n=516)	20.3% (n=1,012)	24.4% (n=1,718)	22.7% (n=3,245)
No	71.4% (n=1,612)	70.7% (n=3,517)	65.9% (n=4,642)	68.4% (n=9,772)
Don't Know	3.2% (n=72)	3.6% (n=178)	4.2% (n=296)	3.8% (n=546)
Other	2.6% (n=59)	5.4% (n=267)	5.5% (n=391)	5.0% (n=716)
Weighted missing values, n=1,874				

The majority of public libraries (68.4 percent) do not plan to add public access workstations in the next year (Figure 9). The percentage of libraries that do plan to add workstations decreased from 28.7 percent in

2009-2010 to 22.7 percent this year, an even further decrease from 33.0 percent in 2008-2009. In a change from last year when more urban libraries reported plans to add workstations (32.1 percent) than suburban (28.0 percent) and rural (28.0 percent) libraries, 24.4 percent of rural libraries reported plans to add workstations this year, followed by 20.3 percent of suburban libraries and 22.8 percent of urban libraries. In viewing the comments by libraries in the “other” grouping, a number of libraries indicated that their ability to add workstations depended on: 1) the receipt of Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) grants as provided through competitive grants made possible by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 through the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA); and 2) the availability of space.

**Figure 10: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops**

Factors	Overall						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
Availability of Space	6.0% (n=903)	4.1% (n=665)	11.1% (n=1,670)	21.2% (n=3,198)	56.0% (n=8,454)	1.3% (n=198)	4.2 (n=14,889)
Cost Factors	3.1% (n=462)	4.1% (n=625)	12.9% (n=1,951)	19.3% (n=2,912)	59.4% (n=8,946)	1.1% (n=171)	4.3 (n=14,896)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	13.7% (n=2,003)	16.0% (n=2,343)	28.5% (n=4,177)	24.0% (n=3,519)	15.4% (n=2,262)	2.3% (n=341)	3.1 (n=14,304)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	16.4% (n=2,406)	17.6% (n=2,582)	29.3% (n=4,290)	21.7% (n=3,168)	12.0% (n=1,759)	2.9% (n=429)	3.0 (n=14,205)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	16.3% (n=2,407)	18.1% (n=2,681)	24.0% (n=3,540)	23.3% (n=3,438)	15.4% (n=2,278)	2.9% (n=429)	3.0 (n=14,344)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	19.5% (n=2,888)	15.9% (n=2,350)	19.8% (n=2,932)	18.6% (n=2,749)	22.2% (n=3,288)	3.9% (n=583)	3.1 (n=14,207)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	13.3% (n=1,970)	11.6% (n=1,716)	18.5% (n=2,742)	23.3% (n=3,458)	31.1% (n=4,623)	2.3% (n=354)	3.5 (n=14,509)
Other	8.9% (n=109)	1.3% (n=16)	8.0% (n=98)	2.6% (n=32)	11.5% (n=141)	67.7% (n=832)	3.2 (n=397)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

The three most important factors influencing the addition of public library workstations continue to be cost (78.7 percent when factoring important and most important), space (77.2 percent when factoring important and most important), and availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure (54.4 percent when factoring important and most important) (Figure 10). Cost factors were rated slightly higher for rural libraries (60.4 percent) than for suburban (58.4 percent) and urban (58.3 percent), and availability of electrical

outlets, cabling and other infrastructure was rated higher by urban libraries (36.3 percent) than suburban (29.7 percent) and rural (30.4 percent) (Figures 11-13).

**Figure 11: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops**

Factors	Urban Public Libraries						Average (n)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
Availability of Space	4.8% (n=117)	5.2% (n=129)	10.0% (n=246)	22.9% (n=563)	55.6% (n=1,366)	1.5% (n=38)	4.2 (n=2,421)
Cost Factors	1.3% (n=32)	4.6% (n=113)	10.6% (n=261)	24.1% (n=593)	58.3% (n=1,438)	1.1% (n=28)	4.4 (n=2,438)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	18.0% (n=429)	20.0% (n=476)	23.8% (n=567)	17.8% (n=423)	16.3% (n=387)	4.2% (n=100)	2.3 (n=2,283)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	20.2% (n=484)	21.9% (n=524)	25.8% (n=618)	20.2% (n=484)	8.4% (n=200)	3.5% (n=83)	2.7 (n=2,310)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	19.0% (n=463)	22.6% (n=550)	22.2% (n=541)	19.6% (n=476)	12.2% (n=297)	4.4% (n=108)	2.8 (n=2,327)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	20.7% (n=505)	15.2% (n=370)	24.0% (n=584)	14.3% (n=350)	20.2% (n=493)	5.6% (n=136)	3.0 (n=2,302)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	12.8% (n=314)	10.3% (n=253)	15.1% (n=370)	23.7% (n=582)	36.3% (n=892)	1.8% (n=45)	3.6 (n=2,412)
Other	3.1% (n=6)	-	4.2% (n=8)	2.1% (n=4)	9.4% (n=17)	81.2% (n=147)	3.8 (n=34)
<b>Key:</b> - No data to report 1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

<b>Figure 12: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops</b>							
	<b>Suburban Public Libraries</b>						
<b>Factors</b>	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	Average
Availability of Space	5.5% (n=286)	3.9% (n=203)	11.3% (n=590)	21.3% (n=1,111)	56.9% (n=2,967)	1.2% (n=60)	4.2 (n=5,156)
Cost Factors	3.1% (n=159)	4.8% (n=250)	14.0% (n=732)	18.3% (n=956)	58.4% (n=3,046)	1.4% (n=72)	4.3 (n=5,144)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	15.9% (n=799)	16.5% (n=832)	30.3% (n=1,527)	22.1% (n=1,115)	12.9% (n=652)	2.2% (n=112)	3.0 (n=4,924)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	17.7% (n=888)	17.3% (n=871)	30.2% (n=1,517)	21.8% (n=1,095)	10.5% (n=530)	2.4% (n=122)	2.9 (n=4,899)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	17.4% (n=886)	17.1% (n=867)	24.9% (n=1,266)	24.7% (n=1,254)	13.8% (n=699)	2.1% (n=106)	3.0 (n=4,972)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	21.2% (n=1,076)	16.1% (n=819)	18.9% (n=962)	17.6% (n=896)	22.5% (n=1,114)	3.7% (n=188)	3.0 (n=4,897)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	11.9% (n=610)	12.0% (n=614)	19.7% (n=1,008)	24.8% (n=1,266)	29.7% (n=1,517)	1.9% (n=97)	3.5 (n=5,015)
Other	8.4% (n=33)	2.1% (n=8)	12.6% (n=50)	1.6% (n=6)	11.0% (n=43)	64.4% (n=254)	3.1 (n=141)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

**Figure 13: Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops**

Factors	Rural Public Libraries						Average (n)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
Availability of Space	6.8% (n=501)	4.5% (n=334)	11.3% (n=834)	20.6% (n=1,523)	55.6% (n=4,210)	1.4% (n=100)	4.1 (n=7,312)
Cost Factors	3.7% (n=271)	3.5% (n=261)	13.0% (n=958)	18.4% (n=1,362)	60.4% (n=4,462)	1.0% (n=71)	4.3 (n=7,314)
Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	10.7% (n=775)	14.3% (n=1,035)	28.8% (n=2,083)	27.4% (n=1,981)	16.9% (n=1,223)	1.8% (n=130)	3.3 (n=7,096)
Availability of public service staff to manage the use of the public access computers and users	14.3% (n=1,035)	16.4% (n=1,188)	29.9% (n=2,155)	22.0% (n=1,590)	14.2% (n=1,029)	3.1% (n=224)	3.1 (n=6,996)
Availability of technical staff to install, maintain, and update the public access computers	14.6% (n=1,058)	17.4% (n=1,264)	23.9% (n=1,733)	23.5% (n=1,708)	17.7% (n=1,282)	3.0% (n=216)	3.1 (n=7,045)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	18.0% (n=1,307)	16.0% (n=1,160)	19.1% (n=1,386)	20.7% (n=1,504)	22.7% (n=1,651)	3.6% (n=259)	3.1 (n=7,008)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	14.4% (n=1,046)	11.6% (n=848)	18.7% (n=1,364)	22.1% (n=1,610)	30.4% (n=2,214)	2.8% (n=202)	3.4 (n=7,083)
Other	10.8% (n=71)	1.2% (n=8)	6.3% (n=41)	3.3% (n=22)	12.3% (n=80)	66.0% (n=430)	3.1 (n=222)
1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

<b>Figure 14: Public Library Outlets Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by Metropolitan Status</b>				
	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			
<b>Length of Time</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Overall</b>
Less than one day	12.6% (n=312)	16.7% (n=883)	15.4% (n=1,154)	15.4% (n=2,350)
One day	27.4% (n=680)	27.3% (n=1,442)	20.4% (n=1,525)	23.9% (n=3,648)
Two days	38.5% (n=956)	27.7% (n=1,463)	21.2% (n=1,584)	26.3% (n=4,003)
More than two days	18.1% (n=450)	21.0% (n=1,107)	31.8% (n=2,377)	25.8% (n=3,934)
Don't know	*	1.3% (n=68)	3.5% (n=261)	2.2% (n=339)
Other amount of time	3.0% (n=74)	6.0% (n=319)	7.7% (n=573)	6.3% (n=966)
Weighted missing values, n=914 <b>Key:</b> *: Insufficient data to report				

Figure 14 presents the length of time it takes for public access computers to get back into service. Last year, the highest percentage of libraries reported an average of one day (26.4 percent). However, the 2010-2011 survey found most libraries (52.1 percent) take two or more than two days to restore a public access computer. Rural libraries are significantly more likely to require more than two days (31.8 percent) than urban (18.1 percent) and suburban (20.1 percent) libraries, but those percentages increased from the 2009-2010 survey results across all three metropolitan status categories.

**Figure 15: 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	40.7% (n=1,024)	42.4% (n=2,263)	36.0% (n=2,725)	39.0% (n=6,013)
Library director	4.2% (n=106)	22.1% (n=1,177)	47.6% (n=3,598)	31.7% (n=4,881)
Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	13.4% (n=336)	16.8% (n=898)	10.5% (n=791)	13.1% (n=2,025)
System-level IT staff	75.5% (n=1,901)	56.4% (n=3,008)	32.2% (n=2,513)	48.1% (n=7,422)
Library consortia or other library organization	5.6% (n=140)	17.3% (n=925)	13.2% (n=997)	13.4% (n=2,062)
County/City IT staff	30.5% (n=767)	20.2% (n=1,130)	11.0% (n=830)	17.7% (n=2,727)
State telecommunications network staff	1.7% (n=42)	4.0% (n=213)	3.8% (n=287)	3.5% (n=541)
State library IT staff	2.3% (n=57)	3.7% (n=197)	8.7% (n=660)	5.9% (n=913)
Outside vendor/contractor	16.2% (n=408)	21.4% (n=1,140)	37.7% (n=2,854)	28.5% (n=4,402)
Volunteer(s)	*	3.4% (n=182)	11.0% (n=834)	6.7% (n=1,031)
Other source	4.0% (n=100)	6.0% (n=323)	6.2% (n=469)	5.8% (n=892)

**Key:** \*: Insufficient data to report

Sources of information technology (IT) support used by public library outlets (Figure 15) continue to indicate that non-IT specialists are providing the majority of support services (70.7 percent), a slight increase from the 67.3 percent reported in the 2009-2010 survey. In urban (40.7 percent) and suburban (42.4 percent) libraries, public service staffs are providing most of this type of support, while rural libraries depend more on library directors (47.6 percent). The metropolitan variation has as much to do with overall staffing in rural libraries compared with larger suburban and urban libraries. System level IT staff continue to be a significant source of IT support (48.1 percent), especially by urban libraries (75.5 percent). Outside vendors/contractors are another important source (28.5 percent), particularly for rural libraries (37.7 percent).

<b>Figure 16: Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>Sufficiency of Public Access Workstations</b>	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			<b>Overall</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	
There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them throughout a typical day	31.7% (n=871)	16.3% (n=917)	12.4% (n=962)	17.1% (n=2,750)
There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	57.9% (n=1,589)	61.4% (n=3,449)	57.9% (n=4,485)	59.1% (n=9,524)
There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day	10.4% (n=285)	22.3% (n=1,250)	29.7% (n=2,305)	23.8% (n=3,840)
Weighted missing values, n=40				

A clear majority of libraries – 76.2 percent – report having insufficient public access Internet workstations to meet patrons’ needs at least sometimes during a typical day, an increase of 2.7 percent since the 2009-2010 survey (Figure 16). Urban libraries face the greatest challenge in providing a sufficient number of public access Internet workstations (89.6 percent report some insufficiency), while conversely, almost 30.0 percent of rural libraries indicate that they do have a sufficient number of workstations to meet patron demand.

<b>Figure 17: Use of Public Internet Workstations by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>Use of workstations</b>	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			<b>Overall</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	
Use of workstations increased since last fiscal year	72.4% (n=1,967)	70.8% (n=3,962)	68.1% (n=5,269)	69.8% (n=11,198)
Use of workstations decreased since last fiscal year	5.0% (n=136)	6.4% (n=358)	4.3% (n=332)	5.1% (n=826)
Use of workstations have stayed the same since last fiscal year	21.3% (n=578)	22.2% (n=1,241)	27.0% (n=2,089)	24.3% (n=3,908)
Not Applicable	*	*	*	*
Don't Know	1.1 (n=30)	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=101 <b>Key:</b> * : Insufficient data to report				

To understand changes in use of public Internet workstations, libraries were asked if use increased, decreased or stayed about the same in the past year (Figure 17). While the majority of public library outlets report an increase in use of public access Internet workstations (69.8 percent), this figure dropped by 5.9 percent since the 2009-2010 survey, while the percentage of libraries reporting a decrease in or a steady rate of workstation use rose. Last year, 3.1 percent reported a decrease, and 20.3 percent reported no change from 2008-2009 over all three metropolitan status categories.

**Figure 18: Use of Wireless Internet Access in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status**

Use of wireless Internet Access	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Use of wireless Internet access has increased since last fiscal year	78.8% (n=2,098)	78.0% (n=4,306)	72.1% (n=5,496)	75.3% (n=11,900)
Use of wireless Internet access has decreased since last fiscal year	*	*	*	*
Use of wireless Internet access has stayed the same since last fiscal year	8.7% (n=232)	9.5% (n=523)	10.1% (n=768)	9.6% (n=1,523)
Don't Know	3.8% (n=100)	3.4% (n=188)	1.7% (n=132)	2.7% (n=420)
Not Applicable	7.8% (n=208)	8.7% (n=480)	15.7% (n=1,197)	11.9% (n=1,885)
Weighted missing values, n=350				
<b>Key:</b> * : Insufficient data to report				

As Figure 18 demonstrates, use of wireless Internet access in all public library outlets continues to increase (up 4.2 percent from last year's survey). While 9.6 percent of public library outlets reported that use of wireless Internet access stayed the same over the past year (a slight increase from the year before of .6 percent), virtually no libraries reported a decrease in the use of the library's wireless Internet service.

**Figure 19: Use of Patron Technology Training Classes in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status**

Use of patron technology training classes	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Use of patron technology training classes has increased since last fiscal year	40.8% (n=1,047)	32.4% (n=1,740)	19.4% (n=1,435)	27.6% (n=4,222)
Use of patron technology training classes has decreased since last fiscal year	3.9% (n=100)	4.5% (n=240)	3.7% (n=277)	4.0% (n=617)
Use of patron technology training classes has stayed the same since last fiscal year	27.3% (n=701)	24.8% (n=1,328)	24.7% (n=1,824)	25.2% (n=3,853)
Not Applicable	19.5% (n=501)	30.5% (n=1,635)	49.9% (n=3,683)	38.0% (n=5,818)
Don't Know	8.4% (n=215)	7.9% (n=422)	2.2% (n=165)	5.2% (n=802)
Weighted missing values, n=841				

Overall, only 27.6 percent of libraries report an increase in the usage of patron technology training classes (Figure 19). However, 40.8 percent of urban libraries report an increase in the usage of patron technology training classes, as compared to 32.4 percent of suburban and only 19.4 percent of rural libraries. These figures are consistent with data collected during the 2009-2010 survey cycle.

**Figure 20: Use of Electronic Resources in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status**

Use of electronic resources	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Use of electronic resources increased since last fiscal year	64.0% (n=1,639)	59.3% (n=3,172)	30.8% (n=2,273)	49.8% (n=7,614)
Use of electronic resources decreased since last fiscal year	4.9% (n=125)	1.2% (n=64)	1.6% (n=118)	2.0% (n=307)
Use of electronic resources have stayed the same since last fiscal year	13.9% (n=355)	21.2% (n=1,134)	30.8% (n=2,273)	24.6% (n=3,762)
Don't Know	15.2% (n=389)	13.6% (n=726)	13.9% (n=1,027)	14.0% (n=2,142)
Not Applicable	2.0% (n=51)	4.7% (n=250)	15.6% (n=1,152)	9.5% (n=1,454)
Weighted missing values, n=875				

Nearly half – 49.8 percent – of public libraries report an increase in usage of their electronic resources (Figure 20). The most significant change from the 2009-2010 survey is visible among suburban library outlets, where the number of outlets reporting an increase in the use of electronic resources rose by 9.6 percent.

**Public Library Internet Connectivity Type, Speed, & Sufficiency**

**Figure 21: Availability of Fiber Optic Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status**

Fiber Optic Public Access Internet Connection	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Yes, the connection is fiber optic	65.6% (n=1,608)	42.8% (n=2,241)	21.8% (n=1,612)	36.2% (n=5,461)
No, the connection is not fiber optic	32.1% (n=786)	49.4% (n=2,588)	61.5% (n=4,556)	52.6% (n=7,931)
Don't know	2.3% (n=57)	7.7% (n=406)	16.7% (n=1,235)	11.2% (n=1,697)
Weighted missing values, n=1,063				

Figure 21 shows the percentage of library outlets with fiber optic public access Internet connections. A majority (65.6 percent) of urban library outlets offer fiber optic connection, with 42.8 percent of suburban outlets and only 21.8 percent of rural outlets also offering fiber connections. Overall, the number of public library outlets offering fiber optic connections increased by 5.5 percent from the 2009-2010 survey, but the largest gains were seen in urban (+ 8.5 percent) and suburban (+7.1 percent) library outlets, while only 4.1 percent more rural library outlets report fiber optic connections.

<b>Figure 22: Public Library Outlets Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>Maximum Speed</b>	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			<b>Overall</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	
Less than 256 kbps	*	*	2.3% (n=167)	1.4% (n=211)
257 kbps - 768 kbps	*	4.2% (n=215)	6.9% (n=501)	5.0% (n=733)
769 kbps - 1.4 Mbps	1.4% (n=328)	4.2% (n=215)	5.8% (n=418)	5.6% (n=824)
1.5 Mbps (T1)	9.8% (n=232)	21.1% (n=1,076)	28.0% (n=2,030)	22.7% (n=3,338)
1.6 Mbps-3.0 Mbps	11.1% (n=263)	9.9% (n=505)	13.7% (n=995)	12.0% (n=1,763)
3.1 Mbps-6.0 Mbps	12.2% (n=289)	10.7% (n=544)	11.5% (n=832)	11.3% (n=1,666)
6.1 Mbps-10 Mbps	16.3% (n=386)	14.6% (n=745)	9.0% (n=650)	12.1% (n=1,780)
10.0-20.0 Mbps	22.2% (n=525)	12.3% (n=625)	6.1% (n=440)	10.8% (n=1,590)
20.1-30.0 Mbps	2.7% (n=64)	2.4% (n=124)	1.4% (n=102)	2.0% (n=290)
30.1-40.0 Mbps	1.0% (n=23)	2.1% (n=106)	1.1% (n=80)	1.4% (n=209)
Greater than 40 Mbps	20.8% (n=491)	13.1% (n=666)	5.8% (n=418)	10.7% (n=1,576)
Don't Know	1.4% (n=32)	4.7% (n=242)	6.3% (n=459)	5.0% (n=734)
Weighted missing values, n=1,440				
<b>Key:</b> * Insufficient data to report				

Figure 22 shows the maximum speed of public Internet access offered by library outlets. The percentage of libraries offering speeds greater than 1.5Mbps (T1) has increased almost 10.0 percent from 2009-2010. In the current survey, 60.3 percent of libraries reported connection speeds greater than 1.5Mbps, compared to 51.8 percent in the last survey. There also is a reported drop in the percentage of libraries with connection speeds of less than 1.5Mbps (12.0 percent in 2010-2011 versus 14.8 percent last year). In addition, the percentage of libraries reporting greater than 10Mbps connection speeds is up to 24.9 percent over last year's report of 18.4 percent. The percentage of urban libraries reporting connection speeds greater than 40Mbps grew from 14.8 percent in 2009-2010 to 20.8 percent in the current survey, and suburban libraries increased from 9.5 percent to 13.1 percent. Only a small percentage – 5.8 percent – of rural libraries report connection speeds of greater than 40Mbps. The percentages of rural libraries reporting connection speeds greater than 1.5Mbps have grown 9.9 percent from 38.7 percent last year to 48.6 percent in 2010-2011. This growth is accompanied by a decrease in rural libraries reporting connection speeds below 1.5Mbps, declining from 20.4 to 15.0 percent.

**Figure 23: Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets over the last year, by Metropolitan Status**

Public Access Internet Connection Increase	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased	27.0% (n=661)	22.1% (n=1,148)	20.2% (n=1,488)	22.0% (n=3,298)
Stayed the same	72.1% (n=1,765)	76.8% (n=3,985)	77.5% (n=5,701)	76.4% (n=11,451)
Don't know	*	1.1% (n=58)	2.2% (n=163)	1.6% (n=242)
Weighted missing values, n=1,163				
<b>Key:</b> * Insufficient data to report				

Though libraries continue to increase their speed of connectivity, most public libraries have not increased their connection speeds. A majority of libraries, 76.4 percent, reported that their speed stayed the same (Figure 23). This is consistent across metropolitan status categories, with the majority of rural (77.5 percent), suburban (76.8 percent), and urban (72.1 percent) libraries maintaining their connection speeds. The percentage of urban outlets reporting increased connection speeds dropped from 33.3 percent in 2009-2010 to 27.0 percent in 2010-2011. Urban outlets still reported the highest number of increases, with rural libraries reporting the smallest number of increases at 20.2 percent.

**Figure 24: 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	10.5% (n=261)	12.6% (n=650)	14.9% (n=1,097)	13.3% (n=2,008)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at some times	34.1% (n=847)	30.3% (n=1,570)	31.6% (n=2,336)	31.6% (n=4,753)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at all times	55.0% (n=1,366)	56.7% (n=2,934)	53.1% (n=3,918)	54.6% (n=8,218)
Don't know	*	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=1,112				
<b>Key:</b> * Insufficient data to report				

Figure 24 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), 44.9 percent of libraries indicated those connection speeds are insufficient to meet patron needs some or all of the time. This is consistent with the 2009-2010 report. Adequate connection speeds were reported by 54.6 percent of public libraries, with urban libraries reporting the greatest increase, approximately 7 percent (up from 47.6 percent last year). However, suburban (56.7 percent) and rural (53.1 percent) libraries reported slight decreases in the adequacy of connection speeds (down from 57.9 percent and 54.3 percent, respectively).

**Figure 25: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status**

Increasing Adequacy of Connections	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
No, the connection speed is already at the maximum level available	10.9% (n=265)	14.7% (n=753)	25.5% (n=1,861)	19.4% (n=2,879)
No, there is no interest in increasing the speed of public access Internet connection	9.0% (n=217)	11.1% (n=567)	10.4% (n=758)	10.4% (n=1,542)
Yes, there is interest in increasing the branch's bandwidth, but the library cannot currently afford to	26.5% (n=643)	29.8% (n=1,529)	30.1% (n=2,199)	29.4% (n=4,370)
Yes, and there are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	10.8% (n=505)	12.6% (n=646)	9.6% (n=699)	12.5% (n=1,849)
It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	23.2% (n=563)	20.0% (n=1,022)	10.8% (n=785)	16.0% (n=2,371)
There is interest but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library	*	*	1.6% (n=118)	1.0% (n=152)
Other	7.6% (n=183)	7.8% (n=397)	5.1% (n=371)	6.4% (n=952)
Don't Know	1.6% (n=38)	3.6% (n=186)	7.0% (n=512)	5.0% (n=736)
Weighted missing values, n=1,303				
<b>Key:</b> * Insufficient data to report				

The extent to which library outlets can increase their connection speeds to meet demand is presented in Figure 25. A decreasing percentage of urban libraries report plans to increase the bandwidth within the next year (10.8 percent, down from 16.4 percent last year), while an increasing percentage of suburban (12.8 percent, up from 8.9 percent) and rural (9.6 percent, up from 5.5 percent) libraries report the same plans. Libraries continue to report that even though higher bandwidth was available they could not afford it – 29.4 percent of libraries overall report this to be the case.

**Figure 26: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status**

Availability of Public Access Wireless Internet Services	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Currently available for public use when the library is open and closed	69.8% (n=1,714)	65.0% (n=3,356)	64.7% (n=4,754)	65.7% (n=9,825)
Currently available for public use only when library is open	21.6% (n=531)	24.3% (n=1,254)	16.5% (n=1,213)	20.0% (n=2,998)
Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	4.9% (n=121)	4.4% (n=230)	7.2% (n=532)	5.9% (n=883)
Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	3.5% (n=87)	6.2% (n=319)	11.2% (n=822)	8.2% (n=1,228)
Weighted missing values, n=1,190				

Figure 26 shows the availability of public access wireless connections (Wi-fi) to the Internet in public libraries. Public libraries continue to increase wireless availability, as 85.7 percent of libraries offer wireless connection (up from 82.2 percent in 2009-2010). Urban and suburban libraries continue to provide wireless access at similar rates (91.8 percent and 89.1 percent respectively), although urban libraries experienced 4.3 percent growth from last year compared to 1.8 percent grown for suburban libraries. Wireless access in rural libraries has increased 5.0 percent to 81.5 percent. The percentage of libraries that do not provide wireless access and have no plans to make it available decreased from 10.6 percent last year to 8.2 percent in the current survey.

**Figure 27: 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	35.8% (n=798)	48.8% (n=2,224)	68.9% (n=4,024)	55.8% (n=7,046)
Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share bandwidth/connection; but have management techniques	36.2% (n=807)	28.1% (n=1,281)	15.9% (n=928)	23.9% (n=3,016)
No, the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	27.3% (n=609)	21.8% (n=993)	12.5% (n=730)	18.5% (n=2,332)
Don't know	*	1.3% (n=58)	2.9% (n=161)	1.9% (n=234)
Weighted missing values, n=194				
<b>Key:</b> * : Insufficient data to report				

Figure 27 outlines the level of sharing between wireless and public access workstation connections. Fewer urban libraries report sharing the wireless and public access workstations connections (down from 41.6 percent to 35.8 percent), with a correlated increase in separate connections (up from 24.4 percent to 27.3 percent) and shared connections with management techniques (up from 33.9 percent to 36.2 percent) in 2010-2011. Similarly to last year, 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 68.9 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 28: 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	1.0% (n=151)	1.2% (n=173)	5.9% (n=872)	17.4% (n=2,587)	74.4% (n=11,089)	0.2% (n=28)	4.6 (n=14,873)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	3.0% (n=451)	8.4% (n=1,246)	26.5% (n=3,934)	28.2% (n=4,178)	33.4% (n=4,951)	0.4% (n=66)	3.8 (n=14,761)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or paying traffic tickets	0.9% (n=127)	1.5% (n=228)	8.8% (n=1,307)	24.5% (n=3,650)	64.0% (n=9,525)	0.3% (n=37)	4.5 (n=14,838)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	3.9% (n=576)	9.3% (n=1,383)	24.6% (n=3,661)	24.2% (n=3,590)	33.5% (n=4,983)	4.5% (n=667)	3.8 (n=14,193)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	2.1% (n=307)	5.5% (n=817)	18.5% (n=2,756)	29.0% (n=4,319)	44.2% (n=6,574)	0.7% (n=103)	4.1 (n=14,773)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	3.1% (n=454)	8.0% (n=1,179)	22.1% (n=3,277)	31.9% (n=4,726)	34.2% (n=5,076)	0.8% (n=118)	3.9 (n=14,702)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	3.0% (n=447)	7.0% (n=1,033)	20.8% (n=3,080)	29.5% (n=4,374)	38.7% (n=5,738)	1.1% (n=166)	3.9 (n=14,672)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	2.2% (n=325)	5.9% (n=882)	19.3% (n=2,864)	33.2% (n=4,922)	38.7% (n=5,747)	0.7% (n=107)	4.0 (n=14,740)
The library provides information for college applicants	2.6% (n=388)	9.1% (n=1,336)	26.8% (n=3,963)	28.6% (n=4,219)	32.2% (n=4,750)	0.7% (n=105)	3.8 (n=14,656)
The library provides information about the library's community	3.4% (n=504)	9.0% (n=1,323)	23.6% (n=3,493)	27.3% (n=4,026)	36.2% (n=5,348)	0.5% (n=79)	3.8 (n=14,694)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	9.6% (n=1,427)	19.3% (n=2,858)	29.2% (n=4,334)	21.7% (n=3,217)	18.6% (n=2,753)	1.6% (n=233)	3.2 (n=14,589)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	12.8% (n=1,894)	15.9% (n=2,350)	22.9% (n=3,391)	20.1% (n=2,967)	24.3% (n=3,592)	4.0% (n=591)	3.3 (n=14,193)
Other	4.8% (n=66)	1.6% (n=22)	8.8% (n=119)	11.1% (n=150)	44.6% (n=603)	29.0% (n=392)	4.2 (n=959)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

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, and education resources and databases for K-12 students (Figure 28).

- 91.8 percent report that services to job-seekers are either important or most important.

- 88.5 percent report that access to government information and services is either important or most important.
- 73.2 percent report providing education resources and databases for K-12 students is either important or most important.

Figures 29-31 detail the extent to which public Internet services are important to the community. 96.6 percent of urban public libraries report that services to job-seekers are either important or most important, followed by 86.5 percent reporting that access to government information and services is either important or most important, and 78.3 percent reporting that education resources and databases for K-12 students are either important or most important. 94.7 percent of suburban public libraries report that services to job-seekers are either important or most important, followed by 90.1 percent reporting that access to government information and services is either important or most important, and 76.4 percent reporting that providing education resources and databases for K-12 students is either important or most important. 88.2 percent of rural public libraries report that services to job-seekers are either important or most important, followed by 88.2 percent reporting that access to government information and services is either important or most important, and 76.4 percent reporting that providing education resources and databases for K-12 students is either important or most important.

<b>Figure 29: Extent to which Public Internet Services are Important to the Community</b>							
<b>Services</b>	<b>Urban Public Libraries</b>						<b>Average</b>
	<b>Least Important</b>	<b>Unimportant</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Most Important</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>	
The library provides services to job seekers	0.2% (n=6)	0.6% (n=13)	2.5% (n=59)	13.9% (n=329)	82.7% (n=1,958)	0.1% (n=2)	4.8 (n=2,364)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	1.6% (n=38)	6.0% (n=142)	25.0% (n=590)	27.5% (n=650)	39.6% (n=936)	0.2% (n=6)	4.0 (n=2,355)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or paying traffic tickets	0.2% (n=6)	0.8% (n=19)	12.2% (n=289)	23.7% (n=561)	62.8% (n=1,489)	0.2% (n=6)	4.5 (n=2,364)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	2.3% (n=55)	5.5% (n=130)	24.7% (n=586)	23.6% (n=559)	42.2% (n=1,002)	1.7% (n=40)	4.0 (n=2,332)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	1.2% (n=28)	2.9% (n=68)	17.4% (n=414)	27.0% (n=641)	51.3% (n=1,217)	0.2% (n=6)	4.2 (n=2,368)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	3.1% (n=74)	6.6% (n=155)	23.6% (n=556)	32.7% (n=771)	33.7% (n=796)	0.3% (n=8)	3.9 (n=2,351)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	2.5% (n=59)	5.4% (n=127)	22.5% (n=522)	30.2% (n=714)	38.9% (n=920)	0.6% (n=13)	4.0 (n=2,353)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	1.0% (n=23)	4.0% (n=95)	20.9% (n=493)	33.8% (n=799)	40.1% (n=947)	0.2% (n=6)	4.1 (n=2,357)
The library provides information for college applicants	1.9% (n=45)	7.9% (n=185)	29.8% (n=701)	26.8% (n=629)	33.1% (n=777)	0.5% (n=11)	3.8 (n=2,338)
The library provides information about the library's community	1.6% (n=38)	6.7% (n=159)	22.6% (n=533)	26.9% (n=635)	42.1% (n=992)	0.1% (n=2)	4.0 (n=2,357)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	5.2% (n=123)	21.3% (n=503)	25.3% (n=597)	19.3% (n=455)	28.2% (n=667)	0.7% (n=17)	3.4 (n=2,345)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	3.9% (n=93)	11.1% (n=263)	19.3% (n=455)	27.3% (n=644)	38.0% (n=898)	0.4% (n=9)	3.8 (n=2,353)
Other	-	-	7.2% (n=13)	21.6% (n=40)	49.5% (n=91)	21.6% (n=40)	4.5 (n=144)
Key: - : No data to report 1=Least Important; 5=Most Important							

**Figure 30: 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	0.8% (n=41)	0.3% (n=17)	4.1% (n=213)	15.7% (n=811)	79.0% (n=4,090)	0.1% (n=4)	4.7 (n=5,173)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	2.7% (n=141)	7.2% (n=368)	24.4% (n=1,254)	29.3% (n=1,504)	36.1% (n=1,856)	0.4% (n=19)	3.9 (n=5,123)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or paying traffic tickets	0.6% (n=33)	1.2% (n=62)	8.0% (n=412)	27.1% (n=1,397)	63.0% (n=3,248)	0.1% (n=6)	4.5 (n=5,152)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	2.6% (n=134)	8.1% (n=416)	22.7% (n=1,167)	25.2% (n=1,299)	37.5% (n=1,930)	4.0% (n=205)	3.9 (n=4,947)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	1.4% (n=72)	4.8% (n=246)	17.2% (n=888)	30.4% (n=1,570)	46.0% (n=2,375)	0.3% (n=14)	4.1 (n=5,152)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	2.6% (n=134)	7.8% (n=401)	22.5% (n=1,161)	34.1% (n=1,755)	32.6% (n=1,678)	0.4% (n=19)	3.9 (n=5,129)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	2.0% (n=101)	6.7% (n=343)	21.3% (n=1,097)	30.5% (n=1,572)	38.8% (n=1,997)	0.8% (n=39)	4.0 (n=5,110)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	1.4% (n=74)	6.1% (n=317)	19.0% (n=979)	34.9% (n=1,800)	38.2% (n=1,970)	0.3% (n=17)	4.0 (n=5,139)
The library provides information for college applicants	2.0% (n=101)	9.3% (n=474)	28.0% (n=1,434)	29.0% (n=1,483)	31.3% (n=1,601)	0.4% (n=23)	3.8 (n=5,094)
The library provides information about the library's community	3.2% (n=166)	7.6% (n=389)	21.5% (n=1,103)	28.1% (n=1,442)	39.4% (n=2,023)	0.3% (n=17)	3.9 (n=5,123)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	7.0% (n=362)	15.7% (n=807)	28.0% (n=1,440)	27.3% (n=1,403)	21.3% (n=1,092)	0.7% (n=35)	3.4 (n=5,104)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	9.3% (n=478)	14.5% (n=745)	23.3% (n=1,196)	23.2% (n=1,190)	27.2% (n=1,399)	2.5% (n=128)	3.5 (n=5,007)
Other	3.5% (n=14)	1.0% (n=4)	15.9% (n=66)	10.4% (n=43)	36.3% (n=151)	32.8% (n=137)	4.1 (n=279)

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

**Figure 31: 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	1.4% (n=104)	1.9% (n=143)	8.2% (n=601)	19.7% (n=1,447)	68.5% (n=5,041)	0.3% (n=22)	4.5 (n=7,336)
The library provides information for economic development (e.g., start a business, seek business opportunities)	3.7% (n=273)	10.1% (n=736)	28.5% (n=2,091)	27.6% (n=2,024)	29.5% (n=2,159)	0.6% (n=41)	3.7 (n=7,283)
The library provides access to government information and services, like unemployment benefits, tax, forms, Medicare information or paying traffic tickets	1.2% (n=88)	2.0% (n=147)	8.3% (n=607)	23.0% (n=1,692)	65.2% (n=4,788)	0.3% (n=26)	4.5 (n=7,322)
The library provides computer and Internet skills training	5.3% (n=387)	11.4% (n=836)	26.0% (n=1,908)	23.6% (n=1,731)	28.0% (n=2,051)	5.8% (n=422)	3.6 (n=6,914)
The library provides education resources and databases for K-12 students	2.8% (n=206)	6.9% (n=502)	19.8% (n=1,455)	28.7% (n=2,108)	40.6% (n=2,982)	1.1% (n=82)	4.0 (n=7,253)
The library provides education resources and databases for students in higher education	3.4% (n=245)	8.5% (n=622)	21.3% (n=1,561)	30.1% (n=2,201)	35.5% (n=2,593)	1.3% (n=92)	3.9 (n=7,222)
The library provides education resources and databases for home schooling	3.9% (n=287)	7.7% (n=563)	19.8% (n=1,451)	28.5% (n=2,087)	38.5% (n=2,821)	1.6% (n=114)	3.9 (n=7,208)
The library provides education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	3.1% (n=228)	6.4% (n=471)	19.0% (n=1,392)	31.7% (n=2,322)	38.6% (n=2,831)	1.2% (n=84)	4.0 (n=7,243)
The library provides information for college applicants	3.3% (n=241)	9.3% (n=677)	25.1% (n=1,828)	28.9% (n=2,106)	32.5% (n=2,371)	1.0% (n=71)	3.8 (n=7,224)
The library provides information about the library's community	4.1% (n=300)	10.7% (n=775)	25.5% (n=1,857)	26.8% (n=1,949)	32.1% (n=2,332)	0.8% (n=61)	3.7 (n=7,214)
The library provides information about databases regarding investments	12.9% (n=942)	21.2% (n=1,549)	31.4% (n=2,297)	18.6% (n=1,358)	13.6% (n=993)	2.5% (n=181)	3.0 (n=7,139)
The library provides services to immigrant populations	18.2% (n=1,323)	18.4% (n=1,343)	23.9% (n=1,739)	15.5% (n=1,133)	17.8% (n=1,296)	6.2% (n=453)	3.0 (n=6,833)
Other	6.8% (n=51)	2.3% (n=18)	5.2% (n=39)	8.9% (n=67)	48.0% (n=3619)	28.7% (n=216)	4.2 (n=536)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

**Technology Training Offered by Public Libraries**

**Figure 32: Public Library Outlets Offering Formal or Informal Technology Training, Availability by Metropolitan Status**

Training Availability	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Offers formal technology training classes	58.8% (n=1,297)	46.6% (n=2,561)	25.2% (n=1,727)	38.0% (n=5,263)
Offers one-on-one technology training sessions by appointment	29.2% (n=644)	30.9% (n=1,481)	25.9% (n=1,777)	28.1% (n=3,902)
Offers informal point-of-use assistance	79.4% (n=1,750)	80.5% (n=3,865)	77.3% (n=5,308)	78.8% (n=10,923)
Offers online training material	40.2% (n=886)	34.9% (n=1,674)	22.4% (n=1,537)	29.5% (n=4,097)
Does not offer any technology training	7.6% (n=168)	10.7% (n=515)	15.6% (n=1,074)	12.7% (n=1,757)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

The types of technology training offered to patrons are presented in Figure 32. The greatest percentage of outlets (78.8 percent) provide informal, point-of-use assistance, and 12.7 percent offer no technology training at all, up from 10.9 percent last year. Of the 38.0 percent of outlets that offer formal technology training classes, urban outlets (58.8 percent) comprise the majority; 46.6 percent of suburban outlets also provide formal training. Libraries offering online training material grew to 29.5 percent this year from 21.7 percent in 2009-2010 (+7.8 percent).

**Figure 33: Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status**

Technology Training Classes	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
General computer skills (e.g., how to use mouse, keyboard, printing)	93.7% (n=1,176)	92.9% (n=1,990)	92.3% (n=1,527)	92.9% (n=4,693)
General software use (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation)	82.8% (n=1,039)	80.9% (n=1,734)	75.2% (n=1,245)	79.5% (n=4,018)
General Internet use (e.g., set up e-mail, Web browsing)	92.8% (n=1,164)	94.7% (n=2,030)	92.4% (n=1,529)	93.5% (n=4,723)
General online/Web searching (e.g., using Google, Yahoo, others)	81.8% (n=1,026)	82.8% (n=1,775)	80.9% (n=1,339)	81.9% (n=4,140)
Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	49.8% (n=626)	52.9% (n=1,134)	51.7% (n=856)	51.8% (n=2,615)
Using online databases (e.g., commercial databases to search and find content)	56.2% (n=705)	59.7% (n=1,281)	46.4% (n=768)	54.5% (n=2,753)
Safe online practices (e.g., not divulging personal information)	29.2% (n=367)	38.0% (n=815)	37.5% (n=620)	35.6% (n=1,802)
Accessing online government information (e.g., Medicare, taxes, how to complete forms)	28.6% (n=359)	30.5% (n=654)	31.6% (n=522)	30.4% (n=1,535)
Accessing online job-seeking and career-related information	51.4% (n=644)	52.9% (n=1,136)	39.4% (n=652)	48.1% (n=2,432)
Accessing online medical information (e.g., health literacy)	22.4% (n=282)	26.6% (n=571)	25.0% (n=414)	25.1% (n=1,267)
Accessing online investment information	16.4% (n=206)	17.4% (n=372)	9.3% (n=153)	14.5% (n=732)
Accessing genealogy information	31.8% (n=399)	42.5% (n=912)	45.6% (n=754)	40.8% (n=2,065)
Accessing consumer information (e.g., product value, safety, reliability, warranty information)	18.7% (n=234)	24.5% (n=526)	19.0% (n=314)	21.2% (n=1,074)
Digital photography, software and online applications (e.g., Photoshop, Flickr)	22.6% (n=283)	34.0% (n=730)	31.8% (n=526)	30.4% (n=1,540)
Social Networking (e.g., blogging, RSS)	31.5% (n=395)	37.4% (n=308)	35.5% (n=587)	35.3% (n=1,785)
Other technology-based training classes	6.8% (n=85)	5.6% (n=120)	5.9% (n=98)	6.0% (n=303)

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 32. For libraries offering formal training, general Internet use classes are the most common (93.5 percent), followed by general computer skills classes (92.9 percent). More than three-quarters of libraries (81.9 percent) report training patrons on general online/Web searching and general software use classes (79.5 percent). The percentage of libraries offering classes on accessing online job-seeking and career related information grew to 48.1 percent from 42.8 percent in 2009-2010. Relatively few outlets (14.5 percent) provide training on accessing online investment information. Social networking training grew, with 35.3 percent of libraries now offering this training from 27.4 percent in 2008-2009. Training on how to access online government

information in suburban (30.5 percent) and rural (31.6 percent) libraries grew, from 29.1 percent and 25.4 percent respectively, to surpassing the training offered by urban libraries (down from 38.7 to 28.6 percent). Genealogical research classes continue to be more common in suburban (42.5 percent) and rural (45.6 percent) libraries than in urban (31.8 percent) libraries.

**Public Access Services Available to Users and Communities**

**Figure 34: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users**

	Overall		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service from Outside the Library (i.e., via the Web)
<b>Resources</b>			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	33.1% (n=4,766)	48.0% (n=6,916)	55.1% (n=7,939)
Licensed databases	0.2% (n=28)	98.1% (n=14,480)	98.6% (n=14,540)
E-books	32.8% (n=4,747)	45.7% (n=6,618)	60.9% (n=8,815)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	89.6% (n=12,438)	8.9% (n=1,238)	2.9% (n=374)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	41.9% (n=5,987)	48.4% (n=6,925)	40.7% (n=5,819)
Homework help	13.0% (n=1,894)	74.0% (n=10,779)	66.2% (n=9,646)
Audio content (e.g., music, audio books, other)	17.2% (n=2,508)	65.6% (n=9,557)	59.5% (n=8,672)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	38.7% (n=5,557)	52.4% (n=7,515)	36.8% (n=5,278)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	53.9% (n=7,698)	37.9% (n=5,411)	35.8% (n=5,119)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	39.9% (n=5,749)	48.2% (n=6,936)	43.7% (n=6,292)
Online book clubs	69.4% (n=9,716)	23.1% (n=3,230)	25.3% (n=3,540)
<b>Services</b>			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	6.5% (n=950)	93.4% (n=13,736)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	33.1% (n=4,807)	66.6% (n=9,664)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	44.6% (n=6,462)	55.1% (n=7,980)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	30.6% (n=4,425)	68.7% (n=9,926)	---
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., e-readers, netbooks)	72.2% (n=8,283)	27.8% (n=3,189)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

Figure 33 illustrates the range of Internet-based resources and services that public libraries provide to their patrons. In this year's survey, libraries were provided with three service choices, and were no longer able to indicate that they only provided limited access. Licensed databases continued to be the most commonly

provided service, with rates of access jumping to 98.1 percent of outlets offering service in the library (from 73.3 percent last year) and to 98.6 percent offering service to patrons accessing them outside the library (from 74.5 percent last year). Libraries also offer substantial homework assistance, with 74.0 percent offering such services from within the library and 66.2 percent supporting access from outside the library. Audio content is also provided by a number of libraries, with 65.6 percent offering these services within the library and 59.5 percent supporting access from outside the library. Finally, 60.9 percent of library outlets offer e-books from outside the library, up from 55.6 last year, and 45.7 percent from within the library. In a new question this year, 27.8 percent of libraries reporting providing access to mobile devices, such as e-readers, in their library.

Figures 35 through 37 present the detailed services that urban, suburban and rural libraries make available to users.

**Figure 35: 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)
<b>Resources</b>			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	21.2% (n=505)	57.4% (n=1,368)	75.4% (n=1,799)
Licensed databases	0.2% (n=4)	99.0% (n=2,391)	98.0% (n=2,391)
E-books	13.2% (n=318)	64.2% (n=1,538)	82.8% (n=1,985)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	93.0% (n=2,070)	6.5% (n=146)	2.9% (n=62)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	34.3% (n=813)	60.1% (n=1,425)	57.2% (n=1,357)
Homework help	10.2% (n=244)	79.5% (n=1,899)	81.6% (n=1,949)
Audio content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	6.8% (n=163)	75.4% (n=1,813)	81.2% (n=1,952)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	23.8% (n=569)	68.9% (n=1,644)	62.1% (n=1,482)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	29.4% (n=701)	62.8% (n=1,499)	63.9% (n=1,523)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	22.7% (n=541)	63.0% (n=1,501)	70.6% (n=1,680)
Online book clubs	55.4% (n=1,285)	37.2% (n=864)	41.9% (n=973)
<b>Services</b>			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	2.4% (n=57)	97.3% (n=2,344)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	37.3% (n=881)	62.1% (n=1,465)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	51.5% (n=1,232)	48.1% (n=1,149)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	81.0% (n=1,939)	18.2% (n=435)	---
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., e-readers, netbooks)	77.8% (n=1,442)	22.2% (n=412)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

**Figure 36: 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)
<b>Resources</b>			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	26.8% (n=1,335)	53.1% (n=2,640)	64.5% (n=3,207)
Licensed databases	0.1% (n=4)	98.7% (n=5,036)	98.8% (n=5,040)
E-books	20.2% (n=1,016)	55.3% (n=2,777)	73.7% (n=3,699)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	89.5% (n=4,252)	9.4% (n=445)	2.5% (n=110)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	38.9% (n=1,903)	50.8% (n=2,489)	47.0% (n=2,303)
Homework help	9.0% (n=455)	78.6% (n=3,964)	77.5% (n=3,910)
Audio content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	11.2% (n=563)	69.6% (n=3,499)	72.6% (n=3,654)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	35.7% (n=1,765)	54.1% (n=2,673)	45.6% (n=2,255)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	47.9% (n=2,352)	43.0% (n=2,108)	42.1% (n=2,065)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	33.1% (n=1,651)	53.8% (n=2,688)	54.7% (n=2,733)
Online book clubs	63.1% (n=3,066)	28.1% (n=1,366)	31.8% (n=1,543)
<b>Services</b>			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	4.4% (n=226)	95.6% (n=4,850)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	35.4% (n=1,771)	64.4% (n=3,224)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	46.8% (n=2,334)	52.8% (n=2,634)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	71.7% (n=3,581)	27.4% (n=1,366)	---
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., e-readers, netbooks)	70.8% (n=2,803)	29.2% (n=1,159)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

<b>Figure 37: Services that the Library Makes Available to Users</b>			
	<b>Rural Public Libraries</b>		
	Does Not Offer Service	Offers Service in Library	Offers Service from Outside the Library (i.e., via the Web)
<b>Resources</b>			
Digital Reference/Virtual Reference	41.5% (n=2,927)	41.2% (n=2,907)	41.6% (n=2,933)
Licensed databases	0.3% (n=20)	97.5% (n=7,053)	98.5% (n=7,132)
E-books	48.3% (n=3,414)	32.6% (n=2,303)	44.3% (n=3,131)
Web/business conferencing (e.g., Skype, WebEx)	88.5% (n=6,117)	9.4% (n=648)	3.2% (n=202)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	46.5% (n=3,270)	42.8% (n=3,011)	30.7% (n=2,159)
Homework help	16.8% (n=1,195)	68.9% (n=4,915)	53.1% (n=3,787)
Audio content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	25.0% (n=1,782)	59.5% (n=4,246)	43.0% (n=3,066)
Video content (e.g., streaming video, video clips, other)	45.9% (n=3,223)	45.5% (n=3,198)	21.9% (n=1,541)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	66.3% (n=4,644)	25.8% (n=1,804)	21.9% (n=1,531)
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	50.7% (n=3,557)	39.2% (n=2,748)	26.8% (n=1,879)
Online book clubs	78.7% (n=5,365)	14.7% (n=1,001)	15.0% (n=1,023)
<b>Services</b>			
Allow patrons to access and store content on USB or other portable devices/drives (e.g., iPods, MP3 players, flash drives, other)	9.2% (n=667)	90.6% (n=6,543)	---
Allow patrons to connect digital cameras and manipulate content	30.2% (n=2,155)	69.6% (n=4,976)	---
Allow patrons to burn compact discs/DVDs	40.7% (n=2,895)	59.0% (n=4,197)	---
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	62.4% (n=4,405)	37.2% (n=2,625)	---
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., e-readers, netbooks)	71.4% (n=4,038)	28.6% (n=1,618)	---
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive			

**Library E-government and Employment Services and Challenges**

<b>Figure 38: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>E-Government roles and services</b>	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			<b>Overall</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	
Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	77.5% (n=1,761)	81.2% (n=3,991)	81.4% (n=5,610)	80.7% (n=11,363)
Staff provide as needed assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use e-government Web sites	92.2% (n=2,094)	92.1% (n=4,525)	87.2% (n=6,011)	89.7% (n=12,630)
Staff provide assistance to patrons for understanding government programs and services	54.7% (n=1,242)	54.1% (n=2,661)	45.9% (n=3,164)	50.2% (n=7,067)
Staff provide assistance to patrons for completing government forms	71.7% (n=1,631)	66.0% (n=3,246)	67.8% (n=4,672)	67.8% (n=9,549)
The library developed guides, tip sheets, or other tools to help patrons use e-government websites and services	23.9% (n=542)	20.5% (n=1,010)	14.2% (n=978)	18.0% (n=2,530)
The library offers training classes regarding the use of government Web sites, understanding government programs, and completing electronic forms	20.1% (n=457)	8.3% (n=410)	4.6% (n=320)	8.4% (n=1,187)
The library offered translation services for forms and services in other languages	11.7% (n=266)	10.6% (n=521)	3.5% (n=243)	7.3% (n=1,031)
The library is partnering with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	33.4% (n=760)	25.8% (n=1,266)	21.2% (n=1,459)	24.7% (n=3,485)
The library is working with government agencies (local, state, or federal) to help agencies improve their websites and/or e-government services	11.7% (n=253)	8.9% (n=422)	5.7% (n=377)	7.8% (n=1,052)
The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in provision of e-government services	29.4% (n=669)	19.1% (n=937)	16.0% (n=1,105)	19.3% (n=2,711)
Other	2.8% (n=64)	2.4% (n=120)	3.0% (n=208)	2.8% (n=392)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

Figure 38 illustrates the E-government services public library outlets provide patrons. The majority of libraries report providing assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use E-government websites (89.7 percent), applying for or accessing E-government services (80.7 percent), and completing government forms (67.8 percent). The percentage of libraries that report providing several of these services continues to increase, particularly assistance for understanding government programs and services (50.2 percent, up from 43.3 percent in 2009-2010) and partnering with government agencies and others for providing E-government services (24.7 percent, up from 13.4 percent in 2008-2009).

**Figure 39: 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 (n)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	19.4% (n=2,828)	17.7% (n=2,580)	25.7% (n=3,743)	16.3% (n=2,379)	16.8% (n=2,452)	4.0% (n=583)	2.9 (n=13,982)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	27.0% (n=3,930)	21.5% (n=3,129)	22.8% (n=3,319)	13.9% (n=2,019)	9.5% (n=1,379)	5.3% (n=777)	2.5 (n=13,776)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	35.4% (n=5,152)	21.8% (n=3,172)	17.9% (n=2,607)	11.0% (n=1,607)	9.7% (n=1,412)	4.1% (n=596)	2.3 (n=13,949)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	48.6% (n=7,045)	23.1% (n=3,344)	12.2% (n=1,767)	4.8% (n=693)	3.2% (n=462)	8.1% (n=1,177)	1.8 (n=13,312)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	9.3% (n=1,354)	11.2% (n=1,632)	20.3% (n=2,957)	21.5% (n=3,131)	34.2% (n=4,984)	3.6% (n=528)	3.6 (n=14,058)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	8.4% (n=1,222)	13.1% (n=1,902)	24.4% (n=3,545)	22.9% (n=3,329)	27.6% (n=4,010)	3.5% (n=506)	3.5 (n=14,008)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	24.4% (n=3,478)	18.4% (n=2,627)	20.1% (n=2,872)	11.7% (n=1,665)	16.5% (n=2,354)	8.8% (n=1,261)	2.7 (n=12,996)

Figure 39 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 (55.7 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 (22.9 percent) or most important (27.6 percent) challenge. Although less significant, a growing number of libraries report that workstation time limits are a challenge; only 14.9 percent rated this issue as important or most important in 2009-2010, while 23.4 percent rated this issue as important or most important in the current survey. This may reflect increasing demand for public access workstations.

Figures 40 through 42 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 (51.8 percent reported this as important or most important). While last year 52.1 percent of urban libraries reported "too few workstations" as an important or most important challenge, the number fell to 42.9 percent this year. The lack of staff expertise (36.7 percent) also was a challenge in the meeting patron E-government needs, but less of a challenge than last year (42.4 percent).

Responses from suburban outlets are similar, with 55.6 percent of libraries reporting that not having enough staff to effectively help patrons meet their E-government needs presents an important (19.3 percent) or most important (36.3 percent) challenge and 47.3 percent of libraries reported that lack of staff expertise necessary to meet patron E-government needs presents an important (21.5 percent) or most important (25.8 percent) challenge. As with urban libraries, although these challenges remain significant,

they represent slight decreases from last year's numbers (58.6 percent reporting insufficient staff and 51.3 percent reporting lack of necessary expertise).

Responses from rural outlets are also similar, with 56.9 percent of libraries reporting that not having enough staff to effectively help patrons meet their E-government needs presents an important (21.3 percent) or most important (35.6 percent) challenge, representing a slight decrease from last year's figure of 59.3. However, 57.3 percent of rural public libraries reported that lack of staff expertise necessary to meet patron E-government needs presents an important (24.9 percent) or most important (32.4 percent) challenge, the same as last year's figure.

**Figure 40: 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	11.6% (n=280)	13.9% (n=335)	27.2% (n=654)	19.2% (n=463)	23.7% (n=571)	4.4% (n=106)	3.3 (n=2,302)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	11.9% (n=287)	22.9% (n=552)	31.8% (n=765)	17.8% (n=429)	10.8% (n=259)	4.7% (n=113)	2.9 (n=2,293)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	38.3% (n=920)	22.0% (n=527)	17.8% (n=427)	8.7% (n=208)	8.6% (n=206)	4.7% (n=113)	2.2 (n=2,289)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	52.3% (n=1,255)	25.5% (n=612)	10.2% (n=244)	2.7% (n=64)	1.7% (n=42)	7.6% (n=181)	1.7 (n=2,217)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	6.4% (n=151)	12.9% (n=302)	23.6% (n=556)	26.5% (n=624)	25.3% (n=595)	5.2% (n=123)	3.5 (n=2,228)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	8.1% (n=189)	17.8% (n=418)	32.5% (n=762)	19.9% (n=467)	16.8% (n=393)	4.9% (n=115)	3.2 (n=2,228)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	25.4% (n=561)	19.5% (n=431)	19.5% (n=431)	12.6% (n=280)	12.9% (n=285)	10.1% (n=223)	2.6 (n=1,988)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

**Figure 41: 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	18.0% (n=894)	18.5% (n=894)	26.8% (n=1,326)	14.7% (n=728)	17.2% (n=850)	4.8% (n=240)	2.9 (n=4,717)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	25.1% (n=1,248)	21.1% (n=1,063)	23.0% (n=1,140)	15.4% (n=766)	9.8% (n=484)	5.3% (n=265)	2.6 (n=4,701)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	36.1% (n=1,783)	23.3% (n=1,152)	17.5% (n=867)	10.0% (n=492)	8.6% (n=426)	4.6% (n=226)	2.3 (n=4,721)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	50.6% (n=2,503)	24.4% (n=1,206)	10.2% (n=505)	4.2% (n=209)	2.6% (n=130)	7.9% (n=393)	1.7 (n=4,554)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	8.8% (n=441)	12.6% (n=633)	19.5% (n=979)	19.3% (n=970)	36.3% (n=1,825)	3.5% (n=178)	3.6 (n=4,848)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	8.8% (n=437)	16.2% (n=807)	23.8% (n=1,186)	21.5% (n=1,070)	25.8% (n=1,283)	3.9% (n=192)	3.4 (n=4,781)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	21.9% (n=1,074)	21.2% (n=1,030)	19.3% (n=946)	11.3% (n=554)	17.8% (n=873)	8.5% (n=416)	2.8 (n=4,477)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

**Figure 42: 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 (n)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	23.0% (n=1,655)	18.4% (n=1,327)	24.5% (n=1,763)	16.5% (n=1,188)	14.3% (n=1,031)	3.3% (n=238)	2.8 (n=6,963)
This library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their E-Government forms, seek government information, etc.	33.4% (n=2,395)	21.1% (n=1,513)	19.7% (n=1,413)	11.5% (n=824)	8.9% (n=636)	5.5% (n=398)	2.4 (n=6,782)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron demands	34.0% (n=2,448)	20.7% (n=1,492)	18.2% (n=1,313)	12.6% (n=907)	10.8% (n=779)	3.6% (n=257)	2.4 (n=6,939)
Filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some government Websites, forms, or services	46.0% (n=3,286)	21.4% (n=1,525)	14.3% (n=1,019)	5.9% (n=420)	4.1% (n=291)	8.4% (n=603)	1.9 (n=6,541)
This library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their E-Government needs	10.6% (n=762)	9.7% (n=697)	19.7% (n=1,423)	21.3% (n=1,537)	35.6% (n=2,564)	3.2% (n=228)	3.6 (n=6,982)
This library's staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron E-Government needs	8.3% (n=597)	9.4% (n=677)	22.2% (n=1,598)	24.9% (n=1,792)	32.4% (n=2,334)	2.8% (n=198)	3.6 (n=6,998)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some E-Government services	25.8% (n=1,843)	16.3% (n=1,166)	20.9% (n=1,496)	11.6% (n=830)	16.7% (n=1,195)	8.7% (n=622)	2.7 (n=6,531)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

<b>Figure 43: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status</b>				
<b>Job seeking roles and services</b>	<b>Metropolitan Status</b>			<b>Overall</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Suburban</b>	<b>Rural</b>	
The library provides access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources	92.6% (n=2,174)	94.6% (n=4,775)	87.9% (n=6,305)	90.9% (n=13,254)
The library provides access to civil service exam materials	90.1% (n=2,115)	83.3% (n=4,206)	68.4% (n=4,909)	77.0% (n=11,231)
The library helps patrons complete online job applications	72.6% (n=1,705)	69.4% (n=3,505)	73.5% (n=5,277)	71.9% (n=10,486)
The library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications	42.6% (n=1,000)	29.5% (n=1,492)	25.0% (n=1,798)	29.4% (n=4,290)
The library helps patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses	30.1% (n=707)	18.5% (n=935)	10.0% (n=720)	16.2% (n=2,362)
The library collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials to start businesses	22.4% (n=525)	16.6% (n=840)	10.7% (n=768)	14.6% (n=2,133)
The library offers classes (either by librarians or others working with the library) on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.	42.1% (n=988)	34.3% (n=1,734)	13.7% (n=983)	25.4% (n=3,706)
The library offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials	84.8% (n=1,990)	78.4% (n=3,960)	68.4% (n=4,911)	74.5% (n=10,862)
Other	2.6% (n=60)	3.2% (n=163)	3.5% (n=253)	3.3% (n=477)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive				

Figure 43 shows the job seeking services provided by public libraries. Provision of these services has increased across the board since this was first asked in last year’s survey. A large majority provide access to job databases and other online resources (90.9 percent); provide access to civil service exam materials (77.0 percent); offer software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials (74.5 percent); and help patrons complete online job applications (71.9 percent).

**Figure 44: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs**

Challenges	Overall						Average (n)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	22.7% (n=3,279)	17.8% (n=2,568)	23.7% (n=3,425)	15.7% (n=2,270)	17.3% (n=2,504)	2.7% (n=393)	2.9 (n=14,047)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	26.9% (n=3,881)	21.1% (n=3,043)	21.8% (n=3,146)	14.7% (n=2,121)	11.2% (n=1,621)	4.2% (n=609)	2.6 (n=13,813)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	34.9% (n=5,025)	22.1% (n=3,185)	18.9% (n=2,718)	10.9% (n=1,572)	10.0% (n=1,434)	3.3% (n=468)	2.4 (n=13,933)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	46.7% (n=6,675)	23.4% (n=3,349)	14.6% (n=2,090)	5.7% (n=814)	3.3% (n=477)	6.2% (n=883)	1.9 (n=13,405)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	9.1% (n=1,326)	11.5% (n=1,670)	20.6% (n=2,995)	22.3% (n=3,239)	33.6% (n=4,880)	2.8% (n=401)	3.6 (n=14,110)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	12.1% (n=1,740)	16.0% (n=2,305)	25.7% (n=3,713)	20.8% (n=3,004)	22.6% (n=3,263)	2.8% (n=405)	3.3 (n=14,026)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	27.8% (n=3,933)	20.0% (n=2,828)	20.6% (n=2,919)	11.0% (n=1,560)	12.8% (n=1,811)	7.8% (n=1,111)	2.6 (n=13,051)
Other	11.7% (n=30)	2.4% (n=6)	3.9% (n=10)	1.5% (n=4)	29.8% (n=76)	50.7% (n=130)	3.7 (n=126)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

Figure 44 shows the challenges that affect public libraries' overall ability to provide job-seeking services to patrons. The greatest challenges reported were not having enough staff to meet patron needs (55.9 percent agree or strongly agree), followed by a lack of staff with the necessary expertise (43.3 percent agree or strongly agree) and an insufficient number of workstations (32.5 percent agree or strongly agree). This is consistent with last year's findings.

Figures 45 through 47 present the details of challenges affecting the ability of urban, suburban and rural public libraries to provide employment-seeking services to patrons.

As in 2009-2010, urban libraries rank the challenges to helping patrons meet their employment needs differently than that of libraries overall (see Figure 44). 52.6 percent (27.0 percent important, 25.6 percent most important) report that they do not have enough staff to meet patron needs. Of urban libraries, 43.6 percent (21.1 percent important, 24.3 percent most important) report that they have too few workstations, whereas suburban and rural libraries report this as the third most significant challenge. The third most significant challenge in urban libraries is workstation time limits (33.4 percent important or most important), which is less important in suburban and rural libraries. However, 28.6 percent (12.1 percent strongly agree, 16.0 percent agree) of urban libraries identify a lack of staff expertise as a problem, which is the second highest rated challenge for suburban and rural libraries.

Figure 45 illustrates the challenges affecting suburban public libraries' job seeking services. 56.7 percent (21.1 percent important, 35.6 percent most important) report that they do not have enough staff to meet

patron needs, followed by 40.8 percent (19.5 percent important, 21.3 percent most important) reporting that the staff does not have the necessary expertise and 33.0 percent (14.6 percent agree, 18.4 percent strongly agree) reporting that they have too few workstations.

Figure 46 illustrates the challenges that affect the job seeking services of rural public libraries. 56.3 percent (22.1 percent important, 34.2 percent most important) report that they do not have enough staff to meet patron needs, followed by 50.0 percent (23.0 percent important, 27.0 percent most important) reporting that the staff does not have the necessary expertise and 29.2 percent (14.8 percent important, 14.4 percent most important) reporting that they have too few workstations. Internet connection speeds are a problem for 22.1 percent (11.1 percent important, 11.0 percent most important) of rural libraries, likely an indication of the slower connection speeds reported by rural libraries in Figure 21, and an increase from last year's number of 19.7 percent of rural public libraries reporting connection speed as being a problem.

**Figure 45: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs**

Challenges	Urban Public Libraries						Average (n=2,200)
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	12.7% (n=293)	13.7% (n=314)	23.9% (n=550)	21.1% (n=484)	24.3% (n=559)	4.3% (n=98)	3.3 (n=2,200)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	11.5% (n=265)	21.9% (n=503)	28.4% (n=652)	17.8% (n=408)	15.6% (n=357)	4.9% (n=112)	3.0 (n=2,185)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	33.7% (n=771)	23.8% (n=544)	19.6% (n=448)	9.1% (n=208)	8.8% (n=202)	5.1% (n=117)	2.3 (n=2,174)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	52.6% (n=1,193)	20.3% (n=459)	13.9% (n=316)	4.0% (n=91)	1.8% (n=42)	7.3% (n=166)	1.7 (n=2,100)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	5.4% (n=125)	12.6% (n=291)	24.5% (n=567)	25.6% (n=592)	27.0% (n=624)	5.0% (n=115)	3.6 (n=2,198)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.8% (n=270)	22.1% (n=508)	32.6% (n=748)	16.9% (n=387)	11.7% (n=268)	4.9% (n=113)	3.0 (n=2,183)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	30.0% (n=650)	19.9% (n=433)	19.1% (n=414)	13.2% (n=287)	8.3% (n=180)	9.5% (n=206)	2.4 (n=1,964)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

**Figure 46: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs**

Challenges	Suburban Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	21.2% (n=1,049)	18.2% (n=902)	25.2% (n=1,246)	14.6% (n=720)	18.4% (n=910)	2.4% (n=118)	2.9 (n=4,827)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	24.4% (n=1,208)	21.9% (n=1,082)	21.3% (n=1,055)	16.7% (n=826)	12.3% (n=608)	3.3% (n=163)	2.7 (n=4,779)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	36.6% (n=1,802)	22.7% (n=1,119)	17.3% (n=852)	11.5% (n=565)	8.9% (n=441)	3.0% (n=147)	2.3 (n=4,779)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	48.9% (n=2,404)	25.1% (n=1,231)	12.6% (n=617)	4.8% (n=238)	2.9% (n=145)	5.6% (n=277)	1.8 (n=4,635)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	9.1% (n=457)	12.5% (n=623)	19.2% (n=960)	21.1% (n=1,053)	35.6% (n=1,779)	2.5% (n=126)	3.6 (n=4,872)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	13.6% (n=674)	18.7% (n=927)	24.3% (n=1,204)	19.5% (n=964)	21.3% (n=1,057)	2.5% (n=126)	3.2 (n=4,827)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	26.2% (n=1,277)	22.3% (n=1,084)	20.5% (n=997)	10.3% (n=503)	13.6% (n=664)	7.1% (n=348)	2.6 (n=4,525)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

**Figure 47: Challenges that affect the ability of Public Library Outlets to help Patrons Meet their Employment Seeking Needs**

Challenges	Rural Public Libraries						Average
	Least Important	Unimportant	Neutral	Important	Most Important	Not Applicable	
The library has too few workstations to meet patron demand	26.9% (n=1,937)	18.8% (n=1,353)	22.6% (n=1,629)	14.8% (n=1,066)	14.4% (n=1,035)	2.5% (n=177)	2.7 (n=7,020)
The library has workstation time limits that do not allow enough time for patrons to complete their job applications, seek job information, etc.	33.5% (n=2,409)	20.3% (n=1,459)	20.0% (n=1,439)	12.4% (n=887)	9.1% (n=656)	4.6% (n=334)	2.4 (n=6,849)
This library's connection speed is too slow and causes delays meeting patron needs	34.1% (n=2,452)	21.2% (n=1,521)	19.7% (n=1,339)	11.1% (n=799)	11.0% (n=791)	2.8% (n=204)	2.4 (n=6,980)
Library filters and/or firewalls prevent the library from accessing at least some job Websites, forms, or services	43.3% (n=3,078)	23.3% (n=1,659)	16.3% (n=1,158)	6.8% (n=485)	4.1% (n=291)	6.2% (n=440)	2.0 (n=6,670)
The library does not have enough staff to effectively help patrons with their job seeking needs	10.3% (n=744)	10.5% (n=756)	20.4% (n=1,468)	22.1% (n=1,594)	34.2% (n=2,477)	2.2% (n=159)	3.6 (n=7,039)
The library staff does not have the necessary expertise to meet patron job seeking needs	11.1% (n=795)	12.1% (n=870)	24.5% (n=1,761)	23.0% (n=1,653)	27.0% (n=1,937)	2.3% (n=165)	3.4 (n=7,016)
Liability issues (e.g., privacy, security, confidentiality) prevent the library from providing some job seeking services	28.2% (n=2,006)	18.4% (n=1,311)	21.2% (n=1,508)	10.8% (n=796)	13.6% (n=968)	7.8% (n=557)	2.6 (n=6,562)

1=Least Important; 5=Most Important

The next section of the report provides national system level data analysis.

**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.

**E-rate Application Data**

**Figure 48: Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount**

	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Applied	56.0% (n=297)	29.2% (n=891)	41.3% (n=2,268)	38.1% (n=3,456)
Another organization applied on the library's behalf	9.8% (n=52)	19.4% (n=591)	15.2% (n=831)	16.3% (n=1,474)
Did not apply	32.0% (n=170)	47.3% (n=1,442)	40.0% (n=2,195)	42.0% (n=3,807)
Do not know	2.2% (n=12)	4.1% (n=126)	3.5% (n=192)	3.6% (n=329)

Weighted missing values, n=2

Figure 48 shows that 54.4 percent of libraries report applying for an E-rate discount, whether directly (38.1 percent) or as part of another organization's application (16.3 percent), a slight increase from 2009-2010 (53.0 percent). As with last year, the highest percentage of urban libraries applied for E-rate discounts (65.8 percent), followed by rural (56.5 percent) and suburban (48.6 percent) libraries.

**Figure 49: Public Library Systems Receiving an E-Rate Discount by Category**

E-Rate Categories	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Internet Connectivity	68.0% (n=233)	57.3% (n=822)	58.5% (n=1,777)	58.8% (n=2,833)
Telecommunications services	87.1% (n=299)	83.1% (n=1,193)	82.8% (n=2,516)	83.2% (n=4,008)
Internal connections cost	16.3% (n=56)	10.3% (n=148)	10.6% (n=323)	11.0% (n=528)

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

The percentage of public library systems receiving E-rate discounts by category is shown in Figure 49. The highest percentage of discounts were received in the telecommunications category, both overall (83.2 percent) and in urban (87.1 percent), suburban (83.1 percent), and rural (82.8 percent) libraries, which is consistent with the findings from 2009-2010. The biggest change was seen in discounts for Internet connectivity in suburban libraries, which jumped to 57.3 percent this year from 49.8 percent last year.

**Figure 50: Reasons Public Library Systems Did Not Apply for E-Rate Discounts**

Reasons	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
The E-rate application process is too complicated	39.5% (n=66)	40.4% (n=571)	39.0% (n=844)	39.6% (n=1,480)
The library staff did not feel that the library would qualify	11.6% (n=19)	14.7% (n=208)	11.9% (n=258)	13.0% (n=485)
Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate in the program	38.4% (n=64)	37.8% (n=534)	31.5% (n=681)	34.2% (n=1,278)
The library receives E-rate discounts as part of a consortium, so therefore does not apply individually	5.8% (n=10)	13.3% (n=188)	6.0% (n=129)	8.7% (n=327)
The library was denied funding in the past and thus is discouraged from applying in subsequent years	5.8% (n=10)	5.1% (n=71)	3.4% (n=73)	4.1% (n=154)
The library did not apply because of the need to comply with CIPA's (Children's Internet Protection Act) filtering requirements	43.0% (n=71)	33.3% (n=471)	29.4% (n=634)	31.5% (n=1,177)
The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	11.6% (n=19)	6.1% (n=86)	8.5% (n=185)	7.7% (n=290)
Other	12.8% (n=21)	17.6% (n=248)	25.8% (n=557)	22.1% (n=826)

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

Figure 50 shows the reasons that 42.0 percent (Figure 47) 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 (39.6 percent), the E-rate discount is low and not worth the time needed to participate (34.2 percent), and the library did not comply with CIPA filtering requirements (31.5 percent). In urban libraries the ranking is slightly different, with CIPA compliance (43.0 percent) being reported above the complicated application process (39.5 percent) and the low discount amount (38.4 percent).

**Figure 51: 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			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Applied directly	26.4% (n=137)	14.7% (n=440)	22.4% (n=1,211)	20.1% (n=1,787)
Library was included in an application submitted by another entity	30.5% (n=158)	26.8% (n=802)	23.3% (n=1,259)	24.9% (n=2,220)
Did not apply	38.3% (n=199)	46.5% (n=1,390)	40.5% (n=2,190)	42.4% (n=3,779)
Don't Know	4.8% (n=25)	12.0% (n=360)	13.7% (n=741)	12.6% (n=1,126)

Weighted missing values, n=156

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

This year the survey asked libraries about application for Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) programs for the first time (Figure 51). Forty-five percent of libraries reported applying (20.1 percent directly, 24.9 percent included in another entity’s application) and 42.4 percent reported that they did not apply. Application was highest in urban libraries (56.9 percent), followed by rural (45.7 percent) and suburban (41.5 percent) libraries.

**Figure 52: BTOP and BIP Applications by Type**

Application Type	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Public computer center	49.6% (n=116)	32.9% (n=328)	25.3% (n=462)	29.6% (n=906)
Sustainable broadband	12.4% (n=29)	11.7% (n=117)	13.2% (n=241)	12.7% (n=387)
Middle mile	5.8% (n=13)	4.3% (n=43)	*	2.4% (n=73)
State Broadband and Data Development (SBDD)	5.0% (n=12)	12.9% (n=128)	8.7% (n=158)	9.8% (n=298)
Don't know	28.9% (n=67)	41.7% (n=417)	52.1% (n=951)	47.0% (n=1,435)
Other	11.6% (n=27)	8.0% (n=80)	9.3% (n=170)	9.1% (n=277)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option  
Key: \*: Insufficient data to report

The types of BTOP and BIP applications submitted by public library systems are shown in Figure 52. The highest percentage of applications were submitted for public computer centers (29.6 percent), followed by sustainable broadband (12.7 percent), State Broadband and Data Development (SBDD) (9.8 percent), and middle mile (2.4 percent). Urban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for public computer centers (49.6 percent) and middle mile (5.8 percent), while rural libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for sustainable broadband (13.2 percent) and suburban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for SBDD (12.9 percent).

**Public Library Operating Budget Details**

**Figure 53: FY2011 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change**

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 10%	1.9% (n=10)	2.5% (n=74)	2.8% (n=151)	2.7% (n=235)
Increased 6.1-10%	2.3% (n=12)	2.7% (n=80)	2.6% (n=136)	2.6% (n=228)
Increased 4.1-6%	3.4% (n=17)	4.3% (n=126)	3.8% (n=202)	3.9% (n=345)
Increased 2.1-4%	8.3% (n=42)	12.4% (n=363)	11.8% (n=625)	11.8% (n=1,030)
Increased up to 2%	13.5% (n=69)	18.6% (n=542)	20.2% (n=1,070)	19.3% (n=1,681)
Stayed the same	16.2% (n=83)	23.2% (n=677)	32.0% (n=1,699)	28.2% (n=2,459)
Decreased up to 2%	13.9% (n=71)	9.5% (n=277)	8.9% (n=472)	9.4% (n=820)
Decreased 2.1-4%	9.4% (n=48)	6.7% (n=194)	4.2% (n=221)	5.3% (n=464)
Decreased 4.1-6%	8.6% (n=44)	5.8% (n=168)	4.2% (n=221)	5.0% (n=434)
Decreased 6.1-10%	11.3% (n=58)	6.6% (n=191)	4.7% (n=248)	5.7% (n=497)
Decreased more than 10%	11.3% (n=58)	7.6% (n=223)	4.9% (n=260)	6.2% (n=541)

Weighted missing values, n=336

Figure 53 shows the changes to public library systems' operating budgets in 2011. In the 2009-2010 survey, libraries anticipated that 37.7 percent of budgets would increase, 34.2 percent would stay the same and 28.0 percent would decrease in 2011. In fact, 40.3 percent of library systems' 2011 operating budgets increased, 28.2 percent stayed the same and 31.6 percent decreased. More rural libraries reported increases in their 2011 budgets (41.2 percent), while more urban libraries reported decreases (54.5 percent) than increases (29.4 percent).

**Figure 54: FY2012 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change**

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	2.0% (n=10)	1.3% (n=34)	1.4% (n=70)	1.4% (n=114)
Increased 6.1-10%	*	2.4% (n=63)	2.2% (n=109)	2.2% (n=176)
Increased 4.1-6%	2.4% (n=12)	2.7% (n=71)	4.0% (n=197)	3.5% (n=280)
Increased 2.1-4%	8.5% (n=40)	12.2% (n=320)	10.7% (n=525)	11.0% (n=885)
Increased up to 2%	15.4% (n=73)	15.6% (n=411)	17.9% (n=882)	17.0% (n=1,367)
Stayed the same	30.8% (n=147)	33.7% (n=885)	43.6% (n=2,149)	39.6% (n=3,181)
Decreased up to 2%	7.3% (n=35)	7.9% (n=208)	6.1% (n=301)	6.8% (n=545)
Decreased 2.1-4%	8.9% (n=42)	5.9% (n=154)	3.7% (n=185)	4.7% (n=381)
Decreased 4.1-6%	8.9% (n=42)	6.3% (n=166)	3.5% (n=170)	4.7% (n=378)
Decreased 6.1-10%	6.9% (n=33)	3.9% (n=103)	2.9% (n=143)	3.5% (n=279)
Decreased more than 10%	8.1% (n=39)	8.1% (n=214)	3.9% (n=194)	5.6% (n=447)

Weighted missing values, n=1,035  
Key: \*: Insufficient data to report

The anticipated changes to public library system's FY2012 operating budgets are presented in Figure 54. Overall, 35.1 percent of libraries anticipate an increased budget in FY2012, while 39.6 percent anticipate no change, and 25.3 percent anticipate decreases. The highest percentages of decreased budgets are anticipated in urban public library systems (40.1 percent), followed by suburban libraries (32.1 percent) and rural libraries (20.1 percent).

**Figure 55: For Current Fiscal Year, Percentage of Public Library Systems that anticipate or experienced changes to their total operating budget**

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Remain unchanged	50.9% (n=264)	60.3% (n=1,779)	60.8% (n=3,248)	60.0% (n=5,291)
Decrease	27.5% (n=143)	23.2% (n=685)	19.0% (n=1,016)	20.9% (n=1,844)
Increase	8.6% (n=44)	9.8% (n=288)	12.4% (n=664)	11.3% (n=996)
Don't Know	13.0% (n=67)	6.7% (n=197)	7.8% (n=418)	7.7% (n=683)

Weighted missing values, n=254  
Key: \*: Insufficient data to report

Figure 55 shows the changes to public library systems' current fiscal year budget, anticipated or already experienced. Fewer systems reported decreases this year (20.9 percent) than last year (26.6 percent), but

the percentage reporting increases was virtually unchanged between this year (11.3 percent) and last year (11.5 percent). Last year, a significantly larger percentage of urban libraries anticipated decreases (43.2 percent) than suburban (28.3 percent) or rural libraries (24.0 percent), but this year, urban library actual or anticipated current fiscal year decreases (27.5 percent) are more in line with those of suburban (23.2 percent) and rural (19.0 percent) libraries.

Each year's survey asks libraries to report current fiscal year expenditures by source of funding and type, and to estimate future fiscal year expenditures. Those findings are presented in Figures 56 to 63.

**Figure 56: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Overall FY2012		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$912,820 (n=3,113)	\$181,470 (n=2,755)	\$377,340 (n=2,732)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$132,610 (n=570)	\$35,641 (n=996)	\$41,475 (n=731)
Federal	\$35,754 (n=48)	\$4,855 (n=96)	\$15,446 (n=359)
Fees/fines	\$39,201 (n=213)	\$13,905 (716)	\$30,449 (n=943)
Donations/local fundraising	\$13,153 (n=268)	\$11,328 (n=1,099)	\$13,761 (n=1,064)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$15,191 (n=143)	\$7,301 (n=270)	\$13,217 (n=416)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$29,465 (n=112)	\$9,628 (n=274)	\$14,093 (n=448)
Reported average total	\$879,930 (n=3,337)	\$165,480 (n=3,402)	\$342,630 (n=3,275)
Reported average percent	63.4%	11.9%	24.7%

**Figure 57: FY2011 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Overall FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$980,660 (n=3,708)	\$183,310 (n=3,327)	\$464,330 (n=5,369)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$115,990 (n=803)	\$101,130 (n=1,305)	\$50,756 (n=1,572)
Federal	\$39,742 (n=91)	\$13,757 (n=170)	\$24,717 (n=475)
Fees/fines	\$31,098 (n=318)	\$14,484 (883)	\$42,915 (n=1,632)
Donations/local fundraising	\$26,169 (n=381)	\$12,294 (n=1,392)	\$20,620 (n=1,310)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$81,816 (n=216)	\$8,674 (n=403)	\$24,631 (n=631)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$24,347 (n=180)	\$12,851 (n=393)	\$15,753 (n=771)
Reported average total	\$936,680 (n=4,030)	\$186,160 (n=4,205)	\$460,400 (n=5,885)
Reported average percent	59.2%	11.8%	29.1%

In the 2009-2010 survey, libraries estimated the operating expenditures for salaries, collections and other expenditures would continue to decrease between fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011. Figure 56 shows that, in actuality, salaries decreased a significant \$87,996, though not as significant as the \$657,929 drop from the year before. Collections decreased \$13,391, which is also much less than between FY2009 and FY2010. Other expenditures actually increased this year from \$421,535 in FY2010 to \$460,400 in FY2011. Figure 57 shows that these decreases are expected to continue.

The most significant change in funding sources between FY2010 and FY2011 were reported in state funding for salaries, which dropped \$89,090 from \$205,080 to \$115,990. At the same time, state funding for collections increased \$40,121. Other notable changes were increases in government grants for salaries, decreases in federal funding for other expenditures, and increases in fees/fines for other expenditures.

Figures 58-63 present these findings for urban, suburban and rural public library systems. Urban libraries reported decreases across the board from FY2010 to FY2011, but estimated increases in funding for salaries and collections in FY2012. Suburban libraries reported increases in funding for salaries and other expenditures from FY2010 to FY2011, but estimated decreases in FY2012. Rural libraries reported increases in funding for collections from FY2010 to FY2011, but estimated decreases in FY2012.

**Figure 58: FY2011 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Urban FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$7,208,700 (n=235)	\$1,231,000 (n=226)	\$2,978,900 (n=405)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$472,110 (n=52)	\$169,090 (n=104)	\$313,720 (n=116)
Federal	\$208,970 (n=13)	\$90,838 (n=19)	\$131,480 (n=54)
Fees/fines	\$381,830 (n=15)	\$54,809 (n=40)	\$298,060 (n=125)
Donations/local fundraising	\$283,530 (n=19)	\$73,719 (n=79)	\$163,900 (n=89)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$684,690 (n=19)	\$28,230 (n=33)	\$172,160 (n=56)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$174,070 (n=13)	\$77,935 (n=40)	\$79,223 (n=64)
Reported average total	\$7,379,100 (n=237)	\$1,224,100 (n=253)	\$3,088,700 (n=426)
Reported average percent	63.1%	10.5%	26.4%

**Figure 59: FY2012 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Urban FY2012		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$7,592,162 (n=302)	\$1,312,457 (n=271)	\$2,903,942 (n=271)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$1,096,864 (n=68)	\$235,936 (n=126)	\$463,560 (n=77)
Federal	\$76,429 (n=9)	\$8,587 (n=3)	\$256,004 (n=38)
Fees/fines	\$406,143 (n=16)	\$166,352 (n=49)	\$226,604 (n=59)
Donations/local fundraising	\$70,492 (n=14)	\$58,373 (n=86)	\$127,368 (n=77)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$313,606 (n=16)	\$16,885 (n=17)	\$257,139 (n=49)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$128,528 (n=10)	\$45,830 (n=26)	\$79,003 (n=49)
Reported average total	\$7,665,262 (n=311)	\$1,315,000 (n=304)	\$2,951,836 (n=295)
Reported average percent	64.2%	11.0%	24.7%

**Figure 60: FY2011 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Suburban FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$1,135,000 (n=1,173)	\$215,000 (n=1,096)	\$521,520 (n=1,899)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$85,687 (n=226)	\$27,480 (n=377)	\$30,365 (n=591)
Federal	\$7,588 (n=14)	\$3,391 (n=49)	\$10,289 (n=131)
Fees/fines	\$24,317 (n=89)	\$19,886 (n=240)	\$36,714 (n=568)
Donations/local fundraising	\$19,745 (n=77)	\$16,008 (n=397)	\$14,052 (n=368)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$48,439 (n=63)	\$15,013 (n=173)	\$17,431 (n=191)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$11,182 (n=43)	\$6,055 (n=114)	\$15,911 (n=197)
Reported average total	\$1,086,400 (n=1,250)	\$198,990 (n=1,305)	\$511,850 (n=2,036)
Reported average percent	60.5%	11.1%	28.5%

**Figure 61: FY2012 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Suburban FY2012		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$1,114,500 (n=945)	\$208,900 (n=842)	\$456,920 (n=834)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$109,880 (n=160)	\$30,769 (n=271)	\$31,870 (n=240)
Federal	\$6,160 (n=3)	\$4,745 (n=20)	\$11,689 (n=86)
Fees/fines	\$32,891 (n=37)	\$19,111 (n=197)	\$26,342 (n=280)
Donations/local fundraising	\$25,572 (n=54)	\$16,690 (n=314)	\$12,384 (n=325)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$13,244 (n=40)	\$13,673 (n=69)	\$17,299 (n=123)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$32,277 (n=20)	\$7,629 (n=77)	\$10,309 (n=134)
Reported average total	\$1,081,500 (n=994)	\$197,310 (n=988)	\$417,910 (n=968)
Reported average percent	63.7%	11.6%	24.6%

**Figure 62: FY2011 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Rural FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$264,890 (n=2,300)	\$48,155 (n=2,006)	\$96,798 (n=3,065)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$93,701 (n=525)	\$126,230 (n=824)	\$29,530 (n=865)
Federal	\$10,870 (n=63)	\$4,129 (n=102)	\$11,344 (n=289)
Fees/fines	\$8,616 (n=214)	\$9,627 (n=603)	\$12,595 (n=938)
Donations/local fundraising	\$10,465 (n=284)	\$5,387 (n=916)	\$8,563 (n=853)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$10,563 (n=134)	\$3,729 (n=265)	\$6,741 (n=384)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$12,597 (n=124)	\$5,049 (n=238)	\$7,783 (n=551)
Reported average total	\$262,250 (n=2,543)	\$80,820 (n=2,647)	\$102,620 (n=3,423)
Reported average percent	58.8%	18.1%	23.0%

**Figure 63: FY2012 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Sources of Funding	Rural FY2012		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$259,580 (n=1,981)	\$47,638 (n=1,743)	\$97,790 (n=1,721)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$106,505 (n=362)	\$23,931 (n=642)	\$30,586 (n=445)
Federal	\$10,337 (n=39)	\$4,916 (n=70)	\$7,517 (n=231)
Fees/fines	\$6,570 (n=160)	\$8,232 (n=486)	\$12,783 (n=598)
Donations/local fundraising	\$6,710 (n=194)	\$6,944 (n=717)	\$8,610 (n=671)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$10,046 (n=90)	\$3,716 (n=180)	\$5,490 (n=263)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$13,330 (n=80)	\$3,979 (n=158)	\$6,195 (n=277)
Reported average total	\$259,480 (n=2,149)	\$49,172 (n=2,217)	\$94,893 (n=2,110)
Reported average percent	58.2%	12.2%	23.5%

**Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures**

Figure 64 shows that the majority of public library systems (53.7 percent) pay for all of their own technology costs, which is consistent with last year's findings. 46.3 percent of libraries either receive some assistance paying their technology costs (37.9 percent) or have all of these expenditures paid by another government agency or outside entity (8.4 percent). The highest percentage of libraries paying for all of their own technology costs are in urban areas (60.2 percent), while the highest percentage that do not pay any of their own technology costs are in suburban areas (10.1 percent).

Financial Support	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The library pays directly for ALL of its technology costs	60.2% (n=301)	53.0% (n=1,376)	53.3% (n=2,565)	53.7% (n=4,242)
The library pays directly for SOME of its technology costs	35.9% (n=179)	36.9% (n=956)	38.7% (n=1,862)	37.9% (n=2,998)
The library does not pay directly for any of its technology costs	3.9% (n=19)	10.1% (n=263)	8.0% (n=384)	8.4% (n=666)
Weighted missing values, n=1,163				

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	5.8% (n=29)	6.0% (n=151)	7.7% (n=365)	7.0% (n=545)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.7% (n=23)	2.8% (n=71)	1.9% (n=92)	2.4% (n=187)
Increased 4.1-6%	3.5% (n=17)	2.7% (n=69)	3.0% (n=143)	3.0% (n=229)
Increased 2.1-4%	10.5% (n=52)	8.2% (n=206)	8.4% (n=396)	8.4% (n=654)
Increased up to 2%	14.4% (n=71)	16.5% (n=417)	14.5% (n=686)	15.1% (n=1,174)
Stayed the same	40.9% (n=202)	46.0% (n=1,159)	52.7% (n=2,501)	49.8% (n=3,863)
Decreased up to 2%	3.9% (n=19)	6.3% (n=160)	3.1% (n=146)	4.2% (n=325)
Decreased 2.1-4%	3.5% (n=17)	2.2% (n=54)	1.8% (n=85)	2.0% (n=157)
Decreased 4.1-6%	2.7% (n=13)	2.0% (n=51)	1.5% (n=70)	1.7% (n=135)
Decreased 6.1-10%	3.1% (n=15)	1.9% (n=49)	1.3% (n=61)	1.6% (n=125)
Decreased more than 10%	7.0% (n=35)	5.3% (n=134)	4.2% (n=197)	4.7% (n=366)
Weighted missing values, n=1,309				

The highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase were in urban areas (38.9 percent), but the highest percentage reporting decreases were also were in urban areas (20.2 percent). Rural libraries (7.7

percent) had the highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase of over 10 percent for their FY2011 technology budgets.

**Figure 66: FY2012 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)	5.3% (n=126)	4.3% (n=190)	4.5% (n=331)
Increased 6.1-10%	2.9% (n=13)	1.9% (n=46)	2.1% (n=92)	2.1% (n=152)
Increased 4.1-6%	5.9% (n=27)	2.4% (n=57)	3.7% (n=165)	3.4% (n=249)
Increased 2.1-4%	10.9% (n=50)	8.9% (n=211)	8.2% (n=365)	8.6% (n=626)
Increased up to 2%	13.0% (n=60)	15.2% (n=360)	15.0% (n=669)	14.9% (n=1,088)
Stayed the same	45.0% (n=206)	46.9% (n=1,108)	54.7% (n=2,441)	51.6% (n=3,755)
Decreased up to 2%	3.4% (n=15)	5.7% (n=134)	3.3% (n=148)	4.1% (n=298)
Decreased 2.1-4%	1.7% (n=8)	2.4% (n=57)	1.5% (n=68)	1.8% (n=133)
Decreased 4.1-6%	3.8% (n=17)	1.9% (n=46)	1.5% (n=68)	1.8% (n=131)
Decreased 6.1-10%	1.7% (n=8)	1.9% (n=46)	1.7% (n=75)	1.8% (129)
Decreased more than 10%	8.4% (n=39)	7.4% (n=174)	4.0% (n=177)	5.4% (n=390)
Weighted missing values, n=1,787				

The majority of public library systems (51.6 percent) anticipate no change in their FY2012 technology budget (see Figure 66). Overall, 33.5 percent anticipate an increase and 14.9 percent anticipate decreases. Decreases were anticipated by library systems in urban (19.0 percent) and suburban (19.3 percent) areas, followed by 12.0 percent in rural library systems.

This is the fifth year that libraries reported technology-related operating expenditures by fiscal year. For the last three reporting cycles the survey asked libraries to account for actual or anticipated expenditures. These data are reported by type of technology expenditure and funding source. It is important to acknowledge the year-to-year fluctuations in the reporting of technology-related library expenditures as these expenditures can vary greatly. These findings are presented in Figures 67 through 70.

**Figure 67: FY2011 Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Overall FY2011				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$129,540 (n=1,185)	\$29,153 (n=1,480)	\$39,948 (n=3,709)	\$23,781 (n=3,350)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$16,908 (n=168)	\$8,576 (n=217)	\$7,785 (n=373)	\$9,658 (n=268)
Federal	\$3,766 (n=12)	\$27,150 (n=22)	\$47,023 (n=72)	\$14,750 (n=305)
Fees/fines	\$2,359 (n=88)	\$7,554 (n=112)	\$1,470 (n=106)	\$8,223 (n=157)
Donations/local fundraising	\$2,041 (n=39)	\$2,067 (n=98)	\$3,684 (n=524)	\$1,876 (n=114)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$4,161 (n=39)	\$7,626 (n=49)	\$12,032 (n=212)	\$6,963 (n=120)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$4,073 (n=30)	\$3,234 (n=85)	\$7,345 (n=675)	\$4,545 (n=87)
Reported average total	\$116,540 (n=1,347)	\$26,657 (n=1,774)	\$38,185 (n=4,296)	\$24,117 (n=3,711)
Reported average percent	56.7%	13.0%	18.6%	11.7%

**Note:** Low item response can influence the reported average.

Figure 67 presents FY2011 technology-related operating expenditures for public libraries. These figures have decreased from FY2010 across all expenditure types and all funding sources, except for fees and fines. The \$119,873 drop in salaries was the most significant change, followed by a \$104,764 decrease in telecommunications expenditures, \$80,921 less for hardware and software, and \$77,001 less going to outside vendors. The changes reported by funding sources were greatest in state funding, federal funding, donations and private foundation grants. State funding for salaries dropped from \$46,532 in FY2010 to \$16,908 in FY2011 and federal funding for salaries fell from \$31,649 to only \$3,766.

Figures 68 through 70 show these findings by metropolitan status. Urban, suburban and rural libraries also show across the board decreases.

**Figure 68: FY2011 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Urban FY2011				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$540,640 (n=129)	\$230,520 (n=102)	\$242,340 (n=318)	\$132,870 (n=278)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$73,758 (n=8)	\$27,854 (n=15)	\$13,910 (n=23)	\$44,174 (n=17)
Federal	-	\$59,184 (n=10)	\$181,290 (n=15)	\$60,621 (n=23)
Fees/fines	\$12,085 (n=4)	\$79,350 (n=10)	\$8,562 (n=13)	\$40,066 (n=13)
Donations/local fundraising	-	\$3,434 (n=6)	\$6,425 (n=15)	\$13,750 (n=4)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	-	\$7,500 (n=2)	\$36,213 (n=12)	\$28,620 (n=8)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$31,581 (n=2)	\$200 (n=2)	\$37,167 (n=29)	\$14,075 (n=2)
Reported average total	\$530,060 (n=133)	\$230,720 (n=110)	\$244,200 (n=335)	\$137,050 (n=291)
Reported average percent	46.4%	20.2%	21.4%	12.0%
<b>Key:</b> - no data to report				
<b>Note:</b> Low item response can influence the reported average.				

**Figure 69: FY2011 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Suburban FY2011				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$130,070 (n=431)	\$25,448 (n=520)	\$38,946 (n=1,288)	\$26,790 (n=1,145)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$2,927 (n=83)	\$5,516 (n=100)	\$7,647 (n=148)	\$2,770 (n=97)
Federal	-	-	\$10,781 (n=3)	\$8,063 (n=49)
Fees/fines	\$1,540 (n=57)	\$696 (n=69)	\$316 (n=69)	\$4,725 (n=69)
Donations/local fundraising	\$1,200 (n=3)	\$1,183 (n=17)	\$4,611 (n=137)	\$1,033 (n=23)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$5,965 (n=20)	\$10,161 (n=20)	\$15,779 (n=74)	\$6,286 (n=34)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$3,000 (n=6)	\$7,066 (n=20)	\$7,887 (n=177)	\$3,871 (n=14)
Reported average total	\$113,820 (n=497)	\$23,005 (n=617)	\$38,279 (n=1,425)	\$26,146 (n=1,222)
Reported average percent	56.6%	11.4%	19.0%	13.0%
<b>Key:</b> - no data to report				
<b>Note:</b> Low item response can influence the reported average.				

**Figure 70: FY2011 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type and Funding Source**

Rural FY2011				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$44,166 (n=625)	\$7,419 (n=858)	\$9,942 (n=2,103)	\$6,282 (n=1,928)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$26,152 (n=78)	\$8,660 (n=102)	\$7,183 (n=202)	\$10,113 (n=153)
Federal	\$3,766 (n=12)	\$1,744 (n=12)	\$10,235 (n=53)	\$11,593 (n=233)
Fees/fines	\$2,688 (n=27)	\$1,025 (n=34)	\$788 (n=24)	\$5,700 (n=75)
Donations/local fundraising	\$2,107 (n=36)	\$2,164 (n=75)	\$3,229 (n=372)	\$1,573 (n=88)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$2,308 (n=19)	\$5,740 (n=27)	\$7,618 (n=126)	\$5,114 (n=78)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$1,930 (n=22)	\$2,115 (n=63)	\$5,302 (n=469)	\$4,421 (n=70)
Reported average total	\$41,706 (n=717)	\$7,403 (n=1,048)	\$10,875 (n=2,536)	\$8,028 (n=2,198)
Reported average percent	61.3%	10.9%	16.0%	11.8%
<b>Note:</b> Low item response can influence the reported average.				

## State Data Tables

This next section presents state-based branch (outlet) level findings. The survey received adequate responses from 46 states plus the District of Columbia. The state data analyzed in the report include:

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

The report does not contain state-based data for Maine, New Hampshire, North Dakota, or Pennsylvania 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=288)	5.7% (n=16)	2.6% (n=7)	91.7% (n=264)
Alaska (n=103)	6.1% (n=6)	6.4% (n=6)	87.5% (n=90)
Arizona (n=205)	4.5% (n=9)	20.5% (n=42)	75.0% (n=154)
Arkansas (n=215)	6.1% (n=13)	3.3% (n=7)	90.7% (n=195)
California (n=1,036)	3.7% (n=37)	44.5% (n=461)	51.8% (n=536)
Colorado (n=245)	3.1% (n=7)	12.7% (n=31)	84.2% (n=207)
Connecticut (n=233)	4.8% (n=11)	13.0% (n=30)	82.2% (n=192)
Delaware (n=32)	4.4% (n=1)	7.7% (n=2)	87.9% (n=26)
Florida (n=508)	8.3% (n=42)	21.0% (n=107)	70.7% (n=359)
Georgia (n=381)	4.7% (n=18)	31.5% (n=120)	63.8% (n=244)
Hawaii (n=40)	2.5% (n=1)	2.5% (n=1)	95.0% (n=38)
Idaho (n=136)	5.3% (n=7)	1.5% (n=2)	93.9% (n=127)
Illinois (n=757)	4.6% (n=35)	8.2% (n=62)	87.2% (n=660)
Indiana (n=412)	4.3% (n=18)	10.3% (n=42)	85.4% (n=352)
Iowa (n=544)	5.1% (n=27)	5.2% (n=28)	89.8% (n=484)
Kansas (n=380)	7.1% (n=26)	8.4% (n=31)	84.5% (n=313)
Kentucky (n=189)	6.5% (n=12)	1.3% (n=2)	92.2% (n=175)
Louisiana (n=278)	3.6% (n=10)	2.8% (n=8)	93.5% (n=260)
Maryland (n=174)	3.6% (n=6)	27.0% (n=47)	69.5% (n=121)
Massachusetts (n=464)	5.0% (n=23)	15.0% (n=70)	80.0% (n=371)
Michigan (n=598)	7.7% (n=46)	3.7% (n=22)	88.6% (n=530)
Minnesota (n=333)	4.9% (n=16)	12.7% (n=42)	82.4% (n=274)
Mississippi (n=227)	3.9% (n=8)	12.5% (n=28)	83.6% (n=190)
Missouri (n=343)	5.7% (n=20)	5.5% (n=19)	88.8% (n=305)
Montana (n=100)	9.6% (n=10)	2.4% (n=2)	88.0% (n=88)

<b>Figure 71 (continued): Public Library Outlet Change in Hours Open, by State</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Hours increased since last fiscal year</b>	<b>Hours decreased since last fiscal year</b>	<b>Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year</b>
Nebraska (n=267)	8.1% (n=22)	1.8% (n=5)	90.1% (n=241)
Nevada (n=78)	7.3% (n=6)	27.7% (n=28)	65.0% (n=51)
New Jersey (n=414)	3.0% (n=12)	13.4% (n=55)	83.6% (n=346)
New Mexico (n=97)	11.8% (n=11)	19.5% (n=19)	68.7% (n=66)
New York (n=1,038)	5.9% (n=61)	19.2% (n=199)	75.0% (n=778)
North Carolina (n=338)	4.6% (n=15)	15.3% (n=51)	80.2% (n=271)
Ohio (n=686)	12.2% (n=83)	49.9% (n=343)	37.9% (n=260)
Oklahoma (n=206)	10.4% (n=21)	3.1% (n=6)	86.5% (n=178)
Oregon (n=207)	11.7% (n=24)	4.0% (n=8)	84.3% (n=174)
Rhode Island (n=70)	6.9% (n=5)	16.1% (n=11)	77.0% (n=54)
South Carolina (n=181)	5.8% (n=10)	7.9% (n=14)	86.3% (n=156)
South Dakota (n= 149)	2.2% (n=3)	8.8% (n=13)	89.0% (n=133)
Tennessee (n=353)	9.3% (n=33)	2.4% (n=8)	88.4% (n=312)
Texas (n=838)	4.4% (n=37)	8.8% (n=74)	86.8% (n=727)
Utah (n=114)	16.3% (n=19)	3.7% (n=4)	79.9% (n=91)
Vermont (n= 180)	9.1% (n=16)	5.3% (n=9)	85.7% (n=154)
Virginia (n= 326)	4.1% (n=13)	27.3% (n=89)	68.7% (n=224)
Washington (n=331)	5.0% (n=16)	13.7% (n=45)	81.3% (n=269)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	100% (n=55)
West Virginia (n=167)	3.4% (n=6)	14.8% (n=25)	81.8% (n=137)
Wisconsin (n=452)	7.6% (n=34)	5.9% (n=27)	86.5% (n=391)
Wyoming (n=74)	4.1% (n=3)	16.2% (n=12)	79.7% (n=59)
<b>National</b>	6.0% (n=949)	15.9% (n=2,524)	78.1% (n=12,401)
<b>Key -- = No data to report</b>			

Figure 71 shows public library changes in hours open. The majority of libraries report that their hours remained the same in almost every state, Ohio being the one exception, where nearly half (49.9 percent) of libraries reported a decrease in hours over the past year. Likewise, while 51.8 percent of libraries in California reported that their hours stayed the same, 44.5 percent reported a decrease in hours. Very few libraries reported an increase in hours open over the past year, with the highest percentage coming from Utah (16.3 percent). In fact, this year there were higher instances of decreased hours in 30 states, an increase of five states over the 2009-2010 survey.

**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=278)	79.9% (n=222)	15.3% (n=43)	1.6% (n=4)	3.2% (n=9)
Alaska (n=103)	74.1% (n=76)	18.3% (n=19)	6.1% (n=6)	1.5% (n=2)
Arizona (n=195)	50.8% (n=99)	47.6% (n=93)	1.6% (n=3)	--
Arkansas (n=212)	80.9% (n=171)	8.9% (n=19)	6.7% (n=14)	3.4% (n=7)
California (n=1,019)	54.7% (n=557)	19.7% (n=200)	24.1% (n=245)	1.6% (n=16)
Colorado (n= 241)	59.6% (n=143)	25.8% (n=62)	11.6% (n=28)	3.0% (n=7)
Connecticut (n=231)	56.8% (n=131)	36.4% (n=84)	5.7% (n=13)	1.1% (n=3)
Delaware (n=31)	64.2% (n=20)	20.0% (n=6)	11.6% (n=4)	4.2% (n=1)
Florida (n=495)	48.4% (n=240)	45.9% (n=227)	1.5% (n=7)	4.3% (n=21)
Georgia (n=380)	77.5% (n=295)	15.7% (n=60)	5.6% (n=21)	1.2% (n=4)
Hawaii (n= 49)	69.4% (n=34)	18.4% (n=9)	10.2% (n=5)	2.0% (n=1)
Idaho (n=134)	70.5% (n=94)	24.1% (n=32)	4.0% (n=5)	1.3% (n=2)
Illinois (n=758)	62.4% (n=473)	29.6% (n=224)	5.8% (n=44)	2.2% (n=17)
Indiana (n=418)	65.8% (n=275)	18.8% (n=78)	11.7% (n=49)	3.8% (n=16)
Iowa (n=543)	82.6% (n=449)	11.9% (n=65)	4.3% (n=24)	1.1% (n=6)
Kansas (n= 380)	78.5% (n=291)	17.4% (n=65)	3.5% (n=13)	*
Kentucky (n=189)	79.3% (n=152)	14.4% (n=28)	3.8% (n=7)	2.5% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=286)	72.1% (n=206)	19.7% (n=56)	5.9% (n=17)	2.3% (n=7)
Maryland (n=177)	59.8% (n=106)	14.4% (n=25)	25.0% (n=44)	*
Massachusetts (n=458)	60.1% (n=275)	27.4% (n=126)	8.3% (n=38)	4.2% (n=19)

**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
Michigan (n=634)	68.9% (n=436)	15.5% (n=98)	12.4% (n=78)	3.2% (n=20)
Minnesota (n=347)	49.4% (n=171)	35.1% (n=122)	13.5% (n=47)	2.1% (n=7)
Mississippi (n=226)	67.4% (n=152)	22.8% (n=51)	8.5% (n=19)	1.4% (n=3)
Missouri (n=347)	59.2% (n=205)	23.1% (n=80)	16.8% (n=58)	1.0% (n=3)
Montana (n =100)	66.3% (n=66)	26.5% (n=26)	3.6% (n=4)	3.6% (n=4)
Nebraska (n – 278)	76.8% (n=214)	11.9% (n=33)	5.2% (n=14)	6.1% (n=17)
Nevada (n=74)	53.2% (n=39)	27.4% (n=20)	9.4% (n=7)	10.0% (n=7)
New Jersey (n=472)	72.6% (n=310)	11.9% (n=51)	12.9% (n=55)	2.6% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=111)	54.3% (n=60)	26.1% (n=30)	4.1% (n=5)	15.4% (n=17)
New York (n=1,035)	72.5% (n=751)	16.1% (n=166)	9.8% (n=101)	1.6% (n=17)
North Carolina (n=373)	60.5% (n=226)	29.4% (n=109)	8.5% (n=32)	1.6% (n=6)
Ohio (n=697)	67.7% (n=472)	21.1% (n=147)	8.1% (n=56)	3.1% (n=21)
Oklahoma (n=206)	61.4% (n=126)	36.5% (n=75)	2.1% (n=4)	--
Oregon (n=205)	55.5% (n=114)	26.2% (n=54)	14.6% (n=30)	3.8% (n=8)
Rhode Island (n=70)	26.1% (n=18)	54.7% (n=38)	1.9% (n=1)	17.3% (n=12)
South Carolina (n=179)	63.8% (n=114)	15.0% (n=27)	21.2% (n=38)	--
South Dakota (n= 143)	78.0% (n=111)	12.7% (n=18)	8.1% (n=11)	1.2% (n=2)
Tennessee (n=345)	57.9% (n=200)	31.1% (n=107)	6.7% (n=23)	4.3% (n=15)
Texas (n=831)	60.0% (n=499)	29.9% (n=248)	7.0% (n=58)	3.1% (n=26)
Utah (n=114)	70.6% (n=80)	13.6% (n=15)	10.7% (n=12)	5.1% (n=6)
Vermont (n= 184)	69.1% (n=127)	20.9% (n=38)	2.0% (n=4)	8.0% (n=15)
Virginia (n=343)	58.9% (n=202)	28.3% (n=97)	10.2% (n=35)	2.7% (n=9)
Washington (n= 335)	61.1% (n=205)	31.6% (n=106)	2.3% (n=8)	5.0% (n=17)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=170)	68.2% (n=116)	21.9% (n=37)	8.3% (n=14)	1.7% (n=3)

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

<i>State</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Do not know</b>	<b>Other</b>
Wisconsin (n=447)	63.5% (n=284)	26.1% (n=117)	6.2% (n=28)	4.2% (n=19)
Wyoming (n=75)	56.0% (n=42)	22.7% (n=17)	21.3% (n=16)	--
<i>National</i>	64.5% (n=10,312)	23.1% (n=3,727)	9.4% (n=1,519)	2.7% (n=438)
<b>Key</b> *=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 Arkansas (80.9 percent), Iowa (82.6 percent) and Washington, DC (100 percent) being the highest. Arizona (47.6 percent) and Rhode Island (54.7 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**

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
Alabama (n=236)	17.6 (n=236)	6.3 (n=82)	11.2 (n=73)	6.9 (n=140)	3.8 (n=94)	7.9 (n=98)	6.1 (n=70)
Alaska (n=99)	7.3 (n=99)	4.2 (n=26)	6.1 (n=28)	3.1 (n=34)	3.2 (n=43)	2.7 (n=32)	2.8 (n=43)
Arizona (n=167)	30.5 (n=167)	16.9 (n=48)	12.4 (n=28)	16.0 (n=64)	23.6 (n=74)	9.1 (n=38)	9.9 (n=36)
Arkansas (n=197)	11.1 (n=197)	3.6 (n=60)	3.9 (n=63)	7.0 (n=89)	3.7 (n=54)	6.3 (n=78)	7.5 (n=49)
California (n=775)	19.1 (n=775)	10.0 (n=96)	6.2 (n=108)	8.7 (n=262)	10.7 (n=370)	12.1 (n=265)	14.6 (n=246)
Colorado (n= 203)	36.0 (n=203)	7.9 (n=52)	10.6 (n=80)	12.8 (n=82)	12.9 (n=84)	9.2 (n=43)	12.1 (n=49)
Connecticut (n=216)	16.7 (n=216)	7.6 (n=67)	6.6 (n=81)	5.2 (n=72)	9.0 (n=103)	5.6 (n=70)	6.7 (n= 102)
Delaware (n=31)	19.2 (n=31)	6.2 (n=10)	10.2 (n=17)	6.9 (n=15)	9.3 (n=15)	6.5 (n=8)	--
Florida (n=425)	30.7 (n=425)	9.0 (n=115)	17.5 (n=142)	14.5 (n=156)	9.6 (n=190)	14.4 (n=215)	11.2 (n=161)
Georgia (n=351)	22.3 (n=351)	16.1 (n=46)	12.0 (n=49)	12.6 (n=132)	6.9 (n=200)	9.2 (n=118)	17.3 (n=133)
Hawaii (n= 40)	5.8 (n=40)	3.8 (n=26)	3.0 (n=2)	8.0 (n=1)	2.0 (n=3)	1.2 (n=4)	3.5 (n=22)
Idaho (n=132)	9.2 (n=132)	5.8 (n=11)	5.5 (n=21)	4.7 (n=49)	5.9 (n=77)	3.1 (n=50)	3.0 (n=64)
Illinois (n=708)	15.8 (n=708)	5.2 (n=426)	5.7 (n=201)	6.3 (n=260)	9.3 (n=224)	5.4 (n=232)	6.6 (n=359)

**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=373)	19.0 (n=373)	8.2 (n=172)	8.4 (n=117)	9.7 (n=150)	6.7 (n=155)	6.6 (n=134)	6.4 (n=168)
Iowa (n=518)	9.0 (n=518)	4.1 (n=185)	5.0 (n=161)	4.6 (n=220)	3.9 (n=183)	3.7 (n=144)	3.0 (n=259)
Kansas (n=369)	10.0 (n=369)	3.9 (n=114)	4.4 (n=99)	4.6 (n=177)	5.6 (n=165)	3.9 (n=104)	3.6 (n=179)
Kentucky (n=173)	17.9 (n=173)	7.5 (n=68)	8.3 (n=71)	6.0 (n=82)	6.9 (n=91)	5.8 (n=75)	8.6 (n=44)
Louisiana (n=274)	18.5 (n=274)	23.8 (n=68)	5.4 (n=91)	6.8 (n=101)	9.00 (n=104)	7.0 (n=92)	8.3 (n=74)
Maryland (n=175)	22.5 (n=175)	11.2 (n=44)	13.7 (n=37)	11.6 (n=61)	13.5 (n=64)	12.4 (n=70)	10.7 (n=42)
Massachusetts (n=434)	13.9 (n=434)	5.6 (n=172)	7.7 (n=187)	6.8 (n=142)	5.2 (n=155)	3.7 (n=174)	6.9 (n=172)
Michigan (n=500)	16.2 (n=500)	9.0 (n=120)	7.1 (n=103)	6.0 (n=224)	6.5 (n=217)	10.0 (n=204)	9.0 (n=163)
Minnesota (n=327)	16.7 (n=327)	6.3 (n=131)	6.2 (n=53)	4.3 (n=135)	5.0 (n=107)	4.2 (n=114)	4.6 (n=82)
Mississippi (n=208)	10.0 (n=208)	5.4 (n=18)	3.7 (n=16)	5.9 (n=74)	5.4 (n=110)	6.3 (n=71)	5.6 (n=53)
Missouri (n=340)	13.3 (n=340)	4.6 (n=206)	3.3 (n=68)	9.3 (n=89)	8.6 (n=154)	6.3 (n=62)	5.5 (n=132)
Montana (n=94)	8.7 (n=94)	4.0 (n=23)	2.3 (n=34)	2.9 (n=52)	3.5 (n=42)	4.3 (n=44)	3.9 (n=42)
Nebraska (N=268)	7.4 (n=268)	3.5 (n=121)	3.3 (n=60)	2.2 (n=96)	3.3 (n=67)	4.0 (n=67)	3.4 (n=189)
Nevada (n=69)	13.3 (n=69)	20.5 (n=10)	5.3 (n=17)	8.9 (n=27)	7.3 (n=15)	10.1 (n=7)	6.0 (n=29)
New Jersey (n=364)	16.7 (n=364)	7.0 (n=139)	5.9 (n=151)	6.0 (n=157)	6.7 (n=132)	6.6 (n=126)	9.1 (n=132)

**Figure 73 (continued): 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
New Mexico (n=111)	12.5 (n=111)	8.5 (n=23)	6.8 (n=22)	5.9 (n=21)	5.3 (n=39)	7.9 (n=58)	6.4 (n=37)
New York (n=994)	14.0 (n=994)	7.1 (n=311)	5.7 (n=423)	7.5 (n=608)	6.5 (n=311)	6.0 (n=247)	3.9 (n=256)
North Carolina (n=341)	14.3 (n=341)	5.3 (n=168)	5.8 (n=161)	6.2 (n=116)	6.4 (n=113)	6.0 (n=115)	7.9 (n=105)
Ohio (n=635)	14.8 (n=635)	6.40 (n=216)	5.3 (n=84)	6.5 (n=144)	7.2 (n=214)	5.9 (n=197)	9.6 (n=286)
Oklahoma (n=204)	13.1 (n=204)	3.5 (n=46)	7.0 (n=42)	4.2 (n=84)	8.1 (n=111)	6.1 (n=91)	4.0 (n=58)
Oregon (n=193)	12.5 (n=193)	3.6 (n=109)	5.9 (n=113)	5.4 (n=47)	5.4 (n=37)	5.0 (n=39)	4.6 (n=76)
Rhode Island (n=67)	17.6 (n=67)	6.9 (n=45)	4.9 (n=51)	5.9 (n=39)	6.7 (n=33)	4.0 (n=17)	6.0 (n=16)
South Carolina (n=157)	15.9 (n=157)	11.0 (n=66)	5.6 (n=56)	10.1 (n=78)	5.0 (n=41)	4.7 (n=43)	7.0 (n=36)
South Dakota (n= 139)	8.1 (n=139)	3.2 (n=58)	3.5 (n=23)	3.6 (n=47)	5.7 (n=61)	2.9 (n=30)	3.3 (n=66)

**Figure 73 (continued): 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
Tennessee (n=332)	14.4 (n=332)	2.9 (n=90)	4.7 (n=54)	4.7 (n=104)	8.3 (n=179)	5.0 (n=166)	5.6 (n=96)
Texas (n=776)	20.7 (n=776)	7.6 (n=199)	7.3 (n=221)	7.8 (n=258)	11.3 (n=273)	9.2 (n=287)	9.2 (n=350)
Utah (n=112)	13.8 (n=112)	3.9 (n=27)	10.5 (n=40)	6.2 (n=36)	7.1 (n=57)	5.6 (n=49)	3.8 (n=30)
Vermont (n= 182)	6.5 (n=182)	3.0 (n=73)	2.1 (n=22)	2.9 (n=52)	3.0 (n=86)	1.9 (n=53)	3.5 (n=116)
Virginia (n= 334)	16.4 (n=334)	6.4 (n=127)	7.2 (n=14)	6.7 (n=100)	5.1 (n=99)	10.0 (n=78)	7.7 (n=101)
Washington (n= 315)	17.0 (n=315)	4.8 (n=177)	11.1 (n=221)	10.8 (n=63)	9.6 (n=89)	2.8 (n=69)	6.9 (n=47)
Washington, DC (n=55)	25.0 (n=55)	34.0 (n=5)	--	--	13.4 (n=41)	13.9 (n=48)	--
West Virginia (n=159)	7.8 (n=159)	2.1 (n=25)	2.4 (n=24)	4.5 (n=57)	4.0 (n=86)	4.1 (n=61)	4.8 (n=54)
Wisconsin (n=434)	10.8 (n=434)	5.0 (n=263)	4.5 (n=132)	4.1 (n=146)	3.9 (n=139)	3.2 (n=124)	5.8 (n=190)
Wyoming (n=62)	11.8 (n=62)	5.3 (n=14)	4.6 (n=25)	8.7 (n=35)	3.6 (n=25)	2.8 (n=20)	3.5 (n=25)
<b>National</b>	16.0 (n=14,669)	6.5 (n=4,975)	6.9 (n=4,276)	7.1 (n=5,334)	7.6 (n=5,632)	7.1 (n=4,815)	7.1 (n=5,337)
<b>Key</b> -- = 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 Louisiana (23.9) and Nevada (20.5) report the highest average number of workstations less than one year old. Libraries in Georgia (17.2) and Florida (14.4) reported the highest number of five-year-old workstations. Libraries in Arizona (16.0) report the highest average number of workstations that are two years old and three years old (23.6), and libraries in Florida report the highest average number of workstations that are four years old (14.4).

**Figure 74: Public Library Outlet Has a Replacement Policy or Procedure, by State**

State	Yes	No, replace as needed	Do not know
Alabama (n=246)	26.4% (n=65)	73.6% (n=181)	--
Alaska (n=103)	26.3% (n=27)	69.1% (n=710)	4.6% (n=5)
Arizona (n=205)	73.4% (n=150)	24.6% (n=50)	1.9% (n=4)
Arkansas (n=210)	12.7% (n=27)	86.5% (n=182)	*
California (n=951)	51.1% (n=486)	48.5% (n=461)	*
Colorado (n= 235)	62.8% (n=148)	36.0% (n=84)	1.2% (n=3)
Connecticut (n=222)	30.2% (n=67)	69.8% (n=155)	*
Delaware (n=31)	75.8% (n=24)	24.2% (n=8)	*
Florida (n=486)	42.2% (n=205)	57.8% (n=281)	*
Georgia (n=359)	31.4% (n=113)	68.1% (n=245)	*
Hawaii (n= 49)	--	100% (n=49)	--
Idaho (n=134)	35.7% (n=48)	63% (n=84)	1.3% (n=2)
Illinois (n=725)	40.1% (n=290)	59.5% (n=431)	*
Indiana (n=397)	54.8% (n=218)	45.2% (n=179)	--
Iowa (n=536)	24.1% (n=129)	73.3% (n=393)	2.6% (n=14)
Kansas (n= 370)	46.0% (n=170)	52.0% (n=192)	2.0% (n=7)
Kentucky (n=185)	51.5% (n=95)	48.5% (n=90)	--
Louisiana (n=287)	50.8% (n=146)	47.0% (n=135)	2.2% (n=6)
Maryland (n=174)	86.9% (n=151)	12.5% (n=22)	*
Massachusetts (n=434)	18.4% (n=80)	81.0% (n=352)	*
Michigan (n=514)	49.0% (n=252)	49.9% (n=256)	1.1% (n=6)
Minnesota (n=332)	82.1% (n=272)	17.9% (n=59)	--
Mississippi (n=223)	34.4% (n=77)	64.1% (n=143)	1.5% (n=3)
Missouri (n=348)	54.3% (n=189)	45.7% (n=159)	--
Montana (n=100)	28.9% (n=29)	68.7% (n=69)	2.4% (n=2)

<b>Figure 74 (continued): Public Library Outlet Has a Replacement Policy or Procedure, by State</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No, replace as needed</b>	<b>Do not know</b>
Nebraska (n=267)	23.3% (n=62)	75.8% (n=203)	*
Nevada (n=80)	39.9% (n=32)	58.0% (n=47)	2.1% (n=2)
New Jersey (n=371)	36.8% (n=137)	61.2% (n=227)	2.0% (n=7)
New Mexico (n=111)	23.9% (n=27)	74.7% (n=83)	1.4% (n=1)
New York (n=1,014)	39.0% (n=395)	60.2% (n=610)	*
North Carolina (n=366)	67.1% (n=246)	31.5% (n=115)	1.4% (n=5)
Ohio (n=676)	41.4% (n=280)	58.1% (n=393)	*
Oklahoma (n=204)	49.5% (n=101)	50.5% (n=103)	--
Oregon (n=197)	42.3% (n=83)	57.7% (n=114)	--
Rhode Island (n=70)	45.9% (n=32)	51.3% (n=46)	2.9% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=166)	28.9% (n=48)	71.1% (n=118)	--
South Dakota (n=143)	30.7% (n=44)	68.1% (n=97)	1.2% (n=2)
Tennessee (n=342)	25.2% (n=86)	72.4% (n=247)	2.4% (n=8)
Texas (n=816)	44.4% (n=362)	53.3% (n=435)	2.3% (n=19)
Utah (n=114)	31.4% (n=36)	68.6% (n=78)	--
Vermont (n=180)	19.3% (n=35)	80.7% (n=145)	--
Virginia (n=337)	63.8% (n=215)	35.7% (n=120)	*
Washington (n=327)	46.9% (n=154)	53.1% (n=174)	--
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--
West Virginia (n=169)	9.9% (n=17)	88.5% (n=149)	1.7% (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=439)	44.1% (n=193)	55.5% (n=244)	*
Wyoming (n=70)	34.3% (n=24)	64.3% (n=45)	1.4% (n=1)
<b>National</b>	43.5% (n=6,722)	56.6% (n=8,599)	*
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report			

Figure 74 indicates if a library has a set workstation replacement policy or procedure. State responses to the question are libraries indicating that there is free public access Internet available. Overall, 56.5 percent of libraries report that they do not have a replacement schedule, which is only a slight change from the 2009-2010 survey (58.7 percent). Washington, DC (100 percent) and Maryland (86.9 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries with a workstation placement procedure or schedule. Maryland had the highest percentage reported in the 2009-2010 survey (87.2 percent). No libraries in Hawaii reported having a replacement schedule or procedure, and West Virginia was a close second, with 88.5 percent of libraries stating that they do not have any workstation replacement schedule or procedure.

**Figure 75: Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

State	The average replacement schedule is every year	The average replacement schedule is every 2 years	The average replacement schedule is every 3 years	The average replacement schedule is every 4 years	The average replacement schedule is every 5 years	The library has another replacement or addition schedule
Alabama (n=65)	--	5.7% (n=4)	24.3% (n=16)	64.2% (n=42)	--	5.7% (n=4)
Alaska (n=65)	--	5.8% (n=2)	35.0% (n=9)	17.5% (n=5)	23.3% (n=6)	18.4% (n=5)
Arizona (n=150)	--	--	30.0% (n=45)	20.9% (n=31)	49.2% (n=74)	--
Arkansas (n=27)	--	--	19.9% (n=5)	67.4% (n=18)	--	12.8% (n=3)
California (n=468)	--	--	23.3% (n=109)	46.6% (n=218)	21.3% (n=99)	8.9% (n=41)
Colorado (n=140)	--	*	31.0% (n=43)	36.2% (n=51)	26.2% (n=37)	5.9% (n=8)
Connecticut (n=64)	8.1% (n=5)	4.1% (n=3)	22.7% (n=15)	29.1% (n=19)	23.8% (n=15)	12.2% (n=8)
Delaware (n=22)	11.7% (n=3)	--	73.4% (n=16)	10.4% (n=2)	--	4.5% (n=1)
Florida (n=205)	--	--	7.7% (n=16)	25.2% (n=52)	66.4% (n=136)	*
Georgia (n=111)	--	--	20.8% (n=23)	53.9% (n=60)	18.9% (n=21)	6.4% (n=7)
Hawaii (n=0)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho (n=48)	--	3.7% (n=2)	7.4% (n=3)	11.8% (n=6)	69.5% (n=33)	7.6% (n=4)
Illinois (n=285)	3.1% (n=9)	3.9% (n=11)	21.7% (n=62)	27.3% (n=78)	24.9% (n=71)	19.1% (n=54)
Indiana (n=218)	*	1.4% (n=3)	22.1% (n=48)	26.7% (n=58)	38.9% (n=85)	10.1% (n=22)
Iowa (n=127)	11.1% (n=14)	5.5% (n=7)	29.2% (n=27)	15.2% (n=19)	29.3% (n=37)	9.6% (n=12)
Kansas (n=171)	8.8% (n=15)	7.7% (n=13)	8.8% (n=15)	26.9% (n=46)	28.2% (n=48)	19.7% (n=34)
Kentucky (n=189)	--	3.9% (n=4)	7.6% (n=7)	44.8% (n=43)	37.8% (n=36)	5.8% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=142)	*	--	16.8% (n=24)	41.3% (n=59)	38.1% (n=54)	2.8% (n=4)
Maryland (n=151)	--	--	14.7% (n=22)	43.6% (n=66)	23.1% (n=35)	18.7% (n=28)

**Figure 75 (continued): Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

State	The average replacement schedule is every year	The average replacement schedule is every 2 years	The average replacement schedule is every 3 years	The average replacement schedule is every 4 years	The average replacement schedule is every 5 years	The library has another replacement or addition schedule
Massachusetts (n=77)	--	--	20.5% (n=16)	26.4% (n=20)	35.9% (n=28)	17.2% (n=13)
Michigan (n=252)	3.3% (n=8)	2.1% (n=5)	22.3% (n=56)	57.1% (n=144)	9.4% (n=24)	5.8% (n=15)
Minnesota (n=272)	*	*	13.4% (n=37)	48.9% (n=133)	34.3% (n=93)	1.5% (n=4)
Mississippi (n=75)	--	--	41.3% (n=31)	43.0% (n=32)	9.9% (n=7)	5.8% (n=4)
Missouri (n=184)	2.3% (n=4)	*	39.0% (n=72)	23.1% (n=42)	25.8% (n=47)	9.1% (n=17)
Montana (n=29)	12.5% (n=4)	--	25.0% (n=7)	41.7% (n=12)	8.3% (n=2)	12.5% (n=4)
Nebraska (n=62)	7.7% (n=5)	15.0% (n=9)	19.3% (n=12)	19.3% (n=12)	15.5% (n=10)	23.2% (n=14)
Nevada (n=32)	--	5.4% (n=2)	16.2% (n=5)	17.7% (n=6)	46.9% (n=15)	13.8% (n=4)
New Jersey (n=137)	1.8% (n=2)	--	39.2% (n=53)	36.2% (n=49)	12.8% (n=17)	10.0% (n=14)
New Mexico (n=27)	11.6% (n=3)	--	34.1% (n=9)	11.6% (n=3)	37.1% (n=10)	5.8% (n=1)
New York (n=395)	*	4.8% (n=19)	50.4% (n=199)	21.2% (n=84)	15.9% (n=63)	6.9% (n=27)
North Carolina (n=246)	--	--	28.8% (n=71)	30.9% (n=76)	16.3% (n=40)	24.0% (n=59)
Ohio (n=280)	--	--	33.1% (n=93)	49.8% (n=139)	11.6% (n=32)	5.5% (n=15)
Oklahoma (n=101)	6.4% (n=6)	--	44.6% (n=45)	2.1% (n=2)	40.6% (n=41)	6.4% (n=6)
Oregon (n=82)	7.8% (n=6)	--	9.2% (n=8)	46.3% (n=38)	16.0% (n=13)	20.6% (n=17)
Rhode Island (n=30)	--	--	12.5% (n=4)	75.1% (n=23)	8.0% (n=2)	4.4% (n=1)
South Carolina (n=48)	--	--	21.3% (n=10)	58.1% (n=28)	20.6% (n=10)	--
South Dakota (n=44)	--	--	26.3% (n=11)	60.2% (n=26)	13.5% (n=6)	--
Tennessee (n=86)	3.7% (n=3)	--	21.6% (n=19)	50.0% (n=43)	9.7% (n=8)	14.9% (n=13)
Texas (n=360)	1.9% (n=7)	*	17.6% (n=63)	28.3% (n=102)	35.1% (n=126)	16.6% (n=60)
Utah (n=36)	--	17.8% (n=6)	25.5% (n=9)	39.6% (n=14)	11.2% (n=4)	5.9% (n=2)
Vermont (n=35)	12.1% (n=4)	6.1% (n=2)	4.6% (n=2)	33.3% (n=12)	33.3% (n=12)	10.6% (n=4)
Virginia (n=214)	--	--	11.3% (n=24)	39.2% (n=84)	46.2% (n=99)	3.3% (n=7)

**Figure 75 (continued): Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

State	The average replacement schedule is every year	The average replacement schedule is every 2 years	The average replacement schedule is every 3 years	The average replacement schedule is every 4 years	The average replacement schedule is every 5 years	The library has another replacement or addition schedule
Washington (n=154)	--	--	12.7% (n=19)	32.6% (n=50)	51.8% (n=79)	3.0% (n=5)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--
West Virginia (n=17)	8.5% (n=1)	8.5% (n=1)	25.4% (n=4)	8.5% (n=1)	32.3% (n=5)	16.9% (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=193)	3.7% (n=7)	2.9% (n=5)	12.4% (n=24)	32.3% (n=62)	29.0% (n=56)	19.7% (n=38)
Wyoming (n=23)	--	--	47.8% (n=11)	17.4% (n=4)	34.8% (n=8)	--
<b>National</b>	1.8% (n=117)	1.4% (n=95)	22.9% (n=1,524)	36.4% (n=2,422)	27.6% (n=1,833)	10.0% (n=663)

**Key** \* = Insufficient data to report  
 -- = No data to report  
 \*\* = Percentages are out of libraries that reported having a replacement schedule

Figure 75 shows the average workstation replacement schedule of public libraries. State responses to the question are libraries indicating that there is free public access Internet available. Again, 42.6 percent of libraries nationwide reported having a workstation replacement schedule or procedure. Of those that do, every four years is most frequently reported (35.8 percent). In Washington, D.C., the location where the highest percentage of libraries reported having a replacement schedule (100 percent), a four-year replacement schedule was most frequently reported (100 percent). Montana (12.5 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries reporting a replacement schedule of every year, Utah (17.8 percent) of every two years, Delaware (73.4 percent) of every three years, and Nevada (69.5 percent) of every five years.

**Figure 76: Public Library Outlet Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

State	No, not able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain, but unsure how many workstations will be replaced	Don't Know	The average number of workstations that the library plans to replace within the next year
Alabama (n=56)	17.2% (n=10)	22.7% (n=13)	52.3% (n=29)	7.8% (n=4)	16.3 (n=13)
Alaska (n=24)	27.4% (n=7)	26.4% (n=6)	39.6% (n=9)	6.6% (n=2)	3.0 (n=6)
Arizona (n=129)	46.2% (n=60)	8.3% (n=11)	41.4% (n=53)	4.1% (n=5)	12.4 (n=24)
Arkansas (n=27)	6.4% (n=2)	34.0% (n=9)	59.6% (n=16)	--	6.8 (n=9)
California (n=372)	23.7% (n=88)	11.7% (n=43)	52.3% (n=194)	12.3% (n=46)	4.6 (n=63)
Colorado (n=130)	5.8% (n=7)	14.5% (n=19)	66.2% (n=86)	13.5% (n=17)	19.0 (n=19)

**Figure 76 (continued): Public Library Outlet Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

<i>State</i>	No, not able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain, but unsure how many workstations will be replaced	Don't Know	The average number of workstations that the library plans to replace within the next year
Connecticut (n=59)	11.4% (n=7)	40.5% (n=24)	43.7% (n=26)	4.4% (n=3)	10.3 (n=27)
Delaware (n=23)	16.6% (n=4)	22.1% (n=5)	40.5% (n=9)	20.9% (n=5)	7.7 (n=4)
Florida (n=198)	19.2% (n=38)	3.7% (n=7)	59.5% (n=118)	17.6% (n=35)	12.4 (n=15)
Georgia (n=100)	21.1% (n=21)	9.7% (n=10)	64.9% (n=65)	4.3% (n=4)	36.3 (n=18)
Hawaii (n=0)	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho (n=45)	18.3% (n=8)	22.1% (n=10)	51.6% (n=23)	8.0% (n=4)	11.1 (n=10)
Illinois (n=274)	15.7% (n=43)	26.7% (n=73)	53.5% (n=146)	4.1% (n=11)	11.3 (n=73)
Indiana (n=202)	13.1% (n=26)	20.4% (n=4)	63.1% (n=127)	3.4% (n=7)	6.6 (n=46)
Iowa (n=105)	17.6% (n=18)	20.2% (n=21)	58.9% (n=62)	3.4% (n=3)	2.8 (n=21)
Kansas (n=159)	23.0% (n=37)	18.8% (n=30)	49.9% (n=79)	8.2% (n=13)	2.1 (n=30)
Kentucky (n=78)	8.1% (n=6)	19.2% (n=15)	66.1% (n=52)	6.6% (n=5)	5.7 (n=20)
Louisiana (n=133)	11.6% (n=15)	6.6% (n=9)	81.8% (n=109)	--	5.3 (n=13)
Maryland (n=144)	43.3% (n=62)	8.8% (n=13)	47.9% (n=69)	--	12.7 (n=25)
Massachusetts (n=69)	15.6% (n=11)	33.2% (n=23)	43.0% (n=30)	8.2% (n=6)	10.7 (n=23)
Michigan (n=224)	31.6% (n=71)	15.4% (n=35)	50.2% (n=113)	2.8% (n=6)	9.9 (n=43)
Minnesota (n=265)	17.0% (n=45)	28.2% (n=75)	54.8% (n=145)	--	3.4 (n=75)
Mississippi (n=73)	28.4% (n=21)	11.0% (n=8)	60.6% (n=44)	--	9.9 (n=43)
Missouri (n=176)	8.7% (n=15)	46.0% (n=81)	44.6% (n=78)	*	7.1 (n=86)
Montana (n=20)	5.9% (n=1)	17.6% (n=4)	70.6% (n=14)	5.9% (n=1)	3.7 (n=4)
Nebraska (n=45)	5.3% (n=2)	26.5% (n=12)	58.3% (n=26)	9.9% (n=4)	2.6 (n=12)
Nevada (n=23)	28.7% (n=7)	26.6% (n=6)	37.3% (n=9)	7.5% (n=2)	5.7 (n=6)
New Jersey (n=129)	3.8% (n=5)	18.2% (n=23)	72.2% (n=93)	5.8% (n=7)	2.6 (n=36)
New Mexico (n=24)	--	43.0% (n=10)	44.4% (n=11)	12.6% (n=3)	6.1 (n=11)

**Figure 76 (continued): Public Library Outlet Ability to Maintain Public Access Workstation Replacement Schedule, by State\*\***

<i>State</i>	No, not able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain replacement schedule	Yes, able to maintain, but unsure how many workstations will be replaced	Don't Know	The average number of workstations that the library plans to replace within the next year
New York (n=358)	14.5% (n=52)	15.7% (n=56)	31.9% (n=114)	37.9% (n=136)	6.3 (n=56)
North Carolina (n=233)	29.9% (n=70)	10.4% (n=24)	46.4% (n=108)	13.3% (n=31)	10.8 (n=24)
Ohio (n=276)	28.5% (n=78)	8.9% (n=25)	58.6% (n=162)	3.9% (n=11)	10.5 (n=26)
Oklahoma (n=97)	11.5% (n=11)	4.4% (n=4)	77.4% (n=75)	6.6% (n=6)	*
Oregon (n=81)	32.7% (n=27)	24.1% (n=20)	37.7% (n=31)	5.5% (n=4)	5.4 (n=20)
Rhode Island (n=30)	12.5% (n=4)	12.5% (n=4)	75.1% (n=23)	--	3.7 (n=4)
South Carolina (n= 35)	35.1% (n=12)	6.3% (n=2)	52.4% (n=18)	6.3% (n=2)	15.0 (n=2)
South Dakota (n=41)	8.1% (n=3)	61.0% (n=25)	26.8% (n=11)	4.1% (n=2)	6.9 (n=25)
Tennessee (n=76)	21.0% (n=16)	34.5% (n=26)	26.9% (n=20)	17.6% (n=13)	15.7 (n=26)
Texas (n=338)	18.0% (n=61)	23.2% (n=78)	50.4% (n=170)	8.5% (n=29)	13.0 (n=85)
Utah (n=31)	29.7% (n=9)	--	64.4% (n=20)	5.9% (n=2)	--
Vermont (n=26)	40.0% (n=10)	32.2% (n=8)	22.0% (n=6)	6.0% (n=6)	1.6 (n=11)
Virginia (n=203)	23.1% (n=47)	12.3% (n=25)	59.8% (n=122)	4.9% (n=10)	3.2 (n=64)
Washington (n=123)	70.0% (n=86)	8.8% (n=11)	17.5% (n=21)	3.8% (n=5)	14.4 (n=11)
Washington, DC (n=53)	73.9% (n=39)	21.7% (n=11)	4.3% (n=2)	--	16.0 (n=12)
West Virginia (n=17)	--	7.9% (n=10)	75.1% (n=12)	16.9% (n=3)	20.0 (n=1)
Wisconsin (n=159)	21.1% (n=19)	51.0% (n=81)	34.2% (n=54)	2.7% (n=4)	5.8 (n=89)
Wyoming (n=22)	36.4% (n=8)	18.2% (n=4)	40.9% (n=9)	4.5% (n=1)	7.5 (n=10)
<b>National</b>	18.6% (n=1,135)	51.5% (n=3,134)	22.3% (n=1,359)	7.6% (n=461)	7.9% (n=1,361)

**Key** \* = Insufficient data to report

-- = No data to report

\*\* = Percentages are out of libraries that reported having a replacement schedule

Figure 76 shows the ability of public libraries to maintain their public access workstation replacement schedules, for those that have such schedules/procedure, and the average number of workstations the libraries plan to replace within the next year. Washington, DC (73.9 percent) and Washington (70.0

percent) have the highest percentage of libraries reporting that they are unable to maintain their replacement schedule. Conversely, Oklahoma (77.4 percent) and Louisiana (81.8 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries reporting that they will be able to maintain their replacement schedule, even if they are unsure how many workstations they will be able to replace. Colorado (19.0) and Georgia (36.3) libraries report the highest average number of workstations that will be replaced, but these numbers are down substantially from the 2009-2010 survey.

**Figure 77: Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Public Access Internet Workstations, by State**

State	Yes	No	Don't Know	Other
Alabama (n=252)	18.7% (n=47)	58.1% (n=147)	15.5% (n=39)	7.7% (n=19)
Alaska (n=92)	8.6% (n=8)	79.4% (n=73)	3.4% (n=3)	8.6% (n=8)
Arizona (n=147)	15.5% (n=23)	74.0% (n=109)	--	10.5% (n=15)
Arkansas (n=162)	21.1% (n=34)	63.9% (n=103)	6.3% (n=10)	8.7% (n=14)
California (n=871)	9.9% (n=86)	86.5% (n=753)	1.0% (n=9)	2.6% (n=22)
Colorado (n=207)	38.5% (n=80)	48.1% (n=100)	11.2% (n=23)	2.2% (n=5)
Connecticut (n=195)	30.9% (n=60)	64.4% (n=126)	1.3% (n=3)	3.4% (n=7)
Delaware (n=31)	11.6% (n=4)	67.4% (n=21)	8.4% (n=3)	12.6% (n=4)
Florida (n=446)	12.2% (n=54)	82.0% (n=366)	5.4% (n=24)	*
Georgia (n=285)	7.2% (n=20)	82.2% (n=234)	7.5% (n=21)	3.1% (n=9)
Hawaii (n=41)	16.3% (n=8)	81.6% (n=40)	--	2.0% (n=1)
Idaho (n=133)	24.3% (n=32)	41.3% (n=55)	2.7% (n=4)	31.7% (n=42)
Illinois (n=664)	33.8% (n=224)	56.3% (n=374)	5.1% (n=34)	4.8% (n=32)
Indiana (n=381)	29.0% (n=110)	63.6% (n=242)	2.4% (n=9)	5.1% (n=19)
Iowa (n=503)	15.6% (n=78)	77.4% (n=390)	4.3% (n=22)	2.6% (n=13)
Kansas (n=365)	20.7% (n=76)	69.0% (n=252)	3.6% (n=13)	6.7% (n=24)
Kentucky (n=165)	40.6% (n=67)	44.5% (n=73)	7.3% (n=12)	7.5% (n=12)
Louisiana (n=239)	37.3% (n=89)	57.7% (n=138)	1.8% (n=4)	3.2% (n=8)

**Figure 77 (continued): Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Public Access Internet Workstations, by State**

State	Yes	No	Don't Know	Other
Maryland (n=154)	6.6% (n=10)	90.5% (n=140)	1.9% (n=3)	1.0% (n=2)
Massachusetts (n=405)	21.0% (n=85)	68.8% (n=278)	2.3% (n=9)	7.9% (n=32)
Michigan (n=499)	36.7% (n=183)	43.9% (n=219)	2.7% (n=14)	16.7% (n=83)
Minnesota (n=347)	18.1% (n=63)	79.1% (n=274)	1.2% (n=4)	1.6% (n=6)
Missouri (n=323)	23.1% (n=74)	72.2% (n=233)	1.7% (n=5)	3.0% (n=10)
Montana (n=100)	37.3% (n=37)	51.8% (n=52)	4.8% (n=5)	6.0% (n=6)
Nebraska (n=260)	45.2% (n=118)	31.7% (n=82)	7.4% (n=19)	15.7% (n=41)
Nevada (n=67)	13.6% (n=9)	72.8% (n=49)	5.1% (n=3)	8.5% (n=6)
New Jersey (n=301)	25.3% (n=76)	66.0% (n=199)	4.6% (n=14)	4.1% (n=12)
New Mexico (n=111)	23.7% (n=26)	65.4% (n=73)	5.6% (n=6)	5.3% (n=6)
New York (n=977)	13.9% (n=136)	78.1% (n=763)	3.0% (n=29)	4.9% (n=48)
North Carolina (n=350)	18.1% (n=64)	78.0% (n=273)	3.5% (n=12)	*
Ohio (n=648)	39.7% (n=257)	48.0% (n=311)	5.2% (n=33)	7.2% (n=46)
Oklahoma (n=178)	21.0% (n=37)	71.8% (n=128)	3.6% (n=6)	3.6% (n=6)
Oregon (n=192)	11.9% (n=23)	83.3% (n=160)	1.6% (n=3)	3.2% (n=6)
Rhode Island (n=65)	61.4% (n=40)	31.1% (n=20)	3.7% (n=2)	3.7% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=111)	29.9% (n=33)	68.2% (n=76)	2.0% (n=2)	--
South Dakota (n=141)	16.3% (n=23)	72.0% (n=102)	4.7% (n=7)	7.0% (n=9)
Tennessee (n=342)	39.9% (n=136)	50.4% (n=172)	4.9% (n=17)	4.9% (n=17)
Texas (n=772)	25.4% (n=196)	63.8% (n=493)	4.6% (n=36)	6.2% (n=48)
Utah (n=108)	7.4% (n=8)	88.6% (n=95)	2.0% (n=2)	2.0% (n=2)
Vermont (n=168)	28.7% (n=48)	60.3% (n=101)	5.9% (n=10)	5.0% (n=8)
Virginia (n=279)	16.5% (n=46)	76.9% (n=215)	3.6% (n=10)	3.0% (n=8)
Washington (n=295)	15.0% (n=44)	81.8% (n=241)	1.3% (n=4)	2.0% (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--	--

<b>Figure 77 (continued): Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Public Access Internet Workstations, by State</b>				
<b>State</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Other</b>
West Virginia (n=160)	16.4% (n=26)	79.2% (n=127)	*	3.5% (n=6)
Wisconsin (n=417)	31.3% (n=131)	57.8% (n=241)	4.4% (n=18)	6.5% (n=27)
Wyoming (n= 70)	10.0% (n=7)	88.6% (n=62)	1.4% (n=1)	--
<b>National</b>	22.7% (n=3,245)	68.4% (n=9,772)	3.8% (n=546)	5.0% (n=716)
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report; -- = No data to report				

Figure 77 shows public library outlets' plans to add public access workstation in the next year. Maryland (90.5 percent), Utah (88.6 percent), and Wyoming (88.6 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries reporting that they do not plan to add workstations in the next year. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Rhode Island (61.4 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries reporting that they do plan to add workstations.

**Figure 78: Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by State (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)**

State	Availability of space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of public service staff	Availability of technical staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	Other
Alabama (n=252)	4.2 (n=252)	4.0 (n=252)	2.9 (n=244)	3.2 (n=248)	3.2 (n=245)	2.9 (n=245)	3.5 (n=248)	5.0 (n=3)
Alaska (n=94)	4.1 (n=94)	4.2 (n=94)	3.2 (n=91)	3.1 (n=93)	3.6 (n=90)	3.9 (n=94)	3.1 (n=83)	3.0 (n=5)
Arizona (n=195)	4.4 (n=191)	4.2 (n=191)	3.5 (n=192)	3.1 (n=193)	3.0 (n=195)	3.0 (n=193)	3.0 (n=193)	--
Arkansas (n=210)	4.0 (n=210)	4.0 (n=198)	3.2 (n=205)	3.1 (n=200)	3.0 (n=202)	3.1 (n=198)	3.2 (n=201)	4.5 (n=10)
California (n=898)	4.3 (n=896)	4.3 (n=895)	3.0 (n=875)	2.8 (n=886)	3.1 (n=886)	3.7 (n=898)	3.9 (n=891)	3.2 (n=9)
Colorado (n=219)	3.8 (n=213)	4.5 (n=219)	3.1 (n=209)	3.0 (n=195)	3.0 (n=199)	3.3 (n=205)	3.2 (n=210)	3.9 (n=10)
Connecticut (n=210)	4.0 (n=209)	4.3 (n=210)	3.3 (n=188)	3.1 (n=201)	3.4 (n=196)	3.0 (n=190)	3.2 (n=198)	2.1 (n=5)
Delaware (n=31)	4.1 (n=31)	4.3 (n=31)	3.2 (n=31)	3.0 (n=31)	3.3 (n=28)	3.3 (n=28)	3.5 (n=31)	3.0 (n=1)
Florida (n=476)	4.3 (n=473)	4.4 (n=474)	3.2 (n=471)	3.1 (n=464)	3.2 (n=469)	3.0 (n=462)	3.8 (n=476)	4.1 (n=6)
Georgia (n=359)	4.0 (n=356)	4.7 (n=359)	2.9 (n=344)	2.8 (n=340)	2.9 (n=348)	2.8 (n=339)	3.4 (n=346)	5.0 (n=5)
Hawaii (n=38)	4.1 (n=36)	4.5 (n=38)	3.4 (n=33)	3.3 (n=35)	3.3 (n=33)	4.5 (n=34)	4.0 (n=36)	3.0 (n=3)
Idaho (n=132)	4.3 (n=130)	4.3 (n=132)	3.0 (n=128)	3.2 (n=128)	3.2 (n=130)	4.0 (n=126)	3.4 (n=126)	5.0 (n=3)
Illinois (n=709)	4.2 (n=694)	4.4 (n=709)	3.5 (n=697)	3.1 (n=689)	3.1 (n=674)	3.2 (n=685)	3.5 (n=688)	3.7 (n=20)
Indiana (n=400)	4.2 (n=387)	4.2 (n=400)	3.0 (n=391)	2.8 (n=388)	2.8 (n=393)	2.8 (n=390)	3.2 (n=391)	2.0 (n=2)
Iowa (n=513)	4.1 (n=506)	4.1 (n=513)	3.4 (n=489)	3.1 (n=479)	3.4 (n=489)	3.0 (n=472)	3.3 (n=489)	3.2 (n=27)

**Figure 78 (continued): Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by State (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)**

State	Availability of space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of public service staff	Availability of technical staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	Other
Kansas (n=367)	4.2 (n=359)	4.5 (n=367)	3.2 (n=348)	2.6 (n=339)	2.7 (n=341)	3.2 (n=343)	3.5 (n=344)	2.0 (n=21)
Kentucky (n=187)	4.5 (n=185)	4.1 (n=187)	3.1 (n=187)	2.9 (n=187)	2.9 (n=187)	3.4 (n=187)	3.6 (n=187)	2.9 (n=5)
Louisiana (n=270)	4.3 (n=274)	3.7 (n=270)	3.0 (n=267)	2.8 (n=259)	3.0 (n=253)	3.1 (n=252)	3.8 (n=258)	2.9 (n=24)
Maryland (n=163)	4.3 (n=163)	4.7 (n=141)	2.9 (n=123)	2.8 (n=120)	2.9 (n=123)	3.0 (n=139)	3.6 (n=137)	5.0 (n=3)
Massachusetts (n=435)	4.1 (n=425)	4.2 (n=435)	3.2 (n=418)	3.3 (n=416)	3.3 (n=412)	2.7 (n=405)	3.3 (n=415)	4.5 (n=11)
Michigan (n=491)	4.1 (n=503)	4.5 (n=505)	3.0 (n=464)	2.8 (n=474)	3.1 (n=481)	3.0 (n=491)	3.2 (n=467)	4.3 (n=16)
Minnesota (n=325)	4.4 (n=325)	4.3 (n=321)	3.0 (n=319)	2.8 (n=320)	3.0 (n=320)	2.7 (n=261)	3.6 (n=315)	3.1 (n=4)
Mississippi (n=223)	3.9 (n=223)	4.5 (n=222)	3.3 (n=220)	3.1 (n=201)	3.0 (n=216)	3.5 (n=219)	3.7 (n=222)	4.2 (n=5)
Missouri (n=337)	4.5 (n=337)	4.3 (n=335)	3.2 (n=320)	2.9 (n=314)	3.0 (n=323)	3.2 (n=319)	3.3 (n=328)	3.5 (n=7)
Montana (n=97)	3.8 (n=97)	4.1 (n=96)	3.3 (n=91)	3.2 (n=91)	3.5 (n=89)	3.6 (n=89)	3.5 (n=91)	--
Nebraska (n=258)	3.8 (n=258)	4.4 (n=258)	3.5 (n=256)	3.0 (n=258)	3.2 (n=249)	3.0 (n=258)	3.3 (n=253)	1.0 (n=5)
Nevada (n=72)	4.1 (n=72)	4.3 (n=72)	3.2 (n=72)	3.1 (n=70)	3.2 (n=70)	3.5 (N=70)	3.7 (N=70)	1.0 (N=2)
New Jersey (n=355)	4.1 (n=355)	4.0 (n=355)	3.1 (n=340)	2.8 (n=345)	2.9 (n=345)	2.7 (n=334)	3.7 (n=351)	1.6 (n=16)
New Mexico (n=107)	4.1 (n=106)	4.0 (n=105)	3.4 (n=102)	3.5 (n=104)	3.6 (n=107)	3.5 (n=105)	3.8 (n=104)	2.2 (n=4)
New York (n=980)	4.3 (n=980)	4.2 (n=968)	2.8 (n=917)	2.7 (n=933)	2.7 (n=919)	2.8 (n=908)	3.6 (n=959)	2.4 (n=23)

**Figure 78 (continued): Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by State (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)**

State	Availability of space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of public service staff	Availability of technical staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	Other
North Carolina (n=355)	4.2 (n=354)	4.3 (n=355)	2.9 (n=344)	2.9 (n=349)	2.8 (n=351)	2.9 (n=348)	3.2 (n=353)	5.0 (n=5)
Ohio (n=644)	4.2 (n=644)	4.4 (n=635)	3.0 (n=563)	3.1 (n=549)	2.9 (n=623)	2.8 (n=615)	3.4 (n=633)	1.0 (n=2)
Oklahoma (n=197)	4.3 (n=197)	4.1 (n=195)	3.1 (n=193)	3.0 (n=191)	2.9 (n=187)	3.1 (n=193)	3.7 (n=193)	2.5 (n=8)
Oregon (n=189)	4.1 (n=189)	4.2 (n=186)	3.4 (n=181)	3.1 (n=181)	3.5 (n=181)	2.9 (n=184)	3.5 (n=184)	2.5 (n=3)
Rhode Island (n=70)	4.3 (n=70)	4.2 (n=68)	2.4 (n=68)	2.4 (n=70)	2.2 (n=69)	3.0 (n=70)	4.1 (n=70)	--
South Carolina (n=166)	4.5 (n=158)	4.0 (n=166)	2.5 (n=149)	3.3 (n=136)	2.3 (n=147)	2.8 (n=151)	3.4 (n=154)	--
South Dakota (n=141)	4.0 (n=139)	4.4 (n=141)	3.4 (n=136)	3.1 (n=133)	3.4 (n=136)	3.1 (n=128)	3.4 (n=133)	3.4 (n=12)
Tennessee (n=345)	4.4 (n=345)	4.6 (n=343)	2.9 (n=304)	3.1 (n=310)	3.0 (n=303)	3.3 (n=305)	3.7 (n=320)	2.0 (n=13)
Texas (n=793)	4.0 (n=778)	4.4 (n=793)	3.2 (n=753)	3.0 (n=746)	3.1 (n=760)	3.4 (n=724)	3.4 (n=764)	2.7 (n=19)
Utah (n=112)	4.5 (n=112)	4.2 (n=109)	2.7 (n=109)	2.4 (n=109)	2.6 (n=108)	2.7 (n=109)	3.4 (n=110)	1.0 (n=2)
Vermont (n=176)	4.0 (n=171)	4.3 (n=176)	3.2 (n=169)	3.0 (n=167)	3.2 (n=172)	2.5 (n=157)	3.0 (n=161)	3.6 (n=10)
Virginia (n=331)	4.0 (n=330)	4.6 (n=331)	3.5 (n=330)	3.0 (n=327)	3.3 (n=327)	3.1 (n=328)	3.7 (n=324)	1.9 (n=3)
Washington (n=326)	4.7 (n=326)	3.9 (n=308)	2.7 (n=322)	2.7 (n=314)	2.4 (n=314)	2.7 (n=326)	3.9 (n=310)	5.0 (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=55)	2.3 (n=55)	4.6 (n=55)	2.8 (n=18)	1.5 (n=51)	2.7 (n=14)	2.1 (n=18)	1.4 (n=53)	--

**Figure 78 (continued): Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by State (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)**

<i>State</i>	Availability of space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of public service staff	Availability of technical staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets, cabling, or other infrastructure	Other
West Virginia (n=165)	4.4 (n=161)	4.2 (n=165)	3.0 (n=154)	3.0 (n=152)	3.0 (n=148)	3.4 (n=151)	3.6 (n=155)	5.0 (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=423)	4.1 (n=423)	4.3 (n=427)	3.3 (n=407)	3.0 (n=398)	3.2 (n=411)	3.3 (n=408)	3.5 (n=416)	4.1 (n=9)
Wyoming (n=67)	4.3 (n=67)	4.4 (n=66)	3.5 (n=66)	3.1 (n=66)	3.2 (n=66)	2.8 (n=65)	3.2 (n=66)	5.0 (n=5)
<i>National</i>	4.2 (n=14,889)	4.3 (n=14,896)	3.1 (n=14,304)	3.0 (n=14,205)	3.0 (n=14,344)	3.1 (n=14,207)	3.5 (n=14,509)	3.2 (n=397)
Key -- = No data to report								

Factors that influence the addition of public access Internet workstations are shown in Figure 78. The responses of libraries in most states mirror the national responses, with cost being identified as the most important factor, followed by space and infrastructure. Notable exceptions include Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, Washington, DC and Idaho, where availability of bandwidth was an important factor. In Arizona, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, DC, Wyoming and Nebraska, workstation maintenance is a concern; and in Connecticut, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, DC and Montana, public libraries report a lack of technical support staff as being a hindrance to adding workstations.

**Figure 79: 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=255)	12.0% (n=31)	11.0% (n=28)	34.4% (n=88)	34.9% (n=89)	1.5% (n=4)	6.3% (n=16)
Alaska (n=99)	9.7% (n=9)	11.3% (n=11)	20.1% (n=20)	34.8% (n=34)	8.0% (n=8)	16.1% (n=16)
Arizona (n=205)	19.1% (n=39)	15.3% (n=31)	24.7% (n=51)	39.9% (n=82)	--	1.0% (n=2)
Arkansas (n=210)	25.6% (n=54)	22.1% (n=46)	14.8% (n=31)	33.5% (n=70)	*	3.2% (n=7)
California (n=909)	8.9% (n=81)	25.7% (n=234)	44.6% (n=405)	15.3% (n=139)	*	4.9% (n=45)
Colorado (n=224)	25.8% (n=58)	19.1% (n=43)	32.6% (n=73)	18.0% (n=40)	1.6% (n=4)	2.9% (n=6)
Connecticut (n=219)	22.5% (n=49)	22.5% (n=49)	24.8% (n=54)	24.6% (n=54)	1.4% (n=3)	4.3% (n=9)
Delaware (n=31)	24.2% (n=7)	12.6% (n=4)	20.0% (n=6)	30.6% (n=10)	--	12.6% (n=4)
Florida (n=479)	9.1% (n=43)	25.3% (n=121)	24.8% (n=119)	38.9% (n=186)	*	1.6% (n=8)
Georgia (n=356)	24.3% (n=86)	22.4% (n=80)	18.8% (n=67)	27.8% (n=99)	*	6.0% (n=21)
Hawaii (n=48)	20.8% (n=10)	37.5% (n=18)	16.7% (n=8)	12.5% (n=6)	2.1% (n=1)	10.4% (n=5)
Idaho (n=136)	21.3% (n=111)	21.7% (n=113)	13.2% (n=69)	28.2% (n=146)	4.1% (n=22)	11.4% (n=59)
Illinois (n=725)	19.3% (n=140)	23.9% (n=173)	27.6% (n=200)	21.6% (n=157)	2.4% (n=17)	5.2% (n=38)
Indiana (n=394)	17.4% (n=69)	30.8% (n=121)	20.2% (n=79)	23.5% (n=93)	*	7.7% (n=30)
Iowa (n=518)	20.1% (n=104)	18.0% (n=93)	20.0% (n=104)	29.8% (n=155)	6.8% (n=35)	5.3% (n=27)
Kansas (n=369)	11.7% (n=43)	29.1% (n=107)	16.6% (n=61)	24.3% (n=90)	5.1% (n=19)	13.2% (n=49)
Kentucky (n=187)	23.4% (n=44)	25.3% (n=47)	35.7% (n=67)	13.0% (n=24)	--	2.6% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=279)	15.7% (n=44)	22.1% (n=62)	30.4% (n=85)	21.6% (n=60)	--	10.2% (n=28)
Maryland (n=167)	10.8% (n=18)	30.5% (n=51)	46.8% (n=78)	11.4% (n=19)	--	*
Massachusetts (n=432)	21.2% (n=91)	23.7% (n=102)	15.4% (n=66)	30.6% (n=132)	1.3% (n=6)	7.8% (n=33)
Michigan (n=514)	18.5% (n=95)	18.3% (n=94)	37.9% (n=195)	16.6% (n=85)	3.2% (n=16)	5.6% (n=29)
Minnesota (n=327)	19.1% (n=63)	39.0% (n=128)	15.4% (n=50)	16.8% (n=55)	2.4% (n=8)	7.2% (n=24)
Mississippi (n=225)	1.5% (n=3)	33.6% (n=76)	30.2% (n=68)	29.9% (n=67)	2.4% (n=5)	2.4% (n=5)
Missouri (n=340)	10.5% (n=36)	34.6% (n=117)	24.4% (n=83)	20.7% (n=71)	6.0% (n=20)	3.8% (n=13)

**Figure 79 (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
Montana (n=99)	17.1% (n=17)	15.9% (n=16)	19.5% (n=19)	42.7% (n=42)	--	4.9% (n=5)
Nebraska (N=265)	10.9% (n=29)	15.2% (n=40)	13.6% (n=36)	48.6% (n=129)	6.4% (n=17)	5.3% (n=14)
Nevada (n=74)	7.7% (n=6)	15.4% (n=11)	39.8% (n=30)	32.4% (n=24)	2.3% (n=2)	2.3% (n=2)
New Jersey (n=379)	18.6% (n=70)	33.8% (n=128)	30.2% (n=114)	14.5% (n=55)	--	2.9% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=111)	10.0% (n=11)	25.0% (n=28)	16.9% (n=19)	38.4% (n=43)	--	9.7% (n=11)
New York (n=990)	19.7% (n=195)	20.0% (n=198)	18.2% (n=180)	33.4% (n=330)	2.9% (n=29)	5.9% (n=59)
North Carolina (n=362)	13.7% (n=50)	25.8% (n=94)	36.1% (n=131)	14.0% (n=51)	2.9% (n=10)	7.5% (n=27)
Ohio (n=665)	12.7% (n=85)	20.3% (n=135)	44.9% (n=299)	17.7% (n=118)	1.2% (n=8)	3.3% (n=22)
Oklahoma (n=200)	17.2% (n=34)	35.6% (n=71)	18.3% (n=36)	21.5% (n=43)	--	7.5% (n=15)
Oregon (n=195)	7.6% (n=15)	17.1% (n=33)	28.2% (n=55)	40.4% (n=79)	2.6% (n=5)	4.0% (n=8)
Rhode Island (n=68)	14.6% (n=10)	37.9% (n=26)	3.6% (n=2)	10.7% (n=7)	7.1% (n=5)	26.1% (n=18)
South Carolina (n=166)	19.1% (n=32)	38.2% (n=63)	16.9% (n=28)	9.9% (n=16)	--	16.0% (n=27)
South Dakota (n=139)	9.5% (n=13)	22.0% (n=31)	26.0% (n=36)	28.4% (n=40)	7.1% (n=10)	7.1% (n=10)
Tennessee (n=338)	15.0% (n=51)	11.6% (n=39)	16.7% (n=56)	40.6% (n=137)	1.9% (n=6)	14.3% (n=48)
Texas (n=790)	12.1% (n=95)	18.4% (n=145)	22.8% (n=180)	36.4% (n=288)	3.0% (n=24)	7.2% (n=57)
Utah (n=110)	44.6% (n=49)	22.2% (n=24)	17.2% (n=19)	16.0% (n=18)	--	--
Vermont (n=178)	16.5% (n=30)	26.3% (n=47)	15.7% (n=28)	24.3% (n=43)	3.5% (n=6)	13.6% (n=24)
Virginia (n=343)	21.0% (n=72)	25.7% (n=88)	25.2% (n=87)	23.2% (n=80)	*	3.9% (n=13)
Washington (n=317)	27.9% (n=89)	26.3% (n=83)	18.4% (n=58)	20.1% (n=64)	1.2% (n=4)	6.1% (n=19)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=166)	15.2% (n=25)	22.0% (n=36)	15.1% (n=25)	23.3% (n=39)	2.5% (n=4)	21.9% (n=36)
Wisconsin (n=437)	15.3% (n=67)	22.6% (n=99)	18.8% (n=82)	33.3% (n=146)	3.3% (n=14)	6.7% (n=29)
Wyoming (n=69)	17.4% (n=12)	27.5% (n=19)	14.5% (n=10)	34.8% (n=24)	1.4% (n=1)	4.3% (n=3)
<b>National</b>	15.4% (n=2,350)	23.9% (n=3,648)	26.3% (n=4,003)	25.8% (n=3,934)	2.2% (n=339)	6.3% (n=966)

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

Figure 79 displays the length of time it takes to get public library computers back in service by state. Nationwide, the majority of library outlets required two days (26.0 percent) or more than two days (25.9 percent) to get workstations back in service. For a second year in a row, Washington (27.9 percent) and Colorado (25.8 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes less than one day to restore workstations to working order, but that percentage has dropped in both states. Minnesota (39.0 percent) and South Carolina (38.2 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes one day. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Maryland (46.8 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes two days, while Nebraska (48.6 percent) and Montana (42.7 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries that say it takes more than two days.

Figure 80: Sources of IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Non-IT specialist public service staff	Non-IT specialist library director	Building-based IT specialist	System-level IT staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Alabama (n=258)	30.4% (n=78)	44.5% (n=115)	9.3% (n=24)	21.2% (n=55)	7.1% (n=18)	29.5% (n=76)	2.9% (n=7)	29.9% (n=77)	16.0% (n=41)	11.9% (n=31)	2.7% (n=7)
Alaska (n=100)	17.4% (n=17)	45.9% (n=46)	20.6% (n=21)	12.7% (n=13)	6.3% (n=6)	17.7% (n=18)	--	--	22.2% (n=22)	26.9% (n=27)	22.2% (n=22)
Arizona (n=105)	26.5% (n=54)	6.1% (n=12)	12.5% (n=25)	59.1% (n=121)	3.9% (n=8)	46.3% (n=95)	--	--	5.6% (n=11)	5.0% (n=10)	1.5% (n=3)
Arkansas (n=212)	28.8% (n=61)	40.1% (n=85)	9.4% (n=20)	34.6% (n=73)	*	3.3% (n=7)	5.7% (n=12)	*	65.7% (n=139)	3.4% (n=7)	*
California (n=941)	49.3% (n=464)	7.0% (n=66)	11.7% (n=110)	61.3% (N=577)	18.1% (n=171)	41.4% (n=390)	--	--	11.3% (n=106)	*	6.5% (n=61)
Colorado (n=226)	25.6% (n=54)	18.9% (n=43)	17.3% (n=39)	43.8% (n=99)	14.1% (n=32)	16.7% (n=38)	*	1.6% (n=4)	21.2% (n=48)	6.0% (n=14)	2.8% (n=6)
Connecticut (n=219)	51.0% (n=112)	46.5% (n=102)	17.4% (n=38)	21.5% (n=47)	33.8% (n=74)	21.7% (n=48)	11.8% (n=26)	--	25.6% (n=56)	7.0% (n=15)	9.5% (n=21)
Delaware (n=31)	39.0% (n=12)	34.8% (n=11)	12.6% (n=4)	41.3% (n=13)	12.6% (n=4)	80.0% (n=25)	--	61.0% (n=19)	7.4% (n=2)	4.2% (n=1)	4.2% (n=1)
Florida (n=478)	52.0% (n=249)	8.3% (n=39)	9.6% (n=46)	80.2% (n=383)	2.7% (n=13)	45.9% (n=220)	--	--	32.4% (n=155)	2.4% (n=11)	5.8% (n=28)
Georgia (n=365)	50.2% (n=183)	15.4% (n=56)	6.8% (n=25)	74.4% (n=271)	2.4% (n=9)	7.8% (n=29)	2.9% (n=11)	11.7% (n=43)	23.4% (n=85)	*	4.4% (n=16)
Hawaii (n=48)	18.8% (n=9)	12.5% (n=6)	6.3% (n=3)	70.8% (n=34)	2.1% (n=1)	--	2.1% (n=1)	52.1% (n=25)	4.2% (n=2)	--	2.1% (n=1)
Idaho (n=132)	68.1% (n=90)	49.5% (n=65)	15.9% (n=21)	16.5% (n=22)	21.8% (n=29)	7.9% (n=10)	--	--	56.3% (n=74)	10.8% (n=14)	--
Illinois (n=728)	41.1% (n=299)	49.3% (n=359)	21.6% (n=157)	23.7% (n=172)	8.6% (n=63)	3.8% (n=28)	4.5% (n=33)	*	55.7% (n=405)	9.5% (n=69)	7.0% (n=51)
Indiana (n=404)	40.5% (n=163)	33.9% (n=137)	30.8% (n=125)	46.3% (n=187)	9.7% (n=40)	--	3.2% (n=13)	1.3% (n=5)	44.4% (n=180)	4.4% (n=18)	8.9% (n=36)
Iowa (n=524)	23.9% (n=125)	68.4% (n=358)	6.6% (n=34)	5.2% (n=27)	2.0% (n=11)	4.9% (n=25)	--	2.7% (n=14)	55.6% (n=291)	20.7% (n=108)	5.2% (n=27)
Kansas (n=370)	28.4% (n=105)	54.3% (n=201)	13.3% (n=50)	48.0% (n=178)	36.3% (n=135)	8.7% (n=32)	1.0% (n=4)	2.0% (n=7)	18.6% (n=69)	5.0% (n=19)	4.4% (n=16)

Figure 80 (continued): Sources of IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Non-IT specialist public service staff	Non-IT specialist library director	Building-based IT specialist	System-level IT staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contract or	Volunteer(s)	Other
Kentucky (n=190)	41.2% (n=78)	29.8% (n=56)	14.1% (n=27)	43.0% (n=82)	--	--	--	--	50.6% (n=96)	5.1% (n=10)	--
Louisiana (n=283)	39.5% (n=112)	21.6% (n=61)	14.8% (n=42)	60.4% (n=171)	11.9% (n=34)	--	2.2% (n=6)	24.8% (n=70)	44.3% (n=126)	1.1% (n=3)	11.4% (n=32)
Maryland (n=175)	44.5% (n=78)	2.7% (n=5)	6.0% (n=11)	96.1% (n=168)	9.4% (n=16)	18.3% (n=32)	17.9% (n=31)	2.7% (n=5)	8.7% (n=15)	*	4.5% (n=8)
Massachusetts (n=434)	50.9% (n=221)	47.6% (n=206)	18.4% (n=80)	19.0% (n=83)	45.4% (n=197)	21.3% (n=92)	--	1.2% (n=5)	31.3% (n=136)	11.6% (n=50)	8.3% (n=36)
Michigan (n=514)	30.3% (n=156)	33.3% (n=171)	19.6% (n=101)	39.2% (n=202)	17.4% (n=90)	2.1% (n=11)	--	*	29.0% (n=149)	5.0% (n=26)	7.0% (n=36)
Minnesota (n=331)	54.2% (n=180)	22.6% (n=75)	13.7% (n=46)	64.9% (n=125)	28.4% (n=94)	35.6% (n=118)	24.5% (n=81)	--	6.6% (n=22)	1.2% (n=4)	*
Mississippi (n=222)	40.8% (n=90)	33.6% (n=74)	3.4% (n=8)	64.5% (n=143)	2.5% (n=5)	*	9.9% (n=22)	12.9% (n=28)	38.0% (n=84)	*	4.5% (n=10)
Missouri (n=346)	45.7% (n=158)	36.9% (n=128)	9.7% (n=34)	59.9% (n=207)	7.4% (n=26)	2.3% (n=8)	9.3% (n=32)	2.0% (n=7)	42.9% (n=149)	2.8% (n=10)	3.7% (n=13)
Montana (n=99)	39.0% (n=37)	58.5% (n=58)	20.7% (n=21)	20.7% (n=20)	4.9% (n=5)	13.4% (n=13)	2.4% (n=2)	15.9% (n=16)	41.5% (n=41)	11.0% (n=11)	1.2% (n=1)
Nebraska (n=268)	24.8% (n=66)	62.7% (n=168)	3.5% (n=9)	5.1% (n=13)	1.8% (n=5)	9.5% (n=25)	*	1.8% (n=5)	59.0% (n=158)	25.2% (n=67)	14.3% (n=38)
Nevada (n=78)	53.0% (n=42)	28.7% (n=22)	11.0% (n=9)	47.9% (n=37)	20.5% (n=16)	33.7% (n=26)	--	4.4% (n=3)	11.0% (n=9)	13.3% (n=10)	6.6% (n=5)
New Jersey (n=397)	33.5% (n=133)	19.2% (n=76)	17.6% (n=70)	48.1% (n=191)	29.2% (n=116)	4.4% (n=17)	1.3% (n=5)	3.2% (n=12)	23.2% (n=92)	*	4.4% (n=17)
New Mexico (n=111)	29.4% (n=33)	41.3% (n=46)	10.7% (n=12)	26.0% (n=29)	5.5% (n=6)	29.4% (n=33)	--	3.9% (n=4)	31.4% (n=35)	15.0% (n=17)	12.8% (n=14)
New York (n=1,000)	32.7% (n=326)	33.1% (n=330)	15.4% (n=154)	62.1% (n=620)	15.6% (n=156)	1.2% (n=11)	3.3% (n=33)	--	22.4% (n=223)	10.1% (n=101)	5.3% (n=53)
North Carolina (n=362)	37.1% (n=134)	23.2% (n=84)	9.6% (n=35)	62.3% (n=226)	*	38.8% (n=141)	--	--	25.3% (n=92)	3.3% (n=12)	6.1% (n=22)
Ohio (n=667)	47.4% (n=316)	19.5% (n=130)	14.4% (n=96)	64.1% (n=427)	17.9% (n=119)	--	5.1% (n=34)	2.1% (n=14)	22.7% (n=151)	2.1% (n=14)	4.6% (n=31)

Figure 80 (continued): Sources of IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by State

State	Non-IT specialist public service staff	Non-IT specialist library director	Building-based IT specialist	System-level IT staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Oklahoma (n=198)	17.3% (n=34)	36.8% (n=73)	4.3% (n=9)	40.5% (n=80)	2.2% (n=4)	14.1% (n=28)	2.2% (n=4)	3.2% (n=6)	32.5% (n=63)	10.8% (n=21)	1.1% (n=2)
Oregon (n=196)	57.2% (n=112)	34.4% (n=67)	6.5% (n=13)	31.8% (n=62)	20.3% (n=40)	53.0% (n=104)	*	1.6% (n=3)	32.0% (n=63)	9.0% (n=18)	7.3% (n=14)
Rhode Island (n=68)	33.0% (n=22)	31.3% (n=21)	23.3% (n=16)	49.8% (n=34)	78.6% (n=53)	2.0% (n=1)	--	2.0% (n=1)	21.1% (n=14)	3.6% (n=2)	3.6% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=168)	27.3% (n=46)	12.4% (n=21)	6.0% (n=10)	77.9% (n=131)	2.6% (n=4)	14.1% (n=24)	9.1% (n=15)	--	39.7% (n=67)	--	--
South Dakota (n=143)	32.4% (n=46)	51.9% (n=74)	13.4% (n=19)	5.8% (n=8)	2.3% (n=3)	25.4% (n=36)	--	1.2% (n=2)	33.5% (n=48)	20.9% (n=30)	10.4% (n=15)
Tennessee (n=355)	26.6% (n=94)	46.9% (n=166)	11.7% (n=42)	28.3% (n=100)	16.3% (n=58)	15.0% (n=53)	7.4% (n=26)	59.4% (n=211)	10.9% (n=38)	3.3% (n=12)	9.6% (n=34)
Texas (n=803)	34.4% (n=276)	37.0% (n=297)	18.4% (n=148)	38.4% (n=308)	13.8% (n=111)	39.5% (n=317)	--	2.8% (n=23)	23.8% (n=191)	7.8% (n=63)	12.9% (n=103)
Utah (n=112)	25.2% (n=28)	48.8% (n=55)	9.4% (n=10)	25.0% (n=28)	--	36.3% (n=41)	1.0% (n=1)	1.9% (n=2)	33.9% (n=38)	4.6% (n=5)	3.8% (n=4)
Vermont (n=182)	34.4% (n=62)	66.5% (n=121)	9.3% (n=17)	4.3% (n=8)	*	2.6% (n=5)	--	--	50.0% (n=91)	42.5% (n=77)	8.1% (n=15)
Virginia (n=344)	49.6% (n=171)	20.5% (n=71)	16.0% (n=55)	63.7% (n=219)	*	32.6% (n=112)	3.1% (n=11)	*	38.8% (n=133)	2.3% (n=8)	3.3% (n=11)
Washington (n=327)	30.5% (n=100)	8.8% (n=29)	7.0% (n=23)	84.9% (n=278)	1.2% (n=4)	7.6% (n=25)	1.9% (n=6)	4.2% (n=14)	4.3% (n=14)	2.9% (n=9)	1.7% (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=167)	26.4% (n=44)	32.4% (n=54)	8.1% (n=14)	22.3% (n=37)	18.2% (n=31)	--	13.5% (n=22)	81.7% (n=137)	1.6% (n=3)	5.8% (n=10)	4.9% (n=8)
Wisconsin (n=436)	36.7% (n=160)	54.8% (n=238)	11.5% (n=50)	52.5% (n=229)	36.6% (n=159)	11.7% (n=51)	2.6% (n=11)	1.3% (n=5)	27.5% (n=120)	7.2% (n=31)	1.3% (n=5)
Wyoming (n=72)	58.3% (n=42)	13.9% (n=10)	15.3% (n=11)	43.1% (n=31)	6.9% (n=5)	19.4% (n=14)	--	15.3% (n=11)	34.7% (n=25)	1.4% (n=1)	9.7% (n=7)
<b>National</b>											
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive Key * = Insufficient data to report; -- = No data to report											

The sources of IT support library outlets have are detailed in Figure 80, which indicates that public libraries nationwide rely on a variety of sources for IT support. As with the 2009-2010 survey, Non-IT specialist public service staff was listed as the highest reported source by Wyoming (58.3 percent) and Idaho (68.1 percent). Non-IT specialist library director was listed as the highest reported source by Iowa (68.4 percent) and Vermont (66.5 percent). Building-based IT specialist was listed as the highest reported source by Rhode Island (23.2 percent) and Illinois (21.6 percent). System-level IT staff were listed as the highest reported source by Washington DC (100 percent) and Maryland (96.1 percent). Library consortia or other library system is the highest reported source in Rhode Island (78.6 percent) and Wisconsin (36.6 percent). County/City IT staff was listed as the highest reported source by Delaware (80.0 percent) and Oregon (53.0 percent). State telecommunications network staff was listed as the highest reported source by Minnesota (24.5 percent) and Maryland (17.9 percent). State library IT staff were listed as the highest reported source by West Virginia (81.7 percent) and Tennessee (59.4 percent). Outside vendors/contractors were are heavily relied on by Idaho public libraries in Arkansas (65.7 percent) and Nebraska (59.0 percent). Finally, volunteers were listed as the highest reported source of IT support by public libraries in Nebraska (25.2 percent) and Alaska (26.9 percent).

**Figure 81: Public Library Outlet Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by State**

<b>State</b>	<b>There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them</b>	<b>There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day</b>	<b>There are sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day</b>
Alabama (n=280)	16.7% (n=47)	56.3% (n=158)	27.0% (n=75)
Alaska (n=100)	13.7% (n=14)	56.2% (n=56)	30.1% (n=30)
Arizona (n=203)	42.8% (n=87)	47.2% (n=96)	10.0% (n=20)
Arkansas (n=210)	19.8% (n=42)	69.5% (n=146)	10.6% (n=22)
California (n=1,053)	21.5% (n=227)	69.6% (n=733)	8.8% (n=93)
Colorado (n=246)	22.8% (n=56)	55.8% (n=138)	21.3% (n=53)
Connecticut (n=235)	16.5% (n=39)	47.5% (n=112)	36.0% (n=85)
Delaware (n=32)	--	55.8% (n=17)	44.2% (n=14)
Florida (n=509)	15.2% (n=78)	74.7% (n=380)	10.0% (n=51)
Georgia (n=380)	28.5% (n=108)	59.5% (n=226)	12.0% (n=45)
Hawaii (n=49)	16.3% (n=8)	71.4% (n=35)	12.2% (n=6)
Idaho (n=134)	15.0% (n=20)	63.5% (n=85)	21.5% (n=29)
Illinois (n=763)	8.8% (n=67)	59.4% (n=454)	31.8% (n=243)
Indiana (n=419)	6.6% (n=28)	59.1% (n=247)	34.3% (n=144)
Iowa (n=543)	8.2% (n=44)	53.3% (n=290)	38.5% (n=209)
Kansas (n=372)	14.7% (n=55)	45.8% (n=170)	39.5% (n=147)
Kentucky (n=195)	13.8% (n=27)	72.3% (n=141)	13.8% (n=27)
Louisiana (n=295)	35.6% (n=105)	41.0% (n=121)	23.5% (n=69)
Maryland (n=178)	26.8% (n=48)	63.3% (n=113)	9.8% (n=18)
Massachusetts (n=465)	8.6% (n=40)	62.4% (n=290)	29.1% (n=135)
Michigan (n=611)	24.4% (n=149)	53.9% (n=329)	21.7% (n=132)
Minnesota (n=343)	12.0% (n=41)	50.8% (n=174)	37.2% (n=127)

**Figure 81 (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=226)	20.6% (n=46)	58.8% (n=133)	20.6% (n=47)
Missouri (n=349)	10.1% (n=35)	58.6% (n=205)	31.3% (n=109)
Montana (n=100)	12.0% (n=12)	59.0% (n=59)	28.9% (n=29)
Nebraska (n=278)	3.5% (n=10)	64.5% (n=179)	32.0% (n=89)
Nevada (n=83)	31.0% (n=26)	41.2% (n=34)	27.8% (n=23)
New Jersey (n=434)	17.9% (n=78)	63.1% (n=274)	19.0% (n=82)
New Mexico (n=111)	15.6% (n=17)	49.1% (n=55)	35.3% (n=29)
New York (n=1,038)	8.9% (n=92)	59.5% (n=617)	31.6% (n=329)
North Carolina (n=375)	10.8% (n=41)	68.3% (n=256)	20.8% (n=78)
Ohio (n=705)	28.8% (n=203)	56.5% (n=398)	14.7% (n=103)
Oklahoma (n=206)	27.8% (n=57)	58.2% (n=120)	14.0% (n=29)
Oregon (n=208)	7.8% (n=16)	76.6% (n=160)	15.6% (n=32)
Rhode Island (n=70)	2.9% (n=2)	71.6% (n=50)	25.5% (n=18)
South Carolina (n=179)	23.0% (n=41)	68.5% (n=122)	8.6% (n=15)
South Dakota (n=143)	6.9% (n=10)	43.0% (n=61)	50.1% (n=72)
Tennessee (n=355)	13.2% (n=47)	60.5% (n=215)	26.3% (n=93)
Texas (n=833)	15.3% (n=127)	54.1% (n=451)	30.6% (n=255)
Utah (n=114)	10.7% (n=12)	67.6% (n=77)	21.7% (n=25)
Vermont (n=184)	9.1% (n=17)	61.7% (n=114)	29.1% (n=54)
Virginia (n=344)	19.9% (n=69)	61.7% (n=213)	29.1% (n=54)

**Figure 81 (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
Washington (n=336)	18.7% (n=63)	64.8% (n=217)	16.5% (n=55)
Washington, DC (n=55)	79.2% (n=44)	20.8% (n=12)	--
West Virginia (n=169)	11.6% (n=20)	56.1% (n=95)	32.2% (n=54)
Wisconsin (n=447)	13.3% (n=60)	61.1% (n=274)	25.6% (n=114)
Wyoming (n=74)	14.9% (n=11)	63.5% (n=47)	21.6% (n=16)
<b>National</b>	16.5% (n=2,484)	59.5% (n=8,948)	23.9% (n=3,599)
<b>Key</b> -- = No data to report			

Figure 81 reports the public libraries responses to the sufficiency of public access Internet workstation availability. South Dakota has the highest percentage of outlets reporting there are always a sufficient number of workstations for patrons who wish to use them (50.1 percent) whereas Washington, DC has the highest percentage of outlets reporting there are consistently fewer workstations (79.2 percent) than patrons who wish to use them. Nationally, almost 60 percent (59.5 percent) of libraries report having insufficient workstations to meet patron needs at different times of the day.

Figure 82: 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=288)	80.0% (n=230)	1.5% (n=4)	18.5% (n=53)	79.5% (n=229)	--	7.0% (n=20)	31.3% (n=75)	1.6% (n=4)	17.8% (n=42)	43.0% (n=103)	2.2% (n=5)	26.5% (n=63)
Alaska (n=103)	43.4% (n=45)	3.1% (n=3)	51.6% (n=53)	64.9% (n=66)	--	14.0% (n=14)	8.5% (n=8)	3.4% (n=3)	23.7% (n=22)	26.6% (n=25)	1.7% (n=2)	23.3% (n=22)
Arizona (n=205)	76.0% (n=156)	4.1% (n=8)	18.9% (n=39)	91.1% (n=187)	--	2.0% (n=4)	41.8% (n=82)	--	19.3% (n=38)	63.0% (n=124)	--	24.5% (n=48)
Arkansas (n=212)	70.9% (n=150)	1.6% (n=3)	26.7% (n=56)	59.1% (n=124)	--	9.4% (n=20)	7.1% (n=14)	*	16.5% (n=33)	39.2% (n=77)	--	26.2% (n=52)
California (n=1,053)	51.3% (n=541)	5.2% (n=55)	42.9% (n=452)	66.3% (n=695)	--	10.2% (n=107)	23.7% (n=235)	1.1% (n=11)	18.8% (n=187)	44.0% (n=436)	8.1% (n=80)	18.7% (n=185)
Colorado (n=246)	73.6% (n=181)	5.1% (n=12)	20.9% (n=51)	83.9% (n=205)	*	9.5% (n=23)	35.4% (n=84)	4.8% (n=11)	32.8% (n=77)	55.9% (n=131)	2.7% (n=6)	28.3% (n=66)
Connecticut (n=235)	78.3% (n=184)	1.3% (n=3)	20.5% (n=48)	73.7% (n=152)	--	14.0% (n=29)	21.4% (n=48)	3.0% (n=7)	23.7% (n=53)	52.7% (n=118)	1.2% (n=3)	35.1% (n=79)
Delaware (n=31)	66.5% (n=21)	8.4% (n=3)	21.0% (n=7)	40.0% (n=12)	--	4.2% (n=1)	44.2% (n=14)	4.2% (n=1)	19.0% (n=6)	41.0% (n=13)	--	20.0% (n=6)
Florida (n=509)	75.6% (n=385)	7.3% (n=37)	16.8% (n=85)	91.9% (n=466)	*	2.8% (n=14)	48.6% (n=240)	12.7% (n=63)	22.1% (n=109)	65.0% (n=318)	2.3% (n=11)	20.3% (n=99)
Georgia (n=380)	77.0% (n=293)	6.1% (n=23)	16.9% (n=64)	75.9% (n=286)	1.9% (n=7)	9.7% (n=37)	23.3% (n=82)	7.3% (n=26)	31.7% (n=167)	47.8% (n=166)	2.6% (n=9)	19.9% (n=69)
Hawaii (n=49)	69.4% (n=34)	--	30.6% (n=15)	20.8% (n=10)	--	2.1% (n=1)	5.0% (n=2)	2.5% (n=1)	20.0% (n=8)	57.5% (n=23)	--	17.5% (n=7)

**Figure 82 (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
Idaho (n=134)	60.5% (n=81)	14.7% (n=20)	24.8% (n=33)	75.2% (n=98)	--	1.4% (n=2)	16.3% (n=21)	1.4% (n=2)	19.5% (n=25)	22.1% (n=28)	4.2% (n=5)	29.2% (n=37)
Illinois (n=763)	69.0% (n=527)	10.0% (n=76)	20.3% (n=154)	71.7% (n=544)	*	9.4% (n=71)	23.5% (n=166)	3.6% (n=26)	26.6% (n=188)	37.0% (n=259)	2.0% (n=14)	27.4% (n=191)
Indiana (n=420)	66.3% (n=248)	5.2% (n=22)	26.5% (n=111)	77.8% (n=325)	--	7.0% (n=29)	29.3% (n=118)	6.4% (n=26)	27.7% (n=112)	38.4% (n=154)	3.9% (n=16)	25.0% (n=101)
Iowa (n=543)	62.7% (n=341)	6.2% (n=33)	30.2% (n=164)	72.2% (n=392)	--	14.4% (n=78)	19.9% (n=105)	5.4% (n=28)	31.7% (n=166)	39.6% (n=208)	--	28.5% (n=150)
Kansas (n=372)	66.5% (n=248)	3.0% (n=11)	30.5% (n=114)	74.4% (n=276)	--	15.5% (n=57)	19.5% (n=72)	5.6% (n=21)	27.0% (n=99)	33.2% (n=122)	*	29.1% (n=107)
Kentucky (n=195)	73.4% (n=143)	2.5% (n=5)	24.1% (n=47)	85.3% (n=166)	--	9.4% (n=18)	24.3% (n=43)	1.5% (n=3)	50.9% (n=91)	47.6% (n=85)	--	37.3% (n=67)
Louisiana (n=295)	73.6% (n=217)	*	24.0% (n=71)	74.7% (n=216)	--	13.8% (n=40)	49.5% (n=138)	4.6% (n=13)	18.7% (n=52)	50.2% (n=141)	3.2% (n=9)	34.2% (n=96)
Maryland (n=178)	70.4% (n=125)	3.6% (n=6)	26.0% (n=46)	94.0% (n=166)	*	4.4% (n=8)	31.3% (n=50)	8.6% (n=14)	30.5% (n=48)	65.5% (n=117)	8.0% (n=14)	21.0% (n=37)
Massachusetts (n=465)	58.0% (n=269)	3.0% (n=14)	37.2% (n=173)	80.8% (n=375)	*	8.0% (n=37)	21.5% (n=94)	5.0% (n=22)	24.7% (n=108)	57.2% (n=251)	5.2% (n=23)	21.7% (n=95)
Michigan (n=633)	72.4% (n=459)	11.8% (n=75)	15.8% (n=100)	85.3% (n=535)	--	6.7% (n=42)	39.6% (n=221)	2.6% (n=15)	31.4% (n=175)	59.4% (n=331)	*	18.9% (n=105)
Minnesota (n=349)	75.2% (n=262)	2.9% (n=10)	17.3% (n=60)	60.7% (n=210)	8.5% (n=29)	25.9% (n=90)	17.3% (n=57)	2.2% (n=7)	32.7% (n=108)	47.1% (n=154)	--	12.3% (n=40)
Mississippi (n=226)	86.0% (n=194)	1.9% (n=4)	12.1% (n=27)	66.6% (n=151)	--	5.8% (n=13)	15.3% (n=34)	4.3% (n=9)	17.6% (n=39)	44.3% (n=97)	*	36.3% (n=79)
Missouri (n=349)	74.3% (n=260)	4.9% (n=17)	20.1% (n=70)	71.0% (n=244)	--	5.5% (n=19)	34.0% (n=114)	5.1% (n=17)	18.6% (n=62)	43.2% (n=144)	3.3% (n=11)	26.5% (n=88)
Montana (n=100)	59.0% (n=59)	3.6% (n=4)	34.9% (n=35)	78.3% (n=79)	--	10.8% (n=11)	28.4% (n=28)	3.7% (n=4)	23.5% (n=23)	44.4% (n=44)	--	38.3% (n=37)

Figure 82 (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
Nebraska (n=278)	50.6% (n=141)	6.9% (n=19)	39.9% (n=111)	72.1% (n=199)	*	17.5% (n=48)	8.5% (n=23)	3.5% (n=10)	32.3% (n=89)	27.0% (n=74)	1.8% (n=5)	33.4% (n=91)
Nevada (n=83)	66.5% (n=55)	2.1% (n=2)	31.4% (n=26)	67.1% (n=51)	--	6.8% (n=5)	20.3% (n=16)	2.3% (n=2)	26.4% (n=20)	52.5% (n=40)	2.3% (n=2)	22.6% (n=17)
New Jersey (n=434)	80.5% (n=349)	1.7% (n=2)	17.8% (n=77)	85.5% (n=342)	--	9.9% (n=40)	40.1% (n=159)	3.2% (n=13)	28.6% (n=113)	61.1% (n=242)	1.6% (n=6)	26.7% (n=106)
New Mexico (n=111)	68.4% (n=76)	7.8% (n=9)	23.8% (n=27)	70.3% (n=78)	1.4% (n=2)	12.8% (n=14)	39.7% (n=44)	8.1% (n=9)	17.8% (n=20)	28.4% (n=32)	2.3% (n=3)	39.3% (n=44)
New York (n=1,038)	74.6% (n=775)	3.8% (n=40)	21.3% (n= 221)	87.0% (n=879)	*	7.2% (n=73)	31.4% (n=316)	2.0% (n=20)	44.2% (n=444)	62.9% (n=630)	*	21.0% (n=211)
North Carolina (n=375)	88.2% (n=331)	1.8% (n=7)	39.9% (n= 111)	69.7% (n=256)	*	7.8% (n=29)	33.7% (n=120)	3.6% (n=13)	24.3% (n=86)	69.1% (n=243)	--	16.2% (n=57)
Ohio (n=705)	76.2% (n=537)	4.2% (n=29)	19.2% (n= 135)	81.6% (n=533)	--	10.4% (n=68)	29.7% (n=190)	5.0% (n=32)	28.0% (n=180)	64.8% (n=416)	2.2% (n=14)	18.0% (n=115)
Oklahoma (n=206)	71.9% (n=148)	1.0% (n=2)	26.0% (n=54)	91.1% (n=176)	--	5.5% (n=11)	18.0% (n=34)	6.6% (n=13)	25.2% (n=48)	32.6% (n=62)	--	25.6% (n=17)
Oregon (n=208)	76.1% (n=158)	6.6% (n=14)	17.4% (n=36)	81.8% (n=160)	*	8.7% (n=17)	23.4% (n=45)	4.2% (n=8)	13.9% (n=27)	57.6% (n=111)	1.4% (n=3)	11.0% (n=21)
Rhode Island (n=68)	72.4% (n=34)	--	27.6% (n=19)	76.3% (n=52)	--	20.1% (n=14)	42.3% (n=29)	3.6% (n=2)	27.2% (n=19)	70.8% (n=48)	--	25.6% (n=17)
South Carolina (n=168)	88.3% (n=149)	--	11.7% (n=20)	90.9% (n=153)	--	1.3% (n=2)	30.2% (n=51)	--	18.5% (n=31)	55.4% (n=93)	--	32.2% (n=54)
South Dakota (n=141)	52.3% (n=74)	11.7% (n=16)	34.8% (n=49)	51.9% (n=72)	1.2% (n=2)	9.1% (n=13)	8.5% (n=12)	1.2% (n=2)	24.3% (n=34)	33.1% (n=46)	--	42.1% (n=59)
Tennessee (n=342)	72.2% (n=247)	5.3% (n=18)	21.6% (n=74)	75.1% (n=252)	--	9.8% (n=33)	29.3% (n=96)	3.9% (n=13)	23.2% (n=76)	55.1% (n=183)	1.5% (n=5)	23.2% (n=77)
Texas (n=805)	66.4% (n=534)	5.0% (n=41)	28.3% (n= 228)	65.1% (n=522)	*	12.2% (n=98)	34.2% (n=272)	3.6% (n=28)	24.0% (n= 181)	42.6% (n=336)	2.0% (n=16)	28.7% (n=226)
Utah (n=112)	72.1% (n=81)	1.9% (n=2)	26.0% (n=29)	79.5% (n=89)	--	7.9% (n=9)	18.6% (n=21)	3.6% (n=4)	21.9% (n=84)	72.4% (n=81)	--	23.8% (n=27)

Figure 82 (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
Vermont (n=182)	73.7% (n=134)	4.3% (n=8)	21.1% (n=38)	81.5% (n=148)	--	11.9% (n=22)	27.2% (n=49)	4.4% (n=8)	27.2% (n=49)	46.0% (n=80)	3.3% (n=6)	25.8% (n=45)
Virginia (n=341)	61.2% (n=209)	17.3% (n=59)	21.1% (n=72)	68.5% (n=234)	--	2.2% (n=11)	22.8% (n=41)	4.4% (n=14)	24.4% (n=83)	40.8% (n=139)	*	30.8% (n=105)
Washington (n=320)	71.3% (n=228)	7.0% (n=22)	21.7% (n=69)	73.6% (n=235)	--	9.9% (n=32)	27.2% (n=87)	2.2% (n=7)	14.0% (n=45)	61.1% (n=195)	--	11.3% (n=36)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=23)	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--	100% (n=23)	--	--
West Virginia (n=166)	60.3% (n=100)	1.6% (n=3)	38.0% (n=63)	62.2% (n=103)	--	25.8% (n=43)	17.2% (n=29)	1.7% (n=3)	25.1% (n=42)	41.7% (n=69)	*	37.5% (n=62)
Wisconsin (n=436)	72.6% (n=316)	7.2% (n=31)	19.3% (n=84)	83.4% (n=362)	--	10.7% (n=47)	22.7% (n=29)	4.7% (n=21)	16.3% (n=70)	50.4% (n=219)	*	18.1% (n=78)
Wyoming (n=74)	59.5% (n=44)	1.4% (n=1)	39.2% (n=29)	74.3% (n=55)	--	9.5% (n=7)	18.9% (n=14)	1.4% (n=1)	37.8% (n=28)	40.3% (n=29)	4.2% (n=3)	51.4% (n=37)
<b>National</b>	69.9% (n=10,473)	5.2% (n=782)	24.2% (n=2,629)	76.1% (n=11,235)	*	9.7% (n=1,431)	28.0% (n=3,993)	3.9% (n=554)	26.0% (n=3,706)	49.9% (n=7,093)	2.0% (n=291)	24.4% (n=2,475)

**Key** \* = Insufficient data to report  
 -- = No data to report

Figure 82 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 83: Public Library Outlet Fiber Optic Internet Connection, by State**

State	Yes	No	Do not know
Alabama (n=239)	27.6% (n=66)	54.7% (n=131)	17.7% (n=42)
Alaska (n=95)	8.3% (n=8)	78.4% (n=75)	13.3% (n=13)
Arizona (n=177)	51.2% (n=91)	42.5% (n=75)	6.3% (n=11)
Arkansas (n=205)	17.0% (n=35)	60.5% (n=124)	22.5% (n=46)
California (n=921)	40.0% (n=368)	57.4% (n=529)	2.5% (n=23)
Colorado (n=211)	27.1% (n=57)	62.4% (n=132)	10.5% (n=22)
Connecticut (n=214)	34.6% (n=74)	52.7% (n=113)	12.7% (n=27)
Delaware (n=30)	79.1% (n=24)	4.4% (n=1)	16.5% (n=5)
Florida (n=475)	65.0% (n=309)	32.4% (n=154)	2.6% (n=12)
Georgia (n=343)	35.4% (n=122)	60.5% (n=208)	4.2% (n=14)
Hawaii (n=49)	4.1% (n=2)	95.9% (n=47)	--
Idaho (n=130)	9.8% (n=13)	79.2% (n=103)	11.0% (n=14)
Illinois (n=725)	23.8% (n=172)	61.1% (n=443)	15.1% (n=110)
Indiana (n=392)	37.0% (n=145)	55.7% (n=218)	6.9% (n=27)
Iowa (n=520)	24.9% (n=129)	15.5% (n=268)	23.7% (n=123)
Kansas (n=369)	32.4% (n=119)	42.2% (n=156)	25.3% (n=93)
Kentucky (n=185)	22.3% (n=41)	65.6% (n=122)	12.1% (n=23)
Louisiana (n=280)	54.5% (n=153)	36.6% (n=103)	8.9% (n=25)
Maryland (n=175)	54.7% (n=96)	44.1% (n=77)	1.1% (n=2)
Massachusetts (n=429)	22.6% (n=97)	59.3% (n=254)	18.1% (n=78)
Michigan (n=506)	29.1% (n=147)	57.4% (n=290)	13.5% (n=68)
Minnesota (n=329)	30.9% (n=102)	58.6% (n=193)	10.5% (n=35)
Mississippi (n=223)	15.3% (n=34)	74.4% (n=166)	10.3% (n=23)
Missouri (n=333)	34.1% (n=114)	50.1% (n=167)	15.8% (n=53)
Montana (n=99)	18.3% (n=18)	54.9% (n=54)	26.8% (n=27)

**Figure 83 (continued): Public Library Outlet Fiber Optic Internet Connection, by State**

State	Yes	No	Do not know
Nebraska (n=268)	23.9% (n=64)	45.7% (n=122)	30.5% (n=82)
Nevada (n=74)	13.7% (n=10)	69.9% (n=52)	16.4% (n=12)
New Jersey (n=388)	51.9% (n=201)	42.6% (n=165)	5.5% (n=21)
New Mexico (n=111)	20.7% (n=23)	64.6% (n=72)	14.7% (n=16)
New York (n=995)	51.2% (n=509)	39.9% (n=397)	8.9% (n=88)
North Carolina (n=332)	57.2% (n=190)	39.1% (n=130)	3.7% (n=12)
Ohio (n=645)	47.3% (n=305)	44.5% (n=287)	8.2% (n=53)
Oklahoma (n=200)	30.1% (n=60)	52.7% (n=105)	17.2% (n=34)
Oregon (n=192)	36.5% (n=70)	53.4% (n=103)	10.1% (n=20)
Rhode Island (n=68)	10.1% (n=7)	67.2% (n=46)	22.7% (n=15)
South Carolina (n=159)	44.2% (n=70)	53.5% (n=85)	2.3% (n=4)
South Dakota (n=141)	40.4% (n=57)	32.7% (n=46)	26.9% (n=38)
Tennessee (n=332)	21.7% (n=72)	56.7% (n=188)	21.7% (n=72)
Texas (n=804)	35.6% (n=287)	47.0% (n=378)	17.4% (n=140)
Utah (n=110)	41.0% (n=45)	49.3% (n=54)	9.7% (n=11)
Vermont (n=180)	11.1% (n=20)	74.6% (n=134)	14.3% (n=26)
Virginia (n=340)	48.8% (n=166)	48.7% (n=166)	3.5% (n=11)
Washington (n=327)	48.6% (n=159)	47.9% (n=157)	3.5% (n=11)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--
West Virginia (n=168)	13.8% (n=23)	68.7% (n=115)	17.6% (n=29)
Wisconsin (n=433)	19.6% (n=85)	68.9% (n=299)	11.5% (n=50)
Wyoming (n=70)	14.3% (n=10)	85.7% (n=60)	--
<b>National</b>	35.8% (n=5,025)	52.4% (n=7,364)	11.8% (n=1,658)

**Key** -- = No data to report

Figure 83 shows those public libraries that have a fiber optic internet connection. Nationally, just over a third of libraries report having fiber optic (35.8 percent). Washington, DC (100 percent) and Delaware (79.1

percent) are the states with the highest percentages of libraries reporting that they have fiber optic, while Hawaii (4.1 percent) and Alaska (8.3 percent) are the states reporting the lowest percentages.

Figure 84: Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	Less than 256Kbps	257Kbps - 768Kbps	769Kbps - 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6Mbps - 3.0 Mbps	3.1Mbps - 6.0Mbps	6.1Mbps - 10Mbps	10.1Mbps - 20Mbps	20.1Mbps - 30Mbps	30.1Mbps - 40Mbps	Greater than 40Mbps	Don't Know
Alabama (n=210)	1.8% (n=4)	7.5% (n=16)	9.0% (n=19)	20.5% (n=43)	6.9% (n=15)	10.8% (n=23)	9.3% (n=20)	7.7% (n=16)	1.8% (n=4)	--	6.6% (n=14)	18.2% (n=38)
Alaska (n=92)	18.9% (n=17)	22.4% (n=21)	15.5% (n=14)	13.8% (n=13)	6.9% (n=6)	3.4% (n=3)	1.7% (n=2)	7.1% (n=7)	--	--	5.2% (n=5)	5.2% (n=5)
Arizona (n=182)	--	1.1% (n=2)	4.4% (n=8)	29.2% (n=53)	11.3% (n=20)	8.9% (n=16)	11.1% (n=20)	23.1% (n=42)	1.2% (n=2)	1.7% (n=3)	7.9% (n=14)	--
Arkansas (n=207)	1.7% (n=3)	5.8% (n=12)	6.0% (n=12)	40.2% (n=83)	10.5% (n=22)	6.8% (n=14)	4.9% (n=31)	*	1.7% (n=4)	--	2.5% (n=5)	9.1% (n=19)
California (n=837)	2.4% (n=20)	10.8% (n=91)	4.2% (n=35)	24.6% (n=206)	9.4% (n=78)	22.6% (n=189)	7.1% (n=60)	12.9% (n=108)	--	*	4.4% (n=37)	*
Colorado (n=206)	5.7% (n=12)	5.2% (n=11)	8.9% (n=18)	9.3% (n=19)	14.7% (n=30)	8.4% (n=17)	18.0% (n=37)	11.2% (n=23)	--	1.8% (n=4)	9.7% (n=20)	7.1% (n=15)
Connecticut (n=217)	2.4% (n=5)	3.5% (n=8)	10.8% (n=23)	19.1% (n=41)	6.1% (n=13)	12.8% (n=28)	4.0% (n=9)	13.0% (n=28)	1.2% (n=3)	4.3% (n=9)	10.7% (n=23)	12.0% (n=26)
Delaware (n=30)	--	--	--	4.4% (n=1)	--	--	39.4% (n=12)	12.1% (n=4)	11.1% (n=3)	4.4% (n=1)	8.8% (n=3)	19.9% (n=6)
Florida (n=440)	--	1.0% (n=4)	1.0% (n=4)	10.3% (n=46)	7.8% (n=34)	8.8% (n=39)	24.2% (n=106)	12.6% (n=56)	3.9% (n=17)	2.9% (n=13)	24.2% (n=107)	3.3% (n=15)
Georgia (n=318)	1.1% (n=4)	--	2.2% (n=7)	34.7% (n=110)	12.1% (n=38)	11.1% (n=35)	4.4% (n=14)	2.2% (n=7)	--	*	26.5% (n=84)	5.0% (n=16)
Hawaii (n=49)	6.1% (n=3)	2.0% (n=1)	2.0% (n=1)	22.4% (n=11)	10.2% (n=5)	2.0% (n=1)	8.2% (n=4)	44.9% (n=22)	--	--	--	2.0% (n=1)
Idaho (n=128)	7.0% (n=9)	9.7% (n=12)	11.2% (n=14)	19.5% (n=25)	25.9% (n=33)	9.8% (n=13)	9.9% (n=13)	4.2% (n=5)	--	--	2.8% (n=4)	--
Illinois (n=711)	1.2% (n=9)	7.9% (n=56)	6.2% (n=44)	23.9% (n=170)	11.6% (n=83)	6.2% (n=44)	14.9% (n=106)	10.7% (n=76)	3.1% (n=22)	1.9% (n=14)	5.6% (n=40)	6.8% (n=48)
Indiana (n=385)	1.6% (n=6)	*	5.0% (n=19)	19.4% (n=75)	12.0% (n=46)	18.2% (n=70)	11.1% (n=45)	8.3% (n=32)	2.1% (n=8)	3.1% (n=12)	14.5% (n=56)	3.2% (n=12)
Iowa (n=514)	4.1% (n=21)	11.3% (n=58)	12.0% (n=61)	14.2% (n=73)	13.8% (n=71)	10.4% (n=54)	11.8% (n=61)	2.8% (n=15)	2.6% (n=13)	2.4% (n=13)	8.6% (n=44)	6.0% (n=31)
Kansas (n=356)	1.1% (n=4)	4.7% (n=17)	6.8% (n=24)	31.6% (n=112)	18.5% (n=66)	13.8% (n=49)	6.7% (n=24)	3.7% (n=13)	1.6% (n=6)	--	4.2% (n=15)	7.4% (n=26)
Kentucky (n=169)	1.4% (n=2)	--	7.6% (n=13)	12.3% (n=21)	6.2% (n=10)	31.3% (n=53)	15.7% (n=26)	14.7% (n=25)	1.4% (n=2)	--	3.6% (n=6)	5.7% (n=10)

**Figure 84 (continued): Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State**

State	Less than 256Kbps	257Kbps - 768Kbps	769Kbps - 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6Mbps - 3.0 Mbps	3.1Mbps - 6.0Mbps	6.1Mbps - 10Mbps	10.1Mbps - 20Mbps	20.1Mbps - 30Mbps	30.1Mbps - 40Mbps	Greater than 40Mbps	Don't Know
Louisiana (n=274)	*	1.7% (n=5)	1.7% (n=5)	21.5% (n=59)	6.7% (n=18)	6.7% (n=18)	18.3% (n=50)	12.8% (n=35)	2.9% (n=8)	2.7% (n=7)	21.7% (n=60)	2.9% (n=8)
Maryland (n=179)	--	2.4% (n=4)	7.6% (n=13)	12.1% (n=21)	9.1% (n=16)	8.5% (n=15)	8.8% (n=15)	11.2% (n=20)	--	--	39.8% (n=70)	*
Massachusetts (n=411)	*	3.2% (n=13)	9.4% (n=39)	13.6% (n=56)	6.3% (n=26)	14.6% (n=60)	7.5% (n=31)	16.8% (n=69)	7.5% (n=31)	1.2% (n=5)	10.6% (n=43)	8.6% (n=35)
Michigan (n=483)	*	3.6% (n=17)	6.4% (n=31)	26.2% (n=127)	11.7% (n=56)	15.8% (n=76)	14.0% (n=67)	12.6% (n=61)	1.1% (n=5)	1.8% (n=9)	3.3% (n=16)	2.8% (n=14)
Minnesota (n=334)	--	6.8% (n=23)	--	38.3% (n=128)	10.6% (n=35)	6.3% (n=21)	11.7% (n=39)	8.5% (n=28)	3.8% (n=13)	*	8.9% (n=30)	4.3% (n=14)
Mississippi (n=224)	4.9% (n=11)	11.7% (n=26)	6.9% (n=15)	56.0% (n=125)	5.7% (n=13)	5.9% (n=13)	--	*	3.6% (n=8)	--	1.9% (n=4)	2.4% (n=5)
Missouri (n=341)	--	1.9% (n=6)	3.5% (n=12)	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)	1.3% (n=1)	11.3% (n=11)	10.0% (n=10)	21.3% (n=21)	16.3% (n=16)	10.0% (n=10)	16.3% (n=16)	3.8% (n=4)	1.3% (n=1)	1.3% (n=1)	2.5% (n=2)	5.0% (n=5)
Nebraska (n=263)	1.8% (n=5)	8.2% (n=22)	9.2% (n=24)	13.6% (n=36)	13.7% (n=36)	20.8% (n=55)	7.1% (n=19)	4.6% (n=12)	1.7% (n=5)	*	8.2% (n=22)	10.1% (n=26)
Nevada (n=74)	2.3% (n=2)	7.0% (n=5)	10.0% (n=7)	24.4% (n=18)	12.4% (n=9)	6.0% (n=4)	7.7% (n=6)	--	--	5.3% (n=4)	10.7% (n=8)	14.1% (n=10)
New Jersey (n=366)	--	5.1% (n=19)	6.1% (n=22)	11.9% (n=44)	7.8% (n=29)	3.7% (n=14)	12.6% (n=46)	14.2% (n=52)	2.7% (n=10)	4.1% (n=15)	19.6% (n=72)	12.2% (n=45)
New Mexico (n=108)	--	6.3% (n=7)	14.0% (n=15)	21.5% (n=23)	6.9% (n=7)	27.6% (n=30)	11.4% (n=12)	3.0% (n=3)	2.0% (n=2)	--	3.8% (n=4)	3.5% (n=4)
New York (n=695)	--	4.1% (n=40)	2.2% (n=21)	9.8% (n=95)	21.6% (n=208)	18.1% (n=174)	17.9% (n=172)	11.7% (n=113)	1.4% (n=14)	*	6.1% (n=59)	6.2% (n=60)
North Carolina (n=348)	1.2% (n=4)	8.5% (n=29)	1.1% (n=4)	5.1% (n=18)	20.1% (n=70)	18.3% (n=64)	22.1% (n=77)	9.4% (n=33)	4.2% (n=14)	4.0% (n=14)	4.8% (n=17)	1.2% (n=1)
Ohio (n=647)	--	1.4% (n=9)	7.4% (n=48)	24.6% (n=159)	7.9% (n=51)	5.2% (n=34)	22.4% (n=145)	19.5% (n=126)	*	*	6.0% (n=39)	4.3% (n=28)
Oklahoma (n=193)	1.1% (n=2)	1.1% (n=2)	11.1% (n=21)	24.4% (n=47)	11.1% (n=21)	1.1% (n=2)	10.7% (n=21)	12.2% (n=24)	--	--	20.5% (n=39)	6.7% (n=13)
Oregon (n=192)	2.6% (n=5)	1.7% (n=3)	5.1% (n=10)	24.2% (n=46)	10.4% (n=20)	9.5% (n=18)	19.7% (n=38)	6.3% (n=12)	*	--	19.0% (n=36)	*

Figure 84 (continued): Public Library Outlet Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by State

State	Less than 256Kbps	257Kbps - 768Kbps	769Kbps - 1.4Mbps	1.5Mbps T1	1.6Mbps - 3.0 Mbps	3.1Mbps - 6.0Mbps	6.1Mbps - 10Mbps	10.1Mbps - 20Mbps	20.1Mbps - 30Mbps	30.1Mbps - 40Mbps	Greater than 40Mbps	Don't Know
Rhode Island (n=63)	--	--	11.5% (n=7)	11.5% (n=7)	20.6% (n=13)	7.7% (n=5)	7.7% (n=5)	28.1% (n=18)	--	--	2.1% (n=1)	10.8% (n=7)
South Carolina (n=157)	--	1.2% (n=2)	1.2% (n=2)	35.3% (n=55)	10.7% (n=17)	2.4% (n=4)	13.5% (n=21)	26.7% (n=42)	--	1.4% (n=2)	4.2% (n=6)	3.5% (n=5)
South Dakota (n=135)	2.4% (n=3)	18.4% (n=25)	11.0% (n=15)	15.4% (n=21)	7.3% (n=10)	9.8% (n=13)	9.8% (n=13)	4.9% (n=7)	1.2% (n=2)	4.9% (n=7)	9.8% (n=13)	4.9% (n=7)
Tennessee (n=329)	1.0% (n=3)	9.6% (n=31)	7.2% (n=24)	5.8% (n=19)	10.9% (n=36)	22.8% (n=75)	17.8% (n=59)	6.1% (n=20)	2.0% (n=6)	*	9.6% (n=31)	6.6% (n=22)
Texas (n=773)	2.7% (n=21)	3.0% (n=24)	4.4% (n=34)	18.1% (n=140)	16.5% (n=127)	12.2% (n=94)	12.1% (n=93)	12.0% (n=93)	4.0% (n=31)	2.4% (n=19)	6.4% (n=50)	6.2% (n=48)
Utah (n=95)	--	--	8.7% (n=8)	26.8% (n=26)	6.7% (n=6)	5.4% (n=5)	13.5% (n=13)	13.1% (n=13)	--	4.5% (n=4)	21.3% (n=20)	--
Vermont (n=168)	--	8.5% (n=14)	11.3% (n=19)	6.3% (n=11)	13.1% (n=22)	17.9% (n=30)	9.4% (n=16)	9.1% (n=15)	2.5% (n=4)	--	8.5% (n=14)	13.5% (n=23)
Virginia (n=343)	--	4.3% (n=15)	8.9% (n=31)	16.0% (n=55)	12.7% (n=44)	8.3% (n=28)	10.7% (n=37)	8.3% (n=29)	1.9% (n=7)	*	26.8% (n=92)	1.6% (n=5)
Washington (n=315)	--	1.8% (n=6)	3.0% (n=9)	19.2% (n=60)	17.6% (n=55)	5.0% (n=16)	9.4% (n=30)	12.0% (n=38)	8.2% (n=26)	*	21.6% (n=68)	1.8% (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100% (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=170)	--	*	4.9% (n=8)	75.2% (n=128)	*	--	1.7% (n=3)	8.6% (n=15)	--	--	5.6% (n=10)	2.4% (n=4)
Wisconsin (n=436)	*	1.2% (n=5)	2.1% (n=9)	33.2% (n=145)	26.1% (n=114)	10.3% (n=45)	4.7% (n=21)	5.1% (n=22)	*	1.8% (n=8)	3.0% (n=13)	11.4% (n=50)
Wyoming (n=69)	1.4% (n=1)	13.0% (n=9)	10.1% (n=7)	27.5% (n=19)	11.6% (n=8)	7.2% (n=5)	13.0% (n=9)	4.3% (n=3)	--	--	11.6% (n=8)	--
<b>National</b>	1.4% (n=187)	5.0% (n=684)	5.8% (n=790)	21.8% (n=2,982)	12.4% (n=1,693)	11.8% (n=1,614)	12.2% (n=1,664)	10.5% (n=1,434)	2.1% (n=283)	1.4% (n=194)	10.2% (n=1,394)	5.4% (n=731)
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report												

The maximum speed of public access Internet service is shown in Figure 84. The largest percentage of libraries report having 1.5Mbps (T1) connection (21.8 percent), which was the largest reported category in 2009-2010 (27.4 percent) as well. In 2010-2011, West Virginia (75.2 percent), Mississippi (56.0 percent) and Missouri (50.5 percent) reported the highest percentage of T1 connections. Significantly, 2009-2010 responses indicate 60.6 percent of all outlets have greater than a T1 connection, up from 51.8 percent last year. 18.9 percent of outlets in Alaska report a connection speed less than 256 Kbps, and 41.3 percent of Alaskan outlets have a connection speed less than 769Kbps.

**Figure 85: Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets Over the Last Year, by State**

State	Connection speed has increased	Connection speed has remained the same	Don't Know
Alabama (n=94)	15.2% (n=14)	84.8% (n=80)	--
Alaska (n=94)	28.6% (n=60)	69.3% (n=146)	2.1% (n=4)
Arizona (n=199)	18.1% (n=36)	80.8% (n=161)	1.0% (n=2)
Arkansas (n=203)	29.8% (n=61)	67.5% (n=137)	2.7% (n=5)
California (n=912)	14.7% (n=134)	84.9% (n=775)	*
Colorado (n=205)	29.7% (n=61)	68.0% (n=140)	2.3% (n=5)
Connecticut (n=212)	4.9% (n=10)	91.6% (n=194)	3.5% (n=8)
Delaware (n=30)	15.5% (n=5)	71.4% (n=21)	13.1% (n=4)
Florida (n=448)	27.9% (n=125)	71.3% (n=320)	*
Georgia (n=323)	12.3% (n=40)	83.3% (n=269)	4.4% (n=14)
Hawaii (n=49)	87.8% (n=43)	8.2% (n=4)	4.1% (n=2)
Idaho (n=128)	13.5% (n=17)	85.2% (n=109)	1.4% (n=2)
Illinois (n=716)	14.5% (n=104)	84.7% (n=607)	*
Indiana (n=386)	17.2% (n=66)	81.2% (n=313)	1.6% (n=6)
Iowa (n=524)	16.3% (n=85)	79.7% (n=417)	4.0% (n=21)
Kansas (n=363)	15.5% (n=56)	81.9% (n=297)	2.6% (n=9)
Kentucky (n=181)	30.1% (n=54)	68.6% (n=124)	1.3% (n=2)
Louisiana (n=283)	29.2% (n=83)	66.3% (n=188)	4.5% (n=13)
Maryland (n=175)	11.2% (n=20)	88.8% (n=155)	--
Massachusetts (n=418)	25.3% (n=106)	72.9% (n=305)	1.8% (n=8)

**Figure 85 (continued): Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets Over the Last Year, by State**

State	Connection speed has increased	Connection speed has remained the same	Don't Know
Michigan (n=503)	18.8% (n=95)	81.2% (n=408)	--
Minnesota (n=342)	17.3% (n=59)	81.5% (n=279)	1.2% (n=4)
Mississippi (n=219)	10.6% (n=23)	89.4% (n=196)	--
Missouri (n=338)	10.2% (n=34)	89.8% (n=304)	--
Montana (n=98)	23.5% (n=23)	76.5% (n=75)	--
Nebraska (n=265)	11.7% (n=31)	84.7% (n=225)	3.6% (n=10)
Nevada (n=78)	19.6% (n=15)	76.0% (n=60)	4.4% (n=3)
New Jersey (n=368)	27.5% (n=101)	71.8% (n=264)	*
New Mexico (n=106)	30.4% (n=32)	69.6% (n=74)	--
New York (n=984)	41.9% (n=413)	55.7% (n=548)	2.4% (n=24)
North Carolina (n=361)	13.2% (n=47)	86.8% (n=314)	--
Ohio (n=650)	15.8% (n=103)	83.2% (n=541)	1.0% (n=6)
Oklahoma (n=195)	13.6% (n=27)	84.2% (n=164)	2.2% (n=4)
Oregon (n=191)	24.9% (n=47)	73.5% (n=140)	1.6% (n=3)
Rhode Island (n=63)	30.4% (n=19)	64.3% (n=41)	5.3% (n=3)
South Carolina (n=168)	40.2% (n=68)	59.8% (n=101)	--
South Dakota (n=139)	18.9% (n=26)	81.1% (n=113)	--
Tennessee (n=335)	17.4% (n=58)	77.8% (n=261)	4.8% (n=16)
Texas (n=789)	30.0% (n=236)	67.3% (n=530)	2.8% (n=22)
Utah (n=106)	19.7% (n=21)	80.3% (n=85)	--
Vermont (n=168)	13.1% (n=22)	84.4% (n=142)	2.5% (n=4)
Virginia (n=343)	23.7% (n=81)	76.3% (n=262)	--
Washington (n=320)	21.3% (n=68)	78.7% (n=252)	--
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--
West Virginia (n=170)	15.1% (n=26)	82.4% (n=140)	2.5% (n=4)

<b>Figure 85 (continued): Increase in Public Access Internet Connection at Public Library Outlets Over the Last Year, by State</b>			
<b>State</b>	<b>Connection speed has increased</b>	<b>Connection speed has remained the same</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Wisconsin (n=433)	29.9% (n=129)	68.6% (n=297)	1.6% (n=7)
Wyoming (n=70)	12.9% (n=9)	87.1% (n=61)	--
<b>National</b>	21.9% (n=3,051)	76.4% (n=10,636)	1.7% (n=231)
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report			

Figure 85 shows the increase in public access Internet connection speeds over the past year. Over three-fourths of public library outlets (76.4 percent) reported that their connection speeds have stayed the same. Washington, DC (100 percent) was the exception as the majority of library outlets reported increased connection speeds.

<b>Figure 86: Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State</b>				
<b>State</b>	<b>The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs most of the time</b>	<b>The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs at some times</b>	<b>The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs almost all of the time</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
Alabama (n=207)	14.6% (n=30)	20.2% (n=42)	65.3% (n=135)	--
Alaska (n=94)	44.2% (n=42)	38.9% (n=37)	16.9% (n=16)	--
Arizona (n=189)	14.3% (n=27)	36.3% (n=69)	49.3% (n=93)	--
Arkansas (n=205)	23.6% (n=48)	28.6% (n=59)	47.8% (n=98)	--
California (n=913)	15.3% (n=139)	51.5% (n=470)	32.9% (n=300)	*
Colorado (n=230)	22.7% (n=52)	34.3% (n=79)	43.0% (n=99)	--
Connecticut (n=212)	11.1% (n=23)	31.5% (n=67)	57.4% (n=122)	--
Delaware (n=30)	4.4% (n=1)	13.1% (n=4)	82.5% (n=25)	--
Florida (n=454)	10.4% (n=47)	31.3% (n=142)	82.5% (n=263)	*
Georgia (n=343)	18.6% (n=64)	30.6% (n=105)	50.8% (n=174)	--
Hawaii (n=42)	33.3% (n=14)	47.6% (n=20)	16.7% (n=7)	2.4% (n=1)
Idaho (n=127)	27.7% (n=35)	42.5% (n=54)	28.4% (n=36)	1.4% (n=2)
Illinois (n=722)	14.1% (n=102)	25.5% (n=184)	60.0% (n=433)	*
Indiana (n=379)	6.7% (n=25)	25.5% (n=96)	67.8% (n=257)	--
Iowa (n=516)	13.5% (n=70)	23.1% (n=119)	63.4% (n=327)	--

**Figure 86 (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
Kansas (n=367)	14.3% (n=52)	26.4% (n=97)	59.4% (n=218)	--
Kentucky (n=174)	11.6% (n=20)	34.3% (n=60)	54.1% (n=94)	--
Louisiana (n=280)	8.5% (n=24)	20.4% (n=57)	71.1% (n=200)	--
Maryland (n=174)	9.1% (n=16)	26.7% (n=46)	64.2% (n=112)	--
Massachusetts (n=426)	9.3% (n=39)	33.0% (n=141)	57.1% (n=243)	*
Michigan (n=505)	21.4% (n=108)	26.7% (n=135)	51.9% (n=262)	--
Minnesota (n=340)	4.4% (n=15)	26.3% (n=90)	68.1% (n=232)	1.2% (n=4)
Mississippi (n=223)	15.2% (n=34)	32.5% (n=72)	51.9% (n=116)	*
Missouri (n=341)	8.1% (n=28)	25.5% (n=87)	65.6% (n=224)	*
Montana (n=98)	21.0% (n=21)	40.7% (n=40)	38.3% (n=37)	--
Nebraska (n=265)	8.2% (n=22)	35.1% (n=93)	55.0% (n=146)	1.8% (n=5)
Nevada (n=78)	12.9% (n=10)	34.1% (n=27)	50.8% (n=40)	2.2% (n=2)
New Jersey (n=378)	13.5% (n=50)	23.0% (n=84)	63.5% (n=233)	--
New Mexico (n=111)	24.8% (n=28)	26.0% (n=29)	49.2% (n=55)	--
New York (n=978)	6.7% (n=66)	40.7% (n=398)	52.0% (n=509)	*
North Carolina (n=361)	12.1% (n=44)	25.1% (n=91)	62.1% (n=224)	*
Ohio (n=649)	9.7% (n=63)	35.6% (n=231)	54.0% (n=350)	*
Oklahoma (n=195)	20.2% (n=39)	31.5% (n=62)	45.4% (n=89)	3.0% (n=6)
Oregon (n=192)	5.1% (n=10)	27.1% (n=52)	67.1% (n=129)	*
Rhode Island (n=66)	3.7% (n=2)	47.2% (n=31)	49.1% (n=32)	--
South Carolina (n=166)	16.7% (n=28)	21.0% (n=35)	62.4% (n=104)	--
South Dakota (n=140)	6.2% (n=9)	22.2% (n=31)	70.4% (n=98)	1.2% (n=2)
Tennessee (n=335)	14.4% (n=48)	33.7% (n=113)	51.9% (n=174)	--
Texas (n=801)	15.5% (n=124)	31.1% (n=249)	52.9% (n=424)	*

**Figure 86 (continued): Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed, by State**

<i>State</i>	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=106)	4.0% (n=4)	28.0% (n=30)	68.0% (n=72)	--
Vermont (n=176)	12.0% (n=21)	33.5% (n=59)	54.5% (n=96)	--
Virginia (n=342)	14.0% (n=48)	31.5% (n=107)	54.5% (n=186)	--
Washington (n=320)	24.0% (n=77)	17.3% (n=55)	58.7% (n=188)	--
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	4.2% (n=2)	95.8% (n=53)	--
West Virginia (n=169)	25.4% (n=43)	35.5% (n=60)	38.2% (n=65)	*
Wisconsin (n=436)	12.7% (n=55)	52.6% (n=229)	34.7% (n=152)	--
Wyoming (n=71)	12.7% (n=9)	29.6% (n=21)	57.7% (n=41)	--
<b>National</b>	13.4% (n=1,876)	31.9% (n=4,459)	54.3% (n=7,579)	*
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report				

The adequacy of connection speeds in public libraries is shown in Figure 86 and the results are very similar to results from last year's survey. Just slightly more than half of outlets (54.3 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 16.9 percent of Alaskan libraries and 16.7 percent of Hawaiian libraries reporting sufficient connection speeds at all times. Overall, 31.9 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, more than half the libraries in Wisconsin (52.6 percent) and California (51.5 percent) report having insufficient connection speeds at some times during the day. Overall, just under half of libraries (45.3 percent) report having insufficient connection speeds either always or at some times of the day.

**Figure 87: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection, by State**

State	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is no interest in increasing the speed of public access Internet connection	There is interest, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans to do so within the next year	There is interest, but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth	Other	Don't Know
Alabama (n=224)	10.6% (n=24)	27.5% (n=62)	27.5% (n=62)	13.3% (n=30)	8.3% (n=18)	1.7% (n=4)	--	11.2% (n=25)
Alaska (n=94)	20.3% (n=19)	1.7% (n=2)	44.2% (n=42)	8.5% (n=8)	6.8% (n=6)	5.1% (n=5)	5.1% (n=5)	8.5% (n=8)
Arizona (n=170)	8.4% (n=14)	7.1% (n=12)	30.3% (n=51)	36.9% (n=63)	9.0% (n=15)	--	3.5% (n=6)	4.8% (n=8)
Arkansas (n=203)	46.3% (n=94)	5.5% (n=11)	29.1% (n=59)	2.5% (n=5)	9.7% (n=20)	1.7% (n=3)	2.7% (n=5)	2.5% (n=5)
California (n=922)	16.5% (n=152)	4.0% (n=37)	40.2% (n=371)	23.5% (n=216)	11.8% (n=108)	*	2.7% (n=25)	1.1% (n=10)
Colorado (n=207)	19.2% (n=40)	5.2% (n=11)	33.5% (n=69)	13.0% (n=27)	19.4% (n=40)	*	1.8% (n=4)	7.1% (n=15)
Connecticut (n=212)	10.4% (n=22)	14.8% (n=31)	19.8% (n=42)	9.3% (n=20)	26.7% (n=57)	1.9% (n=4)	9.7% (n=21)	7.3% (n=15)
Delaware (n=30)	30.6% (n=9)	3.4% (n=1)	21.9% (n=7)	--	20.9% (n=6)	--	11.1% (n=3)	12.1% (n=4)
Florida (n=448)	13.3% (n=60)	6.8% (n=30)	21.7% (n=97)	12.1% (n=54)	31.5% (n=141)	--	11.7% (n=52)	2.9% (n=13)
Georgia (n=331)	15.6% (n=52)	7.5% (n=25)	37.2% (n=123)	1.1% (n=4)	29.2% (n=97)	--	4.8% (n=16)	4.6% (n=15)
Hawaii (n=49)	38.8% (n=19)	2.0% (n=1)	6.1% (n=3)	6.1% (n=3)	42.9% (n=21)	--	--	4.1% (n=2)
Idaho (n=127)	17.7% (n=22)	1.4% (n=2)	29.8% (n=38)	30.6% (n=39)	6.5% (n=8)	--	9.8% (n=12)	4.1% (n=5)
Illinois (n=716)	22.4% (n=160)	9.2% (n=66)	36.5% (n=262)	6.7% (n=48)	11.5% (n=111)	3.7% (n=26)	3.2% (n=23)	2.9% (n=21)
Indiana (n=380)	14.5% (n=55)	7.6% (n=29)	25.3% (n=96)	14.2% (n=54)	31.3% (n=119)	1.2% (n=5)	3.0% (n=12)	2.9% (n=11)
Iowa (n=513)	32.3% (n=166)	13.9% (n=71)	19.2% (n=98)	3.3% (n=17)	14.0% (n=72)	2.1% (n=11)	5.2% (n=27)	10.1% (n=52)
Kansas (n=361)	22.2% (n=80)	9.4% (n=34)	40.5% (n=146)	6.7% (n=24)	6.7% (n=24)	1.0% (n=4)	3.1% (n=11)	10.2% (n=37)
Kentucky (n=176)	15.2% (n=27)	4.3% (n=8)	20.6% (n=36)	26.8% (n=47)	18.8% (n=33)	4.1% (n=7)	7.5% (n=13)	2.8% (n=5)
Louisiana (n=283)	9.3% (n=26)	13.6% (n=38)	33.2% (n=94)	8.2% (n=23)	16.7% (n=47)	*	12.2% (n=35)	6.2% (n=18)
Maryland (n=175)	36.5% (n=64)	8.5% (n=15)	9.7% (n=17)	23.3% (n=41)	19.4% (n=34)	--	2.7% (n=5)	--
Massachusetts (n=416)	27.1% (n=113)	16.5% (n=68)	22.3% (n=93)	10.0% (n=41)	11.5% (n=48)	--	7.4% (n=31)	5.2% (n=22)
Michigan (n=505)	14.6% (n=74)	2.3% (n=12)	37.9% (n=192)	8.0% (n=41)	24.0% (n=121)	*	5.5% (n=28)	6.9% (n=35)

**Figure 87 (continued): Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection, by State**

State	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is no interest in increasing the speed of public access Internet connection	There is interest, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans to do so within the next year	There is interest, but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth	Other	Don't Know
Minnesota (n=326)	13.6% (n=44)	6.6% (n=21)	30.7% (n=100)	*	20.9% (n=68)	--	18.8% (n=61)	8.9% (n=29)
Mississippi (n=222)	5.9% (n=13)	13.4% (n=30)	65.5% (n=145)	9.5% (n=21)	4.2% (n=9)	*	--	*
Missouri (n=342)	9.1% (n=31)	26.9% (n=92)	25.7% (n=88)	9.6% (n=33)	17.1% (n=59)	*	7.2% (n=25)	3.7% (n=13)
Montana (n=97)	26.2% (n=25)	6.3% (n=6)	27.5% (n=27)	21.2% (n=21)	6.3% (n=6)	1.3% (n=1)	7.5% (n=7)	3.8% (n=4)
Nebraska (n=256)	22.6% (n=58)	16.6% (n=42)	21.3% (n=54)	9.4% (n=24)	7.4% (n=19)	4.7% (n=12)	7.5% (n=19)	10.4% (n=26)
Nevada (n=74)	19.4% (n=14)	12.4% (n=9)	38.1% (n=28)	13.7% (n=10)	2.3% (n=2)	2.3% (n=2)	2.3% (n=2)	9.4% (n=7)
New Jersey (n=365)	8.5% (n=31)	12.2% (n=45)	20.7% (n=76)	21.2% (n=77)	27.4% (n=100)	1.7% (n=6)	3.4% (n=13)	4.8% (n=17)
New Mexico (n=111)	29.1% (n=32)	10.7% (n=12)	34.5% (n=38)	6.7% (n=7)	47% (n=5)	1.4% (n=2)	6.8% (n=8)	6.1% (n=7)
New York (n=962)	15.5% (n=149)	10.5% (n=101)	42.2% (n=406)	4.5% (n=44)	12.2% (n=117)	1.0% (n=10)	7.9% (n=76)	6.1% (n=59)
North Carolina (n=349)	10.8% (n=38)	20.5% (n=72)	40.7% (n=142)	10.2% (n=36)	10.7% (n=37)	--	3.9% (n=13)	3.2% (n=11)
Ohio (n=642)	15.3% (n=99)	11.4% (n=73)	22.4% (n=144)	17.3% (n=111)	24.7% (n=159)	*	5.2% (n=34)	2.9% (n=19)
Oklahoma (n=195)	12.9% (n=25)	15.2% (n=30)	19.8% (n=39)	39.3% (n=78)	6.2% (n=12)	--	2.2% (n=4)	3.8% (n=7)
Oregon (n=186)	36.1% (n=67)	11.0% (n=20)	21.9% (n=41)	3.4% (n=6)	15.8% (n=29)	--	6.0% (n=11)	5.9% (n=11)
Rhode Island (n=66)	39.2% (n=26)	3.7% (n=2)	14.8% (n=10)	22.5% (n=15)	11.1% (n=7)	--	5.7% (n=4)	3.0% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=155)	12.7% (n=20)	11.5% (n=18)	14.8% (n=23)	20.7% (n=32)	18.9% (n=29)	--	21.4% (n=22)	--
South Dakota (n=138)	32.3% (n=22)	15.5% (n=21)	23.4% (n=32)	8.4% (n=12)	10.8% (n=15)	--	3.6% (n=5)	8.2% (n=28)
Tennessee (n=335)	23.4% (n=78)	5.6% (n=19)	38.9% (n=130)	8.6% (n=29)	10.0% (n=33)	--	5.4% (n=18)	8.2% (n=28)
Texas (n=788)	22.2% (n=175)	9.3% (n=73)	27.8% (n=219)	12.0% (n=95)	14.4% (n=113)	*	6.7% (n=53)	6.7% (n=53)
Utah (n=108)	27.2% (n=29)	8.2% (n=9)	14.8% (n=16)	9.6% (n=10)	12.6% (n=14)	2.0% (n=2)	14.1% (n=15)	11.6% (n=13)
Vermont (n=170)	22.9% (n=39)	14.2% (n=24)	27.6% (n=47)	5.9% (n=10)	9.9% (n=17)	1.2% (n=2)	9.9% (n=17)	8.4% (n=14)
Virginia (n=342)	17.2% (n=59)	13.1% (n=45)	37.8% (n=129)	5.2% (n=18)	15.3% (n=52)	--	9.4% (n=32)	2.1% (n=7)

**Figure 87 (continued): Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection, by State**

State	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is no interest in increasing the speed of public access Internet connection	There is interest, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans to do so within the next year	There is interest, but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth	Other	Don't Know
Washington (n=291)	25.9% (n=75)	7.5% (n=22)	9.4% (n=27)	16.4% (n=48)	33.2% (n=97)	*	5.5% (n=16)	1.3% (n=4)
Washington, DC (n=55)	--	--	--	100% (n=55)	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=169)	25.4% (n=43)	7.4% (n=13)	33.5% (n=57)	*	8.0% (n=14)	*	10.8% (n=18)	13.1% (n=22)
Wisconsin (n=427)	18.7% (n=80)	7.3% (n=31)	27.7% (n=119)	24.7% (n=106)	5.1% (n=22)	2.0% (n=8)	9.2% (n=39)	5.2% (n=22)
Wyoming (n=71)	52.1% (n=37)	8.5% (n=6)	14.1% (n=10)	4.2% (n=3)	15.5% (n=11)	1.4% (n=1)	4.2% (n=3)	--
<b>National</b>	19.0% (n=2,625)	10.2% (n=1,402)	30.1% (n=4,144)	12.4% (n=1,706)	15.9% (n=2,195)	1.0% (n=142)	6.2% (n=860)	5.2% (n=711)

**Key** \* = Insufficient data to report  
 -- = No data to report

Figure 87 details the possibility of increasing the adequacy of public library Internet connections. The highest percentage of libraries, at 30.1 percent, responded that despite possible interest the library cannot afford to increase connection speed, with Mississippi reporting the highest percentage at 65.5 percent. Only 10.2 percent of libraries report a lack of interest in increasing connection speed, down from 12.4 percent last year. Lack of technical knowledge continues to be a negligible factor, with only 1.0 percent of libraries reporting this as an issue, the same percentage as last year.

**Figure 88: 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=215)	62.8% (n=135)	19.1% (n=41)	6.4% (n=14)	10.4% (n=22)	1.2% (n=3)
Alaska (n=92)	48.2% (n=44)	29.5% (n=27)	8.6% (n=8)	13.8% (n=13)	--
Arizona (n=187)	81.0% (n=149)	10.2% (n=19)	4.5% (n=8)	4.3% (n=8)	--
Arkansas (n=203)	56.9% (n=116)	11.6% (n=23)	15.5% (n=31)	16.0% (n=33)	--
California (n=906)	59.8% (n=542)	15.3% (n=138)	8.4% (n=76)	16.5% (n=150)	--

**Figure 88 (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
Colorado (n=213)	74.7% (n=159)	16.5% (n=35)	1.8% (n=4)	6.9% (n=15)	--
Connecticut (n=212)	69.7% (n=148)	21.5% (n=46)	2.6% (n=5)	6.2% (n=13)	--
Delaware (n=31)	31.6% (n=10)	12.6% (n=4)	44.2% (n=14)	11.6% (n=4)	--
Florida (n=452)	85.7% (n=387)	11.6% (n=52)	*	2.0% (n=9)	*
Georgia (n=345)	59.1% (n=204)	32.9% (n=114)	5.7% (n=20)	2.3% (n=8)	--
Hawaii (n=49)	--	4.1% (n=2)	20.4% (n=10)	75.5% (n=37)	--
Idaho (n=127)	64.5% (n=82)	11.4% (n=14)	14.2% (n=18)	9.9% (n=13)	--
Illinois (n=719)	52.3% (n=376)	30.8% (n=221)	2.8% (n=20)	13.7% (n=99)	*
Indiana (n=384)	59.2% (n=227)	23.4% (n=90)	6.4% (n=25)	11.0% (n=42)	--
Iowa (n=516)	79.6% (n=411)	9.6% (n=50)	4.1% (n=21)	6.7% (n=34)	--
Kansas (n=267)	77.1% (n=283)	15.3% (n=56)	1.5% (n=6)	6.1% (n=22)	--
Kentucky (n=186)	91.6% (n=170)	2.6% (n=5)	1.3% (n=2)	4.5% (n=8)	--
Louisiana (n=259)	66.8% (n=326)	22.3% (n=58)	6.8% (n=18)	4.1% (n=11)	--
Maryland (n=175)	74.2% (n=130)	23.4% (n=41)	*	1.8% (n=3)	--
Massachusetts (n=426)	76.6% (n=326)	15.1% (n=64)	6.4% (n=27)	1.9% (n=8)	--
Michigan (n=505)	46.7% (n=236)	40.2% (n=203)	6.2% (n=31)	6.9% (n=35)	--
Minnesota (n=342)	72.7% (n=248)	22.6% (n=77)	1.2% (n=4)	3.5% (n=12)	--
Mississippi (n=221)	45.5% (n=100)	24.3% (n=53)	7.0% (n=15)	22.8% (n=50)	*
Missouri (n=342)	33.8% (n=116)	41.2% (n=141)	8.2% (n=28)	16.8% (n=58)	--
Montana (n=94)	71.8% (n=68)	17.9% (n=17)	7.7% (n=7)	2.6% (n=2)	--
Nebraska (n=265)	71.3% (n=189)	17.8% (n=47)	8.2% (n=22)	2.7% (n=7)	--
Nevada (n=70)	64.2% (n=45)	9.8% (n=7)	1.8% (n=17)	2.9% (n=28)	2.5% (n=2)

**Figure 88 (continued): Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by State**

<b>State</b>	<b>Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch and when the library is closed</b>	<b>Wireless access is currently available for public use within this library branch, but not when the library is closed</b>	<b>Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year</b>	<b>Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
New Jersey (n=384)	73.3% (n=282)	15.8% (n=61)	8.2% (n=22)	3.9% (n=15)	--
New Mexico (n=111)	52.9% (n=59)	31.5% (n=35)	5.3% (n=6)	10.2% (n=11)	--
New York (n=981)	78.5% (n=770)	16.4% (n=161)	1.8% (n=17)	2.9% (n=28)	*
North Carolina (n=358)	63.6% (n=228)	14.8% (n=53)	15.9% (n=57)	5.0% (n=18)	*
Ohio (n=648)	71.3% (n=463)	21.8% (n=141)	4.8% (n=31)	2.1% (n=14)	--
Oklahoma (n=195)	89.0% (n=174)	7.7% (n=15)	2.2% (n=4)	1.1% (n=2)	--
Oregon (n=193)	69.2% (n=134)	19.5% (n=38)	3.3% (n=6)	7.2% (n=14)	*
Rhode Island (n=68)	100% (n=68)	--	--	--	--
South Carolina (n=157)	62.1% (n=97)	29.6% (n=46)	8.3% (n=13)	--	--
South Dakota (n=139)	43.8% (n=61)	14.2% (n=20)	3.5% (n=5)	38.5% (n=54)	--
Tennessee (n=332)	59.8% (n=199)	20.5% (n=68)	8.1% (n=27)	10.6% (n=35)	1.0% (n=3)
Texas (n=802)	64.9% (n=521)	18.3% (n=147)	9.1% (n=73)	7.7% (n=62)	--
Utah (n=106)	64.3% (n=68)	24.4% (n=26)	2.0% (n=2)	7.3% (n=8)	2.0% (n=2)
Vermont (n=174)	92.1% (n=160)	4.5% (n=8)	2.1% (n=4)	1.2% (n=2)	--
Virginia (n=344)	62.0% (n=214)	24.0% (n=83)	7.3% (n=25)	6.7% (n=23)	--
Washington (n=301)	73.7% (n=222)	11.1% (n=33)	6.0% (n=18)	9.3% (n=28)	--
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=163)	32.9% (n=54)	54.2% (n=88)	10.3% (n=17)	1.7% (n=3)	*
Wisconsin (n=428)	73.5% (n=314)	24.1% (n=103)	2.0% (n=18)	*	--
Wyoming (n=71)	60.6% (n=43)	23.9% (n=17)	--	15.5% (n=11)	--
<b>National</b>	66.5% (n=9,258)	20.1% (n=2,790)	5.6% (n=778)	7.6% (n=1,061)	*
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report					

Whether or not wireless Internet service is available in public libraries is shown in Figure 88. Most libraries (86.6 percent) do provide wireless, up from 82.2 percent in 2009-2010. All libraries in Washington, DC and Rhode Island provide wireless Internet access. Delaware currently has low wireless availability rates, but 44.2 percent of libraries in Delaware report plans to make wireless available within the next year, well above the national average of 5.6 percent. Also well above the national average in this category are Hawaii (20.4 percent), North Carolina (15.9 percent) and Arkansas (15.5 percent). A total of 8.5 percent of outlets in South Dakota and 75.5 percent of outlets in Hawaii also reported no plans to provide wireless access, well above the national average of 7.6 percent.

**Figure 89: Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by State**

State	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=173)	57.5% (n=99)	23.3% (n=40)	16.7% (n=29)	2.5% (n=4)
Alaska (n=72)	68.7% (n=49)	17.7% (n=13)	13.6% (n=10)	--
Arizona (n=167)	64.0% (n=107)	18.9% (n=32)	8.5% (n=14)	8.6% (n=14)
Arkansas (n=138)	59.1% (n=81)	23.1% (n=32)	11.6% (n=16)	6.2% (n=9)
California (n=675)	24.4% (n=165)	37.9% (n=256)	37.0% (n=250)	*
Colorado (n=188)	51.0% (n=96)	15.0% (n=28)	33.0% (n=62)	1.0% (n=2)
Connecticut (n=187)	43.9% (n=82)	18.1% (n=32)	36.6% (n=68)	1.4% (n=3)
Delaware (n=12)	62.9% (n=8)	--	26.6% (n=3)	10.5% (n=1)
Florida (n=437)	39.2% (n=172)	29.4% (n=129)	30.5% (n=133)	*
Georgia (n=301)	66.9% (n=201)	26.3% (n=79)	30.5% (n=133)	*
Hawaii (n=2)	--	--	100% (n=2)	--
Idaho (n=96)	85.9% (n=83)	5.5% (n=5)	8.5% (n=8)	--
Illinois (n=592)	63.6% (n=377)	24.9% (n=147)	9.5% (n=56)	2.0% (n=12)
Indiana (n=314)	56.0% (n=176)	35.2% (n=110)	8.8% (n=28)	--
Iowa (n=458)	80.1% (n=367)	6.9% (n=32)	8.3% (n=38)	4.6% (n=21)
Kansas (n=335)	65.8% (n=221)	14.7% (n=49)	14.5% (n=48)	5.0% (n=17)
Kentucky (n=166)	70.1% (n=116)	12.6% (n=21)	17.3% (n=29)	--
Louisiana (n=228)	59.9% (n=136)	20.0% (n=59)	18.6% (n=42)	1.4% (n=3)

**Figure 89 (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
Maryland (n=170)	54.1% (n=92)	35.0% (n=59)	10.3% (n=17)	*
Massachusetts (n=387)	54.3% (n=210)	13.9% (n=54)	28.9% (n=112)	2.9% (n=11)
Michigan (n=433)	57.4% (n=249)	28.7% (n=124)	12.6% (n=55)	1.3% (n=6)
Minnesota (n=323)	39.2% (n=127)	50.6% (n=164)	9.4% (n=30)	*
Mississippi (n=151)	50.6% (n=76)	44.3% (n=67)	5.0% (n=8)	--
Missouri (n=248)	51.5% (n=127)	15.3% (n=38)	32.7% (n=81)	*
Montana (n=83)	73.9% (n=62)	8.7% (n=7)	15.9% (n=13)	1.4% (n=1)
Nebraska (n=234)	78.5% (n=184)	7.1% (n=17)	8.2% (n=19)	6.2% (n=14)
Nevada (n=52)	53.6% (n=28)	14.2% (n=7)	32.2% (n=17)	--
New Jersey (n=340)	34.2% (n=116)	15.8% (n=54)	46.8% (n=159)	3.3% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=93)	62.1% (n=57)	20.9% (n=19)	15.3% (n=14)	1.7% (n=2)
New York (n=918)	38.7% (n=355)	23.4% (n=215)	37.0% (n=339)	*
North Carolina (n=279)	49.8% (n=139)	9.7% (n=27)	39.5% (n=110)	1.0% (n=3)
Ohio (n=601)	61.1% (n=367)	29.9% (n=180)	7.7% (n=46)	1.3% (n=8)
Oklahoma (n=189)	73.9% (n=140)	17.0% (n=32)	7.9% (n=15)	1.1% (n=2)
Oregon (n=166)	59.9% (n=99)	24.8% (n=41)	7.9% (n=15)	1.1% (n=2)
Rhode Island (n=68)	44.1% (n=30)	48.8% (n=33)	7.1% (n=5)	--
South Carolina (n=142)	66.9% (n=95)	31.7% (n=45)	1.4% (n=2)	--
South Dakota (n=79)	72.9% (n=58)	10.4% (n=8)	14.6% (n=12)	2.1% (n=15)
Tennessee (n=261)	51.8% (n=136)	17.2% (n=45)	25.3% (n=66)	5.7% (n=15)
Texas (n=665)	64.5% (n=429)	17.3% (n=115)	16.2% (n=108)	2.0% (n=13)
Utah (n=92)	76.0% (n=70)	9.9% (n=9)	14.0% (n=13)	--
Vermont (n=164)	81.1% (n=133)	6.1% (n=10)	10.3% (n=17)	2.6% (n=4)

**Figure 89 (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=295)	51.9% (n=153)	37.3% (n=110)	9.4% (n=28)	1.5% (n=5)
Washington (n=251)	46.5% (n=117)	43.2% (n=108)	9.5% (n=24)	*
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=137)	64.4% (n=88)	15.4% (n=21)	11.1% (n=15)	9.2% (n=13)
Wisconsin (n=406)	46.9% (n=191)	28.0% (n=114)	20.1% (n=82)	5.0% (n=20)
Wyoming (n=59)	79.7% (n=47)	10.2% (n=6)	10.2% (n=6)	--
<b>National</b>	55.2% (n=6,563)	23.4% (n=2,781)	19.3% (n=2,294)	2.0% (n=241)
<b>Key</b> * = Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report				

Figure 89 details whether or not the wireless and public access workstations share the same bandwidth or connection in libraries that do provide wireless access. Just over one half (55.2 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), Idaho (85.9 percent), and Wyoming (79.7 percent). States that tend to share bandwidth, yet have management techniques are Minnesota (50.6 percent), Rhode Island (48.8), Mississippi (44.3 percent) and Washington (43.2 percent). States reporting the highest percentage of having a separate connection are Hawaii (100 percent) and New Jersey (46.8 percent).

Figure 90: 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=281)	4.9 (281)	4.1 (281)	4.8 (277)	4.0 (246)	4.7 (281)	4.5 (270)	4.4 (271)	4.4 (263)	4.4 (274)	4.3 (270)	3.3 (270)	3.1 (264)	5.0 (6)
Alaska (n=102)	4.0 (n=102)	3.4 (n=100)	4.6 (n=100)	3.1 (n=97)	4.1 (n=99)	4.0 (n=92)	3.9 (n=86)	4.4 (n=94)	3.8 (n=92)	3.7 (n=94)	2.6 (n=94)	3.0 (n=94)	4.2 (n=16)
Arizona (n=199)	4.6 (n=199)	4.0 (n=199)	4.3 (n=198)	4.0 (n=195)	4.2 (n=199)	3.9 (n=199)	3.9 (n=197)	4.0 (n=197)	3.8 (n=197)	4.1 (n=199)	3.6 (n=196)	3.7 (n=197)	4.8 (n=16)
Arkansas (n=212)	4.6 (n=212)	3.9 (n=212)	4.6 (n=210)	3.5 (n=205)	4.1 (n=210)	4.2 (n=212)	4.2 (n=210)	4.2 (n=210)	4.0 (n=210)	3.8 (n=210)	3.1 (n=202)	3.4 (n=210)	4.8 (n=7)
California (n=837)	4.6 (n=835)	3.8 (n=832)	4.4 (n=835)	3.9 (n=805)	4.2 (n=832)	3.9 (n=822)	3.8 (n=827)	3.9 (n=833)	3.7 (n=818)	3.9 (n=833)	3.3 (n=827)	3.7 (n=832)	4.4 (n=26)
Colorado (n=212)	4.5 (n=212)	3.7 (n=204)	4.3 (n=204)	3.8 (n=197)	4.2 (n=210)	3.7 (n=199)	3.9 (n=200)	3.9 (n=210)	3.4 (n=202)	3.9 (n=204)	3.3 (n=200)	3.5 (n=200)	4.6 (n=20)
Connecticut (n=210)	4.5 (n=210)	3.7 (n=207)	4.4 (n=210)	3.6 (n=204)	4.0 (n=209)	3.7 (n=209)	3.7 (n=209)	3.9 (n=209)	3.7 (n=207)	4.0 (n=208)	3.3 (n=200)	3.4 (n=194)	3.5 (n=15)
Delaware (n=28)	4.7 (n=28)	3.9 (n=28)	4.3 (n=28)	4.1 (n=28)	3.9 (n=28)	3.5 (n=28)	3.6 (n=28)	3.9 (n=27)	3.4 (n=28)	4.2 (n=27)	3.3 (n=28)	3.0 (n=28)	--
Florida (n=471)	4.8 (n=469)	4.0 (n=466)	4.9 (n=469)	4.0 (n=461)	4.3 (n=469)	3.9 (n=466)	4.0 (n=466)	4.1 (n=466)	3.8 (n=464)	4.2 (n=466)	3.6 (n=466)	3.9 (n=460)	4.9 (n=33)
Georgia (n=323)	4.8 (n=323)	4.1 (n=318)	4.3 (n=323)	3.7 (n=300)	4.4 (n=312)	4.0 (n=314)	4.2 (n=314)	4.3 (n=310)	3.8 (n=272)	3.6 (n=209)	3.0 (n=308)	3.6 (n=303)	4.6 (n=20)
Hawaii (n=49)	4.6 (n=49)	3.7 (n=49)	4.5 (n=49)	3.3 (n=48)	4.2 (n=49)	4.0 (n=49)	3.9 (n=49)	4.0 (n=49)	3.8 (n=49)	3.4 (n=48)	3.1 (n=49)	3.4 (n=48)	4.6 (n=5)
Idaho (n=127)	4.7 (n=127)	3.9 (n=125)	4.7 (n=127)	3.8 (n=118)	4.3 (n=127)	4.1 (n=127)	4.3 (n=123)	4.3 (n=125)	4.0 (n=125)	4.0 (n=127)	3.3 (n=121)	3.0 (n=117)	5.0 (n=5)
Illinois (n=725)	4.7 (n=725)	3.8 (n=725)	4.6 (n=722)	3.7 (n=697)	4.1 (n=714)	3.8 (n=714)	3.8 (n=717)	4.0 (n=722)	3.8 (n=725)	3.9 (n=710)	3.0 (n=714)	3.0 (n=678)	4.3 (n=51)
Indiana (n=394)	4.8 (n=394)	3.8 (n=390)	4.7 (n=394)	4.0 (n=388)	4.2 (n=394)	4.1 (n=392)	4.2 (n=390)	4.2 (n=392)	4.0 (n=394)	4.1 (n=384)	3.2 (n=392)	3.3 (n=374)	4.3 (n=17)

Figure 90 (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
Iowa (n=502)	4.5 (n=498)	3.5 (n=500)	4.3 (n=502)	3.5 (n=484)	3.7 (n=498)	3.8 (n=495)	3.6 (n=491)	3.8 (n=491)	3.6 (n=495)	3.8 (n=491)	2.8 (n=484)	2.9 (n=463)	3.7 (n=46)
Kansas (n=365)	4.3 (n=365)	3.5 (n=361)	4.4 (n=363)	3.5 (n=350)	3.6 (n=359)	3.6 (n=357)	3.5 (n=348)	3.8 (n=357)	3.5 (n=363)	3.7 (n=357)	3.0 (n=348)	2.9 (n=333)	3.5 (n=22)
Kentucky (n=186)	4.7 (n=186)	4.0 (n=186)	4.5 (n=186)	4.0 (n=181)	4.3 (n=186)	4.2 (n=186)	4.1 (n=186)	4.2 (n=186)	4.2 (n=186)	4.0 (n=181)	3.4 (n=184)	3.2 (n=181)	5.0 (n=12)
Louisiana (n=284)	4.5 (n=284)	3.8 (n=281)	4.4 (n=284)	4.2 (n=263)	4.4 (n=283)	4.1 (n=281)	4.2 (n=284)	4.1 (n=283)	4.0 (n=280)	4.1 (n=284)	3.2 (n=284)	3.3 (n=277)	4.7 (n=18)
Maryland (n=170)	4.8 (n=170)	4.3 (n=170)	4.6 (n=172)	4.0 (n=163)	4.5 (n=172)	3.6 (n=172)	4.3 (n=172)	4.0 (n=170)	3.8 (n=172)	4.2 (n=172)	3.7 (n=172)	3.6 (n=157)	5.0 (n=10)
Massachusetts (n=412)	4.5 (n=410)	3.7 (n=407)	4.3 (n=410)	3.6 (n=388)	4.0 (n=401)	3.7 (n=406)	3.8 (n=404)	4.0 (n=406)	3.6 (n=404)	3.9 (n=410)	3.3 (n=406)	3.3 (n=387)	4.8 (n=39)
Michigan (n=500)	4.8 (n=500)	4.0 (n=494)	4.7 (n=500)	3.9 (n=485)	4.1 (n=500)	4.0 (n=496)	4.0 (n=494)	4.0 (n=496)	3.9 (n=496)	3.9 (n=486)	3.4 (n=484)	3.1 (n=452)	3.3 (n=20)
Minnesota (n=326)	4.7 (n=326)	3.8 (n=325)	4.7 (n=326)	3.8 (n=319)	4.0 (n=324)	3.9 (n=324)	4.1 (n=326)	4.0 (n=322)	3.6 (n=325)	3.7 (n=325)	3.3 (n=315)	3.2 (n=313)	4.8 (n=23)
Mississippi (n=221)	4.7 (n=221)	3.8 (n=219)	4.4 (n=221)	3.6 (n=209)	4.2 (n=221)	4.1 (n=219)	4.0 (n=218)	4.2 (n=219)	4.2 (n=217)	3.5 (n=216)	3.0 (n=212)	3.2 (n=212)	4.8 (n=7)
Missouri (n=342)	4.8 (n=342)	4.0 (n=342)	4.6 (n=342)	4.3 (n=319)	4.2 (n=341)	4.0 (n=340)	4.1 (n=341)	4.1 (n=341)	4.1 (n=340)	4.1 (n=341)	3.7 (n=340)	3.4 (n=315)	4.0 (n=17)
Montana (n=92)	3.9 (n=91)	3.4 (n=89)	4.3 (n=92)	3.5 (n=82)	3.8 (n=92)	3.4 (n=92)	3.7 (n=91)	3.6 (n=92)	3.5 (n=91)	3.5 (n=91)	3.0 (n=91)	2.4 (n=79)	3.67 (n=11)
Nebraska (n=261)	4.4 (n=258)	3.6 (n=260)	4.5 (n=256)	3.5 (n=246)	3.6 (n=253)	3.7 (n=258)	3.5 (n=246)	3.8 (n=249)	3.7 (n=251)	3.6 (n=251)	2.9 (n=249)	3.1 (n=234)	3.6 (n=24)
Nevada (n=77)	4.6 (n=74)	3.8 (n=74)	4.6 (n=77)	3.4 (n=77)	3.9 (n=74)	3.7 (n=74)	3.5 (n=74)	3.4 (n=77)	3.4 (n=74)	3.6 (n=77)	2.9 (n=77)	3.4 (n=77)	5.0 (n=7)
New Jersey (n=357)	4.7 (n=357)	4.0 (n=357)	4.6 (n=357)	4.0 (n=347)	4.1 (n=353)	3.9 (n=354)	3.8 (n=345)	4.0 (n=350)	3.9 (n=353)	4.0 (n=353)	3.4 (n=353)	3.8 (n=353)	3.6 (n=18)
New Mexico (n=111)	4.6 (n=111)	3.6 (n=108)	4.6 (n=111)	3.6 (n=106)	3.9 (n=108)	3.8 (n=106)	3.6 (n=104)	3.8 (n=110)	3.6 (n=105)	3.8 (n=108)	3.0 (n=102)	3.2 (n=102)	4.2 (n=13)

Figure 90 (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
New York (n=965)	4.7 (n=965)	3.8 (n=961)	4.4 (n=965)	3.8 (n=941)	3.9 (n=968)	3.7 (n=957)	3.8 (n=967)	3.9 (n=959)	3.6 (n=966)	3.8 (n=954)	3.0 (n=957)	3.2 (n=921)	4.2 (n=94)
North Carolina (n=348)	4.8 (n=348)	4.1 (n=342)	4.5 (n=345)	3.9 (n=327)	4.3 (n=344)	4.1 (n=342)	4.3 (n=341)	4.3 (n=341)	3.9 (n=336)	4.0 (n=347)	3.3 (n=342)	3.5 (n=346)	4.4 (n=10)
Ohio (n=649)	4.7 (n=645)	3.6 (n=645)	4.5 (n=645)	3.7 (n=621)	3.9 (n=642)	3.6 (n=641)	3.8 (n=645)	3.8 (n=645)	3.6 (n=645)	3.7 (n=645)	3.1 (n=645)	3.0 (n=591)	3.7 (n=37)
Oklahoma (n=195)	4.6 (n=195)	3.9 (n=193)	4.6 (n=195)	3.7 (n=187)	3.9 (n=193)	3.6 (n=189)	4.1 (n=193)	3.9 (n=193)	3.8 (n=195)	3.9 (n=191)	3.2 (n=189)	3.2 (n=187)	3.5 (n=13)
Oregon (n=192)	4.5 (n=192)	3.5 (n=190)	4.6 (n=192)	3.4 (n=178)	3.9 (n=192)	3.7 (n=192)	3.8 (n=192)	3.8 (n=192)	3.4 (n=189)	3.3 (n=192)	3.0 (n=187)	3.2 (n=187)	4.9 (n=15)
Rhode Island (n=68)	4.6 (n=68)	3.9 (n=68)	4.6 (n=68)	4.2 (n=68)	4.3 (n=68)	3.5 (n=68)	4.1 (n=68)	3.9 (n=68)	3.7 (n=68)	4.0 (n=68)	3.7 (n=66)	3.4 (n=68)	--
South Carolina (n=164)	4.6 (n=164)	3.7 (n=162)	4.2 (n=164)	4.0 (n=153)	3.8 (n=160)	3.9 (n=155)	3.8 (n=164)	4.0 (n=164)	3.7 (n=163)	3.3 (n=164)	3.2 (n=164)	3.0 (n=163)	3.5 (n=4)
South Dakota (n=140)	4.2 (n=138)	3.7 (n=135)	4.3 (n=133)	3.5 (n=131)	4.0 (n=130)	3.8 (n=136)	3.6 (n=133)	3.9 (n=138)	3.7 (n=133)	3.7 (n=138)	2.8 (n=131)	2.7 (n=126)	5.0 (n=7)
Tennessee (n=329)	4.7 (n=326)	3.8 (n=311)	4.7 (n=326)	3.9 (n=303)	4.1 (n=319)	4.0 (n=316)	4.0 (n=326)	4.0 (n=319)	4.0 (n=321)	3.8 (n=316)	2.8 (n=313)	2.7 (n=313)	4.7 (n=21)
Texas (n=778)	4.8 (n=776)	3.9 (n=775)	4.6 (n=780)	3.8 (n=752)	4.1 (n=777)	4.1 (n=775)	4.0 (n=770)	4.1 (n=772)	4.0 (n=774)	3.9 (n=776)	3.3 (n=769)	3.6 (n=770)	4.4 (n=52)
Utah (n=108)	4.6 (n=108)	3.6 (n=106)	4.6 (n=108)	3.5 (n=100)	4.4 (n=108)	4.2 (n=108)	3.8 (n=108)	4.2 (n=108)	4.1 (n=106)	4.1 (n=108)	3.3 (n=106)	3.7 (n=108)	4.3 (n=13)
Vermont (n=171)	4.3 (n=171)	3.5 (n=171)	4.3 (n=171)	3.4 (n=163)	3.4 (n=169)	3.3 (n=171)	3.6 (n=170)	3.6 (n=168)	3.2 (n=169)	3.6 (n=169)	2.7 (n=171)	2.4 (n=161)	4.7 (n=12)
Virginia (n=340)	4.8 (n=340)	3.9 (n=339)	4.6 (n=342)	4.0 (n=333)	4.1 (n=340)	3.9 (n=340)	4.1 (n=331)	4.1 (n=342)	4.0 (n=340)	3.9 (n=340)	3.5 (n=333)	3.3 (n=339)	4.7 (n=21)
Washington (n= 320)	4.6 (n=320)	3.9 (n=318)	4.3 (n=320)	3.7 (n=266)	4.6 (n=318)	3.7 (n=318)	4.5 (n=315)	4.1 (n=318)	4.0 (n=320)	3.7 (n=320)	3.0 (n=314)	3.5 (n=314)	3.2 (n=51)

Figure 90 (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
Washington, DC (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	5.00 (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=166)	4.5 (n=166)	3.6 (n=166)	4.4 (n=165)	3.5 (n=158)	4.4 (n=165)	4.2 (n=166)	4.2 (n=165)	4.2 (n=166)	4.1 (n=163)	3.8 (n=159)	3.0 (n=165)	2.5 (n=147)	4.8 (n=8)
Wisconsin (n=426)	4.6 (n=426)	3.7 (n=420)	4.5 (n=419)	3.7 (n=405)	3.9 (n=421)	3.7 (n=416)	3.9 (n=420)	4.0 (n=417)	3.6 (n=413)	3.9 (n=412)	3.2 (n=418)	3.1 (n=402)	4.4 (n=31)
Wyoming (n=72)	4.2 (n=72)	3.7 (n=71)	4.2 (n=72)	3.3 (n=70)	4.1 (n=71)	4.2 (n=71)	4.2 (n=70)	4.2 (n=71)	3.8 (n=69)	3.6 (n=71)	3.2 (n=70)	3.2 (n=70)	2.3 (n=3)
<b>National</b>	4.6 (n=14,873)	3.8 (n=14,761)	4.5 (n=14,838)	3.8 (n=14,193)	4.1 (n=14,773)	3.9 (n=14,702)	3.9 (n=14,672)	4.0 (n=14,740)	3.8 (n=14,656)	3.8 (n=14,694)	3.2 (n=14,589)	3.3 (n=14,193)	4.2 (n=959)
<b>Key:</b> -- = No data to report													

Figure 90 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; Kansas; Montana; Nebraska; Oregon; and South Dakota rated providing access to government information and services the most important service. In Arkansas; Idaho; Minnesota; Nevada; New Mexico; Oklahoma; Rhode Island; Tennessee; Utah; Vermont; Washington; Washington, DC; and Wyoming, providing services to job seekers was tied with other services for the top rated service.

**Figure 91: 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=214)	29.6% (n=63)	31.3% (n=67)	64.9% (n=139)	23.9% (n=51)	22.5% (n=48)
Alaska (n=81)	9.8% (n=8)	17.6% (n=14)	80.4% (n=65)	15.6% (n=13)	19.6% (n=16)
Arizona (n=112)	61.3% (n=69)	28.4% (n=32)	84.5% (n=95)	39.7% (n=44)	9.0% (n=10)
Arkansas (n=177)	14.3% (n=25)	13.3% (n=24)	77.4% (n=137)	20.3% (n=36)	19.7% (n=35)
California (n=816)	40.7% (n=332)	25.2% (n=206)	69.2% (n=565)	36.2% (n=295)	25.8% (n=211)
Colorado (n=188)	52.1% (n=98)	53.6% (n=101)	75.0% (n=141)	29.4% (n=55)	12.6% (n=24)
Connecticut (n=203)	38.6% (n=78)	28.1% (n=57)	84.6% (n=171)	25.4% (n=50)	14.0% (n=28)
Delaware (n=28)	46.1% (n=13)	35.6% (n=10)	86.3% (n=25)	25.4% (n=7)	4.6% (n=1)
Florida (n=427)	54.5% (n=233)	19.3% (n=82)	82.1% (n=351)	27.9% (n=119)	11.0% (n=47)
Georgia (n=257)	27.7% (n=71)	10.7% (n=28)	78.9% (n=203)	42.1% (n=108)	12.8% (n=33)
Hawaii (n=49)	6.1% (n=3)	16.3% (n=8)	79.6% (n=39)	12.2% (n=6)	20.4% (n=10)
Idaho (n=124)	17.5% (n=22)	16.8% (n=21)	76.1% (n=94)	22.6% (n=28)	18.1% (n=22)
Illinois (n=675)	32.1% (n=217)	30.6% (n=207)	76.9% (n=519)	20.5% (n=138)	13.8% (n=93)
Indiana (n=369)	50.2% (n=186)	38.9% (n=143)	69.7% (n=257)	37.3% (n=138)	6.2% (n=23)
Iowa (n=482)	23.0% (n=111)	30.6% (n=148)	76.0% (n=366)	11.1% (n=54)	14.1% (n=68)
Kansas (n=359)	22.4% (n=80)	34.8% (n=125)	89.3% (n=285)	27.3% (n=98)	11.4% (n=41)
Kentucky (n=164)	53.2% (n=87)	35.4% (n=58)	86.9% (n=143)	22.8% (n=37)	5.9% (n=10)
Louisiana (n=250)	61.9% (n=155)	12.4% (n=31)	65.3% (n=163)	33.8% (n=84)	6.4% (n=16)
Maryland (n=156)	43.4% (n=68)	36.0% (n=56)	92.9% (n=145)	48.0% (n=75)	1.7% (n=3)
Massachusetts (n=383)	28.2% (n=108)	29.5% (n=113)	80.3% (n=308)	15.2% (n=58)	14.2% (n=55)
Michigan (n=490)	54.6% (n=268)	34.7% (n=170)	89.0% (n=436)	26.6% (n=130)	6.5% (n=32)
Minnesota (n=324)	56.6% (n=183)	21.3% (n=69)	83.6% (n=271)	34.8% (n=113)	6.9% (n=22)
Mississippi (n=217)	16.0% (n=35)	15.6% (n=34)	76.1% (n=165)	43.5% (n=94)	16.1% (n=35)

**Figure 91 (continued): Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State**

<b>State</b>	<b>Offers formal IT training classes</b>	<b>Offers one-on-one IT training by appointment</b>	<b>Offers informal point-of-use assistance</b>	<b>Offers online training material</b>	<b>Does not offer any technology training</b>
Missouri (n=320)	30.7% (n=98)	38.6% (n=124)	86.3% (n=277)	38.0% (n=122)	10.5% (n=34)
Montana (n=96)	31.6% (n=30)	35.4% (n=34)	72.2% (n=69)	17.7% (n=17)	17.7% (n=17)
Nebraska (n=260)	13.6% (n=36)	21.1% (n=55)	76.0% (n=198)	13.6% (n=36)	19.4% (n=51)
Nevada (n=61)	17.4% (n=11)	3.6% (n=2)	77.7% (n=48)	15.8% (n=10)	18.6% (n=11)
New Jersey (n=307)	42.1% (n=129)	41.8% (n=128)	80.9% (n=249)	34.4% (n=106)	4.0% (n=12)
New Mexico (n=111)	45.8% (n=51)	37.1% (n=41)	88.4% (n=98)	8.4% (n=9)	4.1% (n=5)
New York (n=940)	59.9% (n=563)	33.9% (n=319)	86.6% (n=814)	29.5% (n=277)	5.4% (n=50)
North Carolina (n=331)	30.6% (n=101)	29.8% (n=99)	84.8% (n=281)	40.6% (n=134)	14.0% (n=46)
Ohio (n=648)	44.3% (n=288)	48.5% (n=315)	77.5% (n=502)	37.3% (n=242)	10.0% (n=65)
Oklahoma (n=172)	46.1% (n=79)	22.5% (n=39)	63.6% (n=109)	38.0% (n=65)	18.7% (n=32)
Oregon (n=189)	24.4% (n=46)	11.1% (n=21)	88.5% (n=168)	40.5% (n=77)	8.4% (n=16)
Rhode Island (n=63)	64.1% (n=41)	34.9% (n=22)	72.7% (n=46)	24.8% (n=16)	3.8% (n=2)
South Carolina (n=109)	63.8% (n=70)	22.3% (n=24)	54.7% (n=60)	36.0% (n=39)	19.1% (n=21)
South Dakota (n=140)	16.8% (n=24)	16.6% (n=23)	70.5% (n=98)	16.3% (n=23)	29.5% (n=41)
Tennessee (n=329)	35.5% (n=117)	23.0% (n=76)	74.8% (n=246)	26.9% (n=89)	18.4% (n=60)
Texas (n=752)	38.2% (n=288)	19.2% (n=144)	82.9% (n=623)	29.0% (n=218)	11.9% (n=89)
Utah (n=97)	26.9% (n=26)	27.5% (n=27)	85.2% (n=83)	15.1% (n=15)	12.8% (n=13)

<b>Figure 91 (continued): Public Library Outlets Formal or Informal Technology Training Availability, by State</b>					
<b>State</b>	<b>Offers formal IT training classes</b>	<b>Offers one-on-one IT training by appointment</b>	<b>Offers informal point-of-use assistance</b>	<b>Offers online training material</b>	<b>Does not offer any technology training</b>
Vermont (n=162)	13.0% (n=21)	39.6% (n=64)	84.4% (n=137)	15.6% (n=25)	10.4% (n=17)
Virginia (n=276)	48.0% (n=132)	34.9% (n=96)	80.9% (n=223)	30.5% (n=84)	13.1% (n=36)
Washington (n= 364)	29.0% (n=77)	12.0% (n=32)	82.5% (n=218)	22.8% (n=60)	6.5% (n=17)
Washington, DC (n=55)	87.5% (n=48)	--	12.5% (n=7)	--	--
West Virginia (n=166)	19.2% (n=32)	23.3% (n=39)	81.4% (n=135)	35.5% (n=59)	15.2% (n=25)
Wisconsin (n=410)	28.9% (n=119)	30.8% (n=126)	80.5% (n=330)	20.5% (n=84)	11.4% (n=47)
Wyoming (n=65)	23.1% (n=15)	24.6% (n=16)	76.9% (n=50)	36.9% (n=24)	21.5% (n=14)
<b>National</b>	38.0% (n=5,263)	28.1% (n=3,902)	78.8% (n=10,923)	29.5% (n=4,097)	12.7% (n=1,757)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive <b>Key -- = No data to report</b>					

The availability of formal and informal technology training at public libraries is shown in Figure 91. Point-of-use assistance is the most prevalent form of technology training and the states with the highest percentages of libraries offering it are Maryland (92.9 percent), Kansas (89.3 percent), and Michigan (89.0 percent). The highest percentage of libraries providing formal training are in Washington, DC (87.5 percent), Rhode Island (64.1 percent), and South Carolina (63.8 percent). Ohio (48.5 percent), New Jersey (41.8 percent), and Vermont (39.6 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 are Maryland (48.0 percent), Mississippi (43.5 percent) and Georgia (42.1 percent). Hawaii (20.4 percent), Wyoming (21.5 percent) and South Dakota (29.5 percent) had the highest percentages of libraries not offering formal or informal training.

**Figure 92 (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=63)	95.8% (n=61)	77.1% (n=49)	89.9% (n=57)	88.9% (n=56)	72.9% (n=46)	77.1% (n=49)	58.3% (n=37)	38.5% (n=24)
Alaska (n=8)	20.0% (n=2)	--	40.0% (n=3)	40.0% (n=3)	60.0% (n=5)	60.0% (n=5)	--	20.0% (n=2)
Arizona (n=66)	91.2% (n=60)	87.7% (n=58)	96.9% (n=64)	78.7% (n=52)	68.3% (n=45)	64.4% (n=42)	22.3% (n=15)	47.7% (n=31)
Arkansas (n=24)	92.8% (n=22)	84.8% (n=20)	92.8% (n=22)	92.8% (n=22)	55.2% (n=13)	69.6% (n=17)	22.4% (n=5)	22.4% (n=5)
California (n=329)	93.3% (n=307)	86.7% (n=285)	94.7% (n=312)	89.9% (n=296)	79.6% (n=262)	79.7% (n=262)	29.4% (n=97)	29.3% (n=96)
Colorado (n=98)	87.3% (n=65)	89.6% (n=88)	94.6% (n=93)	84.4% (n=83)	62.6% (n=61)	65.0% (n=64)	45.5% (n=45)	27.0% (n=27)
Connecticut (n=74)	87.3% (n=65)	80.3% (n=59)	87.6% (n=65)	76.5% (n=57)	53.4% (n=40)	61.0% (n=45)	14.4% (n=11)	23.8% (n=18)
Delaware (n=13)	100% (n=13)	80.2% (n=11)	100% (n=13)	90.1% (n=12)	82.4% (n=11)	70.2% (n=9)	62.6% (n=8)	70.2% (n=9)
Florida (n=228)	97.3% (n=222)	58.6% (n=134)	96.5% (n=220)	82.7% (n=189)	33.8% (n=77)	62.1% (n=142)	39.5% (n=90)	30.8% (n=70)
Georgia (n=61)	86.7% (n=53)	75.0% (n=45)	83.8% (n=51)	77.9% (n=47)	47.0% (n=28)	42.7% (n=26)	33.7% (n=20)	20.5% (n=12)
Hawaii (n=3)	100% (n=3)	33.3% (n=1)	100% (n=3)	100% (n=3)	66.7% (n=2)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)
Idaho (n=22)	94.3% (n=22)	75.3% (n=16)	100% (n=22)	91.8% (n=20)	50.4% (n=11)	57.7% (n=13)	45.8% (n=10)	8.3% (n=2)
Illinois (n=209)	94.8% (n=198)	80.8% (n=169)	91.8% (n=192)	77.5% (n=162)	45.2% (n=95)	51.4% (n=107)	42.0% (n=89)	20.0% (n=42)
Indiana (n=172)	96.6% (n=167)	89.5% (n=154)	94.4% (n=163)	69.8% (n=120)	57.8% (n=100)	41.7% (n=72)	32.9% (n=57)	27.4% (n=47)
Iowa (n=107)	94.3% (n=101)	67.8% (n=73)	93.4% (n=100)	76.2% (n=82)	49.6% (n=53)	40.7% (n=44)	43.1% (n=46)	26.0% (n=28)
Kansas (n=80)	87.1% (n=70)	82.9% (n=67)	95.3% (n=77)	75.1% (n=60)	52.9% (n=43)	50.6% (n=41)	40.4% (n=32)	35.3% (n=28)
Kentucky (n=82)	100% (n=82)	82.3% (n=67)	95.4% (n=78)	84.1% (n=69)	63.8% (n=52)	42.9% (n=35)	33.7% (n=28)	39.3% (n=32)
Louisiana (n=148)	84.8% (n=126)	77.9% (n=116)	91.2% (n=135)	88.0% (n=131)	63.3% (n=94)	62.4% (n=93)	26.7% (n=40)	25.0% (n=37)
Maryland (n=68)	96.1% (n=65)	83.5% (n=57)	92.9% (n=63)	86.7% (n=59)	46.2% (n=31)	51.5% (n=35)	24.9% (n=17)	17.2% (n=12)
Massachusetts (n=105)	83.0% (n=87)	76.5% (n=80)	85.4% (n=90)	73.3% (n=77)	61.1% (n=64)	66.8% (n=70)	28.1% (n=30)	19.7% (n=21)
Michigan (n=268)	90.4% (n=242)	86.5% (n=231)	93.7% (n=251)	82.1% (n=220)	52.1% (n=139)	45.8% (n=123)	46.7% (n=125)	29.2% (n=78)

**Figure 92 (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
Minnesota (n=145)	90.8% (n=131)	30.8% (n=45)	92.6% (n=134)	85.8% (n=124)	39.0% (n=57)	37.9% (n=55)	61.0% (88)	65.9% (n=96)
Mississippi (n=35)	96.9% (n=34)	75.4% (n=26)	96.9% (n=34)	78.2% (n=27)	36.1% (n=13)	49.9% (n=17)	47.3% (n=17)	38.7% (n=14)
Missouri (n=95)	97.3% (n=93)	81.4% (n=78)	100% (n=95)	96.0% (n=92)	49.1% (n=47)	39.8% (n=38)	44.0% (n=42)	31.6% (n=30)
Montana (n=30)	92.0% (n=28)	80.0% (n=24)	96.0% (n=29)	92.0% (n=28)	72.0% (n=22)	68.0% (n=21)	44.0% (n=13)	32.0% (n=10)
Nebraska (n=36)	87.3% (n=31)	72.9% (n=26)	100% (n=36)	66.1% (n=24)	39.8% (n=14)	27.1% (n=10)	33.9% (n=12)	47.4% (n=17)
Nevada (n=11)	100% (n=11)	100% (n=11)	79.1% (n=8)	100% (n=11)	79.1% (n=8)	79.1% (n=8)	--	41.8% (n=4)
New Jersey (n=129)	97.1% (n=126)	80.7% (n=104)	97.1% (n=126)	88.5% (n=114)	60.2% (n=78)	54.9% (n=71)	40.9% (n=53)	34.6% (n=45)
New Mexico (n=49)	94.8% (n=46)	84.3% (n=41)	94.8% (n=46)	82.6% (n=40)	48.7% (n=24)	46.2% (n=22)	26.0% (n=13)	23.0% (n=11)
New York (n=555)	92.2% (n=511)	83.0% (n=461)	95.4% (n=529)	81.1% (n=450)	36.8% (n=204)	36.7% (n=204)	24.4% (n=136)	19.4% (n=108)
North Carolina (n=101)	97.1% (n=98)	92.8% (n=94)	96.8% (n=98)	85.9% (n=87)	37.4% (n=38)	70.2% (n=71)	40.9% (n=41)	29.2% (n=30)
Ohio (n=271)	91.5% (n=248)	87.0% (n=236)	94.4% (n=256)	86.4% (n=234)	59.1% (n=160)	62.5% (n=169)	48.3% (n=131)	40.3% (n=109)
Oklahoma (n=76)	91.5% (n=69)	75.3% (n=57)	86.6% (n=65)	34.9% (n=26)	61.1% (n=46)	58.0% (n=44)	17.4% (n=13)	72.4% (n=55)
Oregon (n=43)	100% (n=43)	80.8% (n=35)	100% (n=43)	94.3% (n=41)	62.7% (n=27)	56.2% (n=24)	29.0% (n=13)	12.8% (n=6)
Rhode Island (n=41)	94.0% (n=38)	88.0% (n=36)	100% (n=41)	82.0% (n=33)	40.4% (n=16)	46.4% (n=19)	20.8% (n=8)	15.3% (n=6)
South Carolina (n=63)	94.1% (n=59)	63.8% (n=40)	96.5% (n=60)	72.6% (n=45)	46.3% (n=29)	37.6% (n=24)	39.9% (n=25)	37.3% (n=23)
South Dakota (n=23)	85.9% (n=20)	78.9% (n=18)	85.9% (n=20)	93.0% (n=22)	50.8% (n=12)	56.3% (n=13)	31.3% (n=37)	35.2% (n=8)
Tennessee (n=117)	94.5% (n=110)	82.9% (n=97)	97.2% (n=114)	94.0% (n=110)	42.3% (n=49)	39.0% (n=46)	31.3% (n=37)	44.0% (n=51)
Texas (n=283)	93.4% (n=264)	87.9% (n=249)	94.8% (n=268)	81.9% (n=232)	54.0% (n=153)	56.7% (n=160)	41.1% (n=116)	32.6% (n=92)
Utah (n=26)	100% (n=26)	100% (n=26)	100% (n=26)	92.9% (n=24)	49.1% (n=13)	56.2% (n=15)	48.0% (n=13)	41.9% (n=11)
Vermont (n=21)	77.7% (n=16)	72.4% (n=15)	100% (n=21)	92.5% (n=19)	37.6% (n=8)	42.4% (n=9)	60.1% (n=13)	40.1% (n=8)
Virginia (n=128)	99.0% (n=127)	87.3% (n=112)	97.9% (n=126)	73.2% (n=94)	43.1% (n=55)	42.7% (n=55)	31.9% (n=41)	30.5% (n=39)

**Figure 92 (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
Washington (n=72)	100% (n=72)	88.4% (n=64)	94.5% (n=68)	89.2% (n=64)	19.7% (n=14)	79.6% (n=57)	50.7% (n=37)	8.1% (n=6)
Washington, DC (n=48)	100% (n=48)	23.8% (n=12)	9.5% (n=5)	4.8% (n=2)	4.8% (n=2)	9.5% (n=5)	--	14.3% (n=7)
West Virginia (n=30)	95.4% (n=29)	72.8% (n=22)	100% (n=30)	72.8% (n=22)	55.3% (n=17)	73.0% (n=22)	32.2% (n=10)	46.3% (n=14)
Wisconsin (n=116)	87.3% (n=102)	70.4% (n=82)	88.9% (n=103)	85.9% (n=100)	59.5% (n=69)	53.7% (n=63)	29.5% (n=34)	22.1% (n=26)
Wyoming (n=8)	87.5% (n=7)	75.0% (n=6)	100% (n=8)	100% (n=8)	75.0% (n=6)	87.5% (n=7)	50.0% (n=4)	12.5% (n=1)
<b>National</b>	92.9% (n=4,693)	79.5% (n=4,018)	93.5% (n=4,723)	81.9% (n=4,140)	51.8% (n=2,615)	54.5% (n=2,753)	35.6% (n=1,802)	30.4% (n=1,535)

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

State	Accessing online job seeking and career related information	Accessing online medical information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing online genealogy information	Accessing online consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social networking	Other
Alabama (n=63)	71.9% (n=46)	31.6% (n=20)	13.9% (n=9)	45.1% (n=29)	32.6% (n=21)	43.4% (n=28)	49.7% (n=32)	8.3% (n=5)
Alaska (n=8)	20.0% (n=2)	--	--	20.0% (n=2)	--	40.0% (n=3)	20.0% (n=2)	20.0% (n=2)
Arizona (n=66)	70.4% (n=46)	36.6% (n=24)	25.4% (n=17)	34.8% (n=23)	22.5% (n=15)	29.1% (n=19)	33.3% (n=22)	--
Arkansas (n=24)	29.6% (n=7)	24.8% (n=6)	--	56.0% (n=13)	--	32.0% (n=8)	48.0% (n=11)	7.2% (n=2)
California (n=329)	43.3% (n=142)	25.1% (n=82)	22.4% (n=74)	26.1% (n=86)	27.2% (n=89)	32.9% (n=108)	26.7% (n=88)	7.5% (n=25)
Colorado (n=98)	57.7% (n=57)	24.1% (n=24)	17.6% (n=17)	53.7% (n=53)	22.3% (n=22)	39.6% (n=39)	41.6% (n=41)	1.8% (n=2)
Connecticut (n=74)	59.7% (n=44)	26.8% (n=20)	24.8% (n=18)	40.0% (n=30)	23.3% (n=17)	9.1% (n=7)	49.6% (n=37)	5.6% (n=4)

**Figure 92 (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 medical information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing online genealogy information	Accessing online consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social networking	Other
Delaware (n=13)	70.2% (n=9)	80.2% (n=11)	7.6% (n=1)	70.2% (n=9)	37.4% (n=5)	19.8% (n=3)	17.6% (n=2)	--
Florida (n=228)	70.3% (n=161)	18.6% (n=42)	10.9% (n=25)	28.7% (n=66)	19.6% (n=45)	29.6% (n=68)	26.0% (n=60)	3.4% (n=8)
Georgia (n=61)	36.8% (n=22)	14.7% (n=9)	4.4% (n=3)	58.8% (n=36)	11.8% (n=7)	24.9% (n=15)	32.2% (n=20)	8.8% (n=5)
Hawaii (n=3)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	--
Idaho (n=22)	50.3% (n=11)	29.3% (n=31)	--	24.7% (n=5)	12.9% (n=3)	32.7% (n=7)	45.7% (n=10)	--
Illinois (n=209)	43.1% (n=91)	13.2% (n=28)	18.2% (n=39)	48.4% (n=103)	11.8% (n=25)	43.0% (n=91)	37.8% (n=80)	8.9% (n=19)
Indiana (n=172)	40.4% (n=70)	16.9% (n=29)	5.8% (n=10)	67.1% (n=116)	14.2% (n=25)	30.4% (n=52)	52.0% (n=90)	3.1% (n=5)
Iowa (n=107)	37.4% (n=40)	29.3% (n=31)	23.5% (n=25)	39.2% (n=42)	19.4% (n=21)	29.8% (n=32)	40.5% (n=43)	--
Kansas (n=80)	53.3% (n=43)	20.9% (n=17)	7.0% (n=6)	53.3% (n=43)	20.9% (n=17)	53.3% (n=43)	60.3% (n=49)	23.4% (n=19)
Kentucky (n=82)	46.1% (n=38)	33.1% (n=27)	22.8% (n=19)	53.6% (n=44)	28.8% (n=24)	25.1% (n=22)	22.6% (n=19)	--
Louisiana (n=148)	33.7% (n=50)	28.3% (n=42)	3.4% (n=5)	25.1% (n=37)	16.1% (n=24)	17.0% (n=25)	16.1% (n=24)	10.4% (n=15)
Maryland (n=68)	69.8% (n=47)	32.1% (n=22)	6.3% (n=4)	28.2% (n=19)	10.9% (n=7)	25.8% (n=18)	35.0% (n=24)	2.3% (n=2)
Massachusetts (n=105)	40.8% (n=43)	13.3% (n=14)	4.9% (n=5)	38.9% (n=41)	16.8% (n=18)	21.9% (n=23)	36.0% (n=38)	22.7% (n=24)
Michigan (n=268)	48.3% (n=129)	26.6% (n=71)	22.8% (n=61)	54.3% (n=145)	27.0% (n=72)	44.1% (n=118)	46.1% (n=123)	4.1% (n=11)
Minnesota (n=145)	29.4% (n=43)	14.9% (n=22)	13.8% (n=20)	33.3% (n=48)	51.8% (n=75)	29.4% (n=43)	34.4% (n=50)	9.9% (n=14)
Mississippi (n=35)	20.9% (n=7)	35.6% (n=12)	2.9% (n=1)	41.9% (n=15)	9.2% (n=3)	11.8% (n=4)	21.2% (n=7)	2.9% (n=1)
Missouri (n=95)	38.5% (n=37)	24.9% (n=24)	13.4% (n=13)	45.1% (n=43)	19.1% (n=18)	26.7% (n=25)	26.5% (n=25)	1.8% (n=2)
Montana (n=30)	32.0% (n=10)	36.0% (n=11)	20.0% (n=6)	64.0% (n=19)	20.0% (n=6)	52.0% (n=16)	48.0% (n=15)	8.0% (n=2)
Nebraska (n=36)	27.1% (n=10)	40.7% (n=14)	6.8% (n=2)	39.8% (n=14)	20.3% (n=7)	33.9% (n=12)	40.7% (n=14)	--
Nevada (n=11)	41.8% (n=4)	20.9% (n=2)	20.9% (n=2)	--	--	--	--	20.9% (n=2)
New Jersey (n=129)	53.3% (n=69)	27.0% (n=35)	15.5% (n=20)	36.6% (n=47)	33.8% (n=44)	35.2% (n=46)	40.8% (n=53)	5.2% (n=7)
New Mexico (n=49)	27.1% (n=13)	13.5% (n=7)	--	20.5% (n=10)	9.0% (n=4)	12.1% (n=6)	23.7% (n=12)	13.6% (n=7)
New York (n=555)	32.8% (n=182)	18.0% (n=100)	8.9% (n=49)	25.5% (n=142)	17.6% (n=98)	29.1% (n=161)	29.4% (163)	5.4% (n=30)

Figure 92 (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 medical information	Accessing online investment information	Accessing online genealogy information	Accessing online consumer information	Digital photography, software and online applications	Social networking	Other
North Carolina (n=101)	70.7% (n=72)	38.8% (n=39)	28.5% (n=29)	55.0% (n=56)	32.3% (n=33)	39.2% (n=40)	42.8% (n=43)	2.9% (n=3)
Ohio (n=271)	60.2% (n=163)	35.2% (n=95)	32.4% (n=88)	59.7% (n=162)	33.0% (n=90)	51.2% (n=139)	56.8% (n=154)	6.3% (n=17)
Oklahoma (n=76)	55.4% (n=42)	31.2% (n=24)	2.0% (n=2)	75.3% (n=57)	2.8% (n=2)	33.3% (n=25)	16.6% (n=13)	--
Oregon (n=43)	26.8% (n=12)	12.8% (n=6)	9.0% (n=4)	22.4% (n=10)	5.7% (n=3)	16.1% (n=7)	16.1% (n=7)	2.5% (n=1)
Rhode Island (n=41)	35.5% (n=14)	9.3% (n=4)	6.0% (n=2)	15.3% (n=6)	6.0% (n=2)	18.0% (n=7)	44.9% (n=18)	--
South Carolina (n=63)	46.3% (n=29)	33.8% (n=21)	30.9% (n=19)	39.9% (n=25)	30.9% (n=19)	33.5% (n=21)	39.7% (n=25)	--
South Dakota (n=23)	50.8% (n=12)	35.2% (n=8)	7.0% (n=2)	42.2% (n=10)	14.1% (n=3)	35.2% (n=8)	43.7% (n=10)	--
Tennessee (n=117)	54.4% (n=64)	33.5% (n=39)	4.4% (n=5)	55.5% (n=65)	23.1% (n=27)	8.8% (n=10)	43.4% (n=51)	--
Texas (n=283)	62.1% (n=176)	33.0% (n=93)	17.3% (n=49)	46.1% (n=131)	27.0% (n=76)	22.4% (n=63)	38.8% (n=110)	5.7% (n=16)
Utah (n=26)	40.9% (n=11)	40.9% (n=11)	25.7% (n=7)	25.7% (n=7)	33.8% (n=9)	62.5% (n=16)	37.1% (n=10)	--
Vermont (n=21)	40.1% (n=8)	47.6% (n=10)	10.0% (n=2)	57.6% (n=12)	40.1% (n=8)	27.6% (n=6)	60.1% (n=13)	--
Virginia (n=128)	68.3% (n=88)	29.4% (n=38)	13.6% (n=18)	28.8% (n=37)	19.0% (n=24)	26.5% (n=34)	39.4% (n=51)	14.5% (n=19)
Washington (n=72)	44.9% (n=32)	11.3% (n=8)	10.9% (n=8)	24.9% (n=18)	5.9% (n=4)	5.5% (n=4)	10.5% (n=8)	5.5% (n=4)
Washington, DC (n=48)	4.8% (n=2)	4.8% (n=2)	--	4.8% (n=2)	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=30)	41.7% (n=13)	32.4% (n=10)	13.9% (n=4)	50.7% (n=15)	23.2% (n=7)	18.5% (n=6)	36.8% (n=11)	--
Wisconsin (n=116)	56.8% (n=66)	21.6% (n=25)	9.6% (n=11)	39.6% (n=46)	15.0% (n=18)	23.3% (n=27)	29.0% (n=34)	3.3% (n=4)
Wyoming (n=8)	25.0% (n=2)	12.5% (n=1)	12.5% (n=1)	25.0% (n=2)	--	37.5% (n=3)	37.5% (n=3)	25.0% (n=2)
<i>National</i>	48.1% (n=2,432)	25.1% (n=1,267)	14.5% (n=732)	40.8% (n=2,065)	21.2% (n=1,074)	30.4% (n=1,540)	35.3% (n=1,785)	6.0% (n=303)

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 91), Figure 92 (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: Delaware (100 percent); Hawaii (100 percent); Kentucky (100 percent); Nevada (100 percent); Oregon (100 percent); Utah (100 percent); Washington (100 percent); and Washington, DC (100 percent);
- General software use: Nevada (100 percent) and Utah (100 percent);

- General Internet use: Delaware (100 percent); Hawaii (100 percent); Idaho (100 percent); Montana (100 percent); Nebraska (100 percent); Oregon (100 percent); Rhode Island (100 percent); Utah (100 percent); Vermont (100 percent); West Virginia (100 percent); and Wyoming (100 percent);
- General online/Web searching: Hawaii (100 percent), Nevada (100 percent), and Wyoming (100 percent);
- Using the library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC): Delaware (82.4 percent);
- Using online databases: California (79.7 percent);
- Safe online practices: Delaware (62.6 percent);
- Accessing online government information: Oklahoma (72.4 percent);
- Accessing online job-seeking information: Alabama (71.9 percent);
- Accessing online medical information: Delaware (80.2 percent);
- Accessing online investment information: Hawaii (33.3 percent);
- Accessing genealogy information: Oklahoma (75.3 percent);
- Accessing consumer information: Minnesota (51.8 percent);
- Using digital photography software and online applications: Kansas (53.3 percent);
- Participating in social networking: Kansas (60.3 percent).

Figure 93 (Part 1): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Digital reference/ Virtual reference			Licensed databases			E-books			Web/business conferencing			Online instructional courses/tutorials		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Alabama (n=215)	47.9% (n=101)	37.8% (n=80)	35.1% (n=74)	96.5% (n=207)	100% (n=215)	--	29.0% (n=61)	22.7% (n=48)	67.2% (n=142)	61.2% (n=121)	5.0% (n=4)	38.8% (n=77)	57.7% (n=119)	44.7% (n=92)	33.2% (n=68)
Alaska (n=91)	20.9% (n=19)	24.3% (n=22)	53.1% (n=48)	93.0% (n=84)	96.5% (n=88)	--	30.0% (n=27)	38.8% (n=35)	49.0% (n=44)	21.4% (n=19)	4.4% (n=3)	75.1% (n=67)	43.7% (n=40)	29.7% (n=27)	37.0% (n=34)
Arizona (n=189)	45.3% (n=84)	39.9% (n=74)	51.3% (n=95)	98.3% (n=186)	96.8% (n=183)	--	42.4% (n=78)	58.1% (n=106)	40.3% (n=74)	4.9% (n=9)	2.8% (n=5)	94.5% (n=175)	48.0% (n=89)	45.3% (n=84)	47.0% (n=87)
Arkansas (n=198)	33.8% (n=67)	21.0% (n=42)	59.2% (n=117)	93.6% (n=186)	90.5% (n=180)	--	29.7% (n=58)	37.0% (n=73)	60.5% (n=119)	3.6% (n=7)	--	96.4% (n=188)	43.0% (n=84)	21.9% (n=43)	53.5% (n=104)
California (n=873)	35.8% (n=310)	65.6% (n=567)	29.5% (n=255)	100% (n=873)	98.0% (n=855)	--	47.8% (n=415)	71.7% (n=622)	22.7% (n=197)	1.9% (n=14)	--	98.1% (n=726)	48.9% (n=419)	50.3% (n=431)	39.4% (n=337)
Colorado (n=208)	64.5% (n=131)	71.1% (n=144)	15.5% (n=31)	97.4% (n=203)	98.3% (n=204)	1.7% (n=4)	41.1% (n=84)	63.6% (n=129)	36.4% (n=74)	10.3% (n=20)	5.0% (n=9)	88.8% (n=173)	40.1% (n=81)	31.4% (n=64)	51.8% (n=105)
Connecticut (n=212)	35.3% (n=75)	42.9% (n=91)	45.0% (n=95)	97.5% (n=207)	98.8% (n=209)	--	55.5% (n=117)	73.0% (n=154)	22.2% (n=47)	12.2% (n=25)	8.8% (n=17)	86.6% (n=176)	36.7% (n=76)	42.3% (n=87)	48.2% (n=99)
Delaware (n=28)	33.6% (n=9)	72.3% (n=20)	13.3% (n=4)	100% (n=28)	100% (n=28)	--	53.9% (n=15)	83.8% (n=24)	3.5% (n=1)	4.6% (n=1)	--	95.4% (n=27)	50.8% (n=13)	43.0% (n=11)	39.1% (n=10)
Florida (n=450)	84.3% (n=377)	90.6% (n=405)	5.8% (n=26)	99.5% (n=448)	100% (n=450)	--	69.2% (n=308)	76.3% (n=340)	19.0% (n=85)	4.1% (n=17)	1.8% (n=7)	92.8% (n=379)	52.8% (n=216)	51.5% (n=210)	43.2% (n=177)
Georgia (n=344)	60.6% (n=207)	61.8% (n=211)	27.4% (n=94)	94.4% (n=325)	98.4% (n=339)	--	41.0% (n=137)	50.9% (n=170)	42.5% (n=142)	11.7% (n=37)	8.0% (n=24)	83.3% (n=267)	36.4% (n=122)	33.5% (n=112)	53.3% (n=179)
Hawaii (n=47)	28.3% (n=13)	71.7% (n=33)	17.4% (n=8)	100% (n=47)	100% (n=47)	--	23.4% (n=11)	95.7% (n=45)	--	--	--	100% (n=44)	21.7% (n=10)	13.0% (n=6)	76.1% (n=35)
Idaho (n=123)	24.0% (n=29)	12.8% (n=15)	70.7% (n=84)	100% (n=123)	100% (n=123)	--	30.0% (n=37)	32.9% (n=41)	61.3% (n=75)	4.3% (n=5)	6.0% (n=7)	90.0% (n=112)	29.7% (n=36)	38.7% (n=47)	45.0% (n=54)
Illinois (n=708)	44.7% (n=310)	38.8% (n=269)	40.5% (n=281)	97.2% (n=688)	95.3% (n=675)	*	31.8% (n=223)	40.6% (n=284)	53.4% (n=374)	6.5% (n=45)	*	93.0% (n=632)	35.0% (n=240)	17.7% (n=121)	60.1% (n=412)
Indiana (n=383)	34.2% (n=130)	48.5% (n=184)	41.7% (n=157)	96.6% (n=370)	95.8% (n=367)	1.3% (n=5)	32.9% (n=123)	41.9% (n=156)	55.7% (n=207)	19.5% (n=72)	2.9% (n=9)	79.7% (n=294)	54.3% (n=202)	44.7% (n=166)	37.6% (n=140)
Iowa (n=488)	27.4% (n=126)	24.9% (n=114)	60.1% (n=276)	98.6% (n=481)	99.3% (n=484)	*	19.6% (n=93)	27.6% (n=131)	68.1% (n=324)	8.9% (n=41)	*	91.1% (n=425)	38.0% (n=181)	12.3% (n=59)	59.1% (n=282)

Figure 93 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Digital reference/ Virtual reference			Licensed databases			E-books			Web/business conferencing			Online instructional courses/tutorials		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Kansas (n=356)	33.5% (n=117)	32.3% (n=113)	52.2% (n=183)	99.5% (n=534)	98.9% (n=352)	*	39.9% (n=140)	49.3% (n=172)	38.4% (n=135)	10.6% (n=37)	6.9% (n=22)	87.5% (n=301)	41.1% (n=144)	33.5% (n=117)	44.6% (n=156)
Kentucky (n=171)	62.6% (n=101)	64.0% (n=103)	13.6% (n=22)	95.7% (n=164)	98.6% (n=169)	--	47.4% (n=77)	53.4% (n=87)	34.4% (n=56)	12.7% (n=19)	3.5% (n=5)	85.7% (n=131)	48.4% (n=77)	39.8% (n=63)	37.4% (n=59)
Louisiana (n=283)	63.2% (n=173)	68.8% (n=189)	25.0% (n=69)	95.6% (n=271)	98.9% (n=280)	--	44.0% (n=124)	55.8% (n=157)	40.9% (n=115)	13.1% (n=37)	4.3% (n=11)	86.9% (n=244)	52.5% (n=146)	54.4% (n=152)	35.6% (n=99)
Maryland (n=166)	83.3% (n=138)	100% (n=165)	--	100% (n=166)	97.1% (n=161)	--	88.3% (n=144)	98.1% (n=160)	--	6.6% (n=10)	3.5% (n=5)	90.1% (n=130)	78.8% (n=115)	77.0% (n=112)	19.0% (n=28)
Massachusetts (n=415)	37.6% (n=148)	60.9% (n=239)	31.6% (n=124)	94.2% (n=391)	97.7% (n=405)	--	57.0% (n=230)	84.0% (n=340)	7.5% (n=30)	7.3% (n=28)	1.6% (n=6)	91.9% (n=355)	30.8% (n=122)	24.9% (n=99)	62.8% (n=249)
Michigan (n=488)	29.6% (n=143)	31.1% (n=150)	59.0% (n=285)	100% (n=488)	99.4% (n=485)	--	50.3% (n=248)	63.7% (n=314)	33.8% (n=167)	10.0% (n=47)	1.6% (n=7)	89.5% (n=424)	49.8% (n=233)	48.8% (n=229)	37.2% (n=175)
Minnesota (n=326)	66.7% (n=218)	72.8% (n=238)	23.7% (n=77)	100% (n=326)	100% (n=340)	--	70.4% (n=224)	82.0% (n=261)	15.7% (n=50)	12.9% (n=42)	2.3% (n=7)	87.1% (n=282)	46.3% (n=150)	33.7% (n=109)	53.2% (n=172)
Mississippi (n=223)	50.1% (n=109)	52.9% (n=116)	37.5% (n=82)	99.5% (n=221)	100% (n=222)	--	18.9% (n=41)	24.0% (n=52)	75.0% (n=161)	10.1% (n=22)	2.2% (n=4)	89.9% (n=193)	71.1% (n=153)	64.0% (n=138)	18.8% (n=41)
Missouri (n=340)	53.2% (n=174)	48.1% (n=158)	39.0% (n=128)	98.8% (n=336)	100% (n=340)	--	42.5% (n=143)	41.9% (n=141)	52.3% (n=176)	8.0% (n=26)	5.5% (n=17)	92.0% (n=301)	60.9% (n=202)	42.2% (n=140)	31.3% (n=104)
Montana (n=94)	42.7% (n=39)	44.0% (n=40)	40.0% (n=36)	100% (n=94)	100% (n=94)	--	42.5% (n=38)	63.0% (n=56)	31.5% (n=28)	12.3% (n=10)	1.8% (n=1)	86.2% (n=68)	33.8% (n=28)	19.1% (n=16)	57.4% (n=47)
Nebraska (n=266)	33.8% (n=88)	23.5% (n=62)	53.4% (n=140)	99.1% (n=264)	100% (n=266)	--	23.4% (n=62)	28.8% (n=76)	64.8% (n=171)	10.5% (n=26)	1.1% (n=2)	88.5% (n=221)	45.7% (n=118)	13.1% (n=34)	50.6% (n=131)
Nevada (n=77)	59.1% (n=44)	34.6% (n=26)	22.1% (n=17)	100% (n=77)	100% (n=77)	--	23.9% (n=18)	40.3% (n=31)	46.1% (n=35)	12.4% (n=7)	9.9% (n=5)	78.9% (n=47)	52.5% (n=31)	25.6% (n=15)	38.8% (n=23)
New Jersey (n=354)	45.6% (n=159)	60.3% (n=211)	28.6% (n=100)	92.9% (n=329)	93.8% (n=332)	--	41.0% (n=145)	70.1% (n=247)	19.8% (n=70)	2.5% (n=9)	1.5% (n=5)	95.4% (n=333)	35.9% (n=126)	36.8% (n=129)	47.5% (n=167)
New Mexico (n=107)	28.5% (n=28)	14.8% (n=15)	62.4% (n=61)	100% (n=107)	100% (n=107)	--	26.4% (n=28)	25.6% (n=27)	71.5% (n=76)	15.5% (n=16)	11.1% (n=11)	84.5% (n=89)	53.2% (n=58)	29.3% (n=32)	42.5% (n=46)
New York (n=958)	60.7% (n=567)	66.7% (n=622)	21.6% (n=202)	98.9% (n=947)	99.7% (n=955)	--	48.0% (n=450)	73.3% (n=687)	19.6% (n=184)	12.0% (n=108)	6.0% (n=49)	85.4% (n=769)	46.6% (n=436)	35.5% (n=331)	46.4% (n=433)
North Carolina (n=358)	40.6% (n=141)	68.4% (n=237)	28.3% (n=98)	100% (n=358)	100% (n=358)	--	63.0% (n=229)	86.4% (n=309)	8.0% (n=29)	4.3% (n=15)	4.8% (n=16)	91.9% (n=314)	49.5% (n=176)	62.1% (n=221)	29.9% (n=107)

Figure 93 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Digital reference/ Virtual reference			Licensed databases			E-books			Web/business conferencing			Online instructional courses/tutorials		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Ohio (n=649)	64.0% (n=412)	79.1% (n=510)	10.8% (n=70)	97.6% (n=633)	100% (n=649)	--	53.0% (n=341)	76.7% (n=494)	12.7% (n=82)	13.1% (n=82)	5.3% (n=29)	83.4% (n=520)	59.8% (n=382)	60.0% (n=384)	26.0% (n=166)
Oklahoma (n=189)	23.5% (n=43)	48.3% (n=88)	35.2% (n=64)	89.8% (n=170)	100% (n=189)	--	7.0% (n=13)	40.8% (n=75)	53.4% (n=99)	3.4% (n=6)	1.2% (n=2)	95.4% (n=178)	44.3% (n=82)	32.7% (n=60)	51.1% (n=94)
Oregon (n=191)	48.2% (n=92)	70.3% (n=134)	25.6% (n=49)	100% (n=191)	100% (n=191)	--	41.3% (n=78)	81.9% (n=155)	16.5% (n=31)	5.5% (n=10)	1.0% (n=2)	93.5% (n=165)	56.4% (n=105)	55.5% (n=103)	24.7% (n=46)
Rhode Island (n=68)	46.0% (n=31)	55.1% (n=38)	41.3% (n=28)	97.1% (n=66)	97.1% (n=66)	2.9% (n=2)	65.2% (n=42)	84.3% (n=54)	15.7% (n=10)	7.4% (n=5)	3.8% (n=2)	92.6% (n=61)	61.7% (n=41)	61.7% (n=41)	30.9% (n=20)
South Carolina (n=157)	23.9% (n=38)	30.5% (n=48)	54.9% (n=86)	89.5% (n=141)	92.1% (n=145)	--	26.4% (n=42)	29.6% (n=47)	59.5% (n=94)	1.5% (n=2)	--	92.5% (n=134)	56.2% (n=86)	47.6% (n=73)	18.3% (n=28)
South Dakota (n=138)	36.7% (n=49)	11.2% (n=15)	58.3% (n=78)	100% (n=138)	98.8% (n=136)	--	35.1% (n=47)	35.6% (n=48)	52.7% (n=71)	7.3% (n=10)	1.3% (n=2)	91.4% (n=123)	56.4% (n=77)	32.7% (n=45)	35.1% (n=48)
Tennessee (n=310)	43.7% (n=133)	39.6% (n=121)	40.3% (n=123)	100% (n=310)	100% (n=310)	--	53.0% (n=166)	73.2% (n=230)	10.6% (n=33)	4.2% (n=12)	2.3% (n=6)	93.6% (n=271)	46.5% (n=143)	32.8% (n=101)	44.9% (n=138)
Texas (n=784)	45.9% (n=344)	43.9% (n=329)	41.0% (n=307)	99.3% (n=778)	99.0% (n=776)	*	46.5% (n=343)	56.0% (n=413)	38.8% (n=286)	6.3% (n=45)	*	92.7% (n=670)	50.4% (n=381)	36.9% (n=279)	39.2% (n=297)
Utah (n=104)	31.9% (n=33)	47.4% (n=48)	40.3% (n=41)	98.0% (n=102)	100% (n=104)	--	65.6% (n=68)	93.9% (n=98)	--	26.7% (n=26)	2.9% (n=2)	73.3% (n=72)	52.4% (n=49)	53.1% (n=50)	33.8% (n=32)
Vermont (n=169)	55.0% (n=92)	39.2% (n=65)	40.5% (n=67)	98.1% (n=166)	98.8% (n=167)	--	25.1% (n=40)	25.7% (n=41)	65.3% (n=104)	12.7% (n=21)	2.8% (n=4)	87.3% (n=145)	28.6% (n=46)	14.0% (n=23)	66.6% (n=108)
Virginia (n=342)	48.2% (n=162)	66.7% (n=224)	24.8% (n=83)	99.6% (n=340)	98.8% (n=338)	--	63.7% (n=217)	66.5% (n=226)	26.4% (n=90)	5.4% (n=18)	--	94.6% (n=316)	63.0% (n=214)	45.2% (n=154)	31.4% (n=107)
Washington (n= 321)	67.3% (n=215)	66.9% (n=213)	21.9% (n=70)	100% (n=321)	100% (n=321)	--	29.8% (n=95)	75.0% (n=239)	23.2% (n=74)	8.5% (n=26)	--	91.5% (n=283)	32.7% (n=104)	20.1% (n=64)	67.3% (n=214)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	8.3% (n=5)	8.3% (n=5)	91.7% (n=51)	100% (n=53)	100% (n=53)	--
West Virginia (n=166)	49.5% (n=77)	40.7% (n=63)	38.0% (n=59)	100% (n=166)	100% (n=166)	--	41.7% (n=66)	39.2% (n=62)	47.7% (n=75)	3.9% (n=6)	1.0% (n=1)	95.1% (n=135)	51.6% (n=82)	43.5% (n=69)	32.5% (n=51)
Wisconsin (n=423)	51.4% (n=214)	69.7% (n=290)	16.8% (n=70)	98.0% (n=414)	98.8% (n=418)	--	69.9% (n=295)	80.2% (n=339)	5.5% (n=23)	6.9% (n=27)	2.0% (n=7)	91.8% (n=360)	39.6% (n=164)	33.9% (n=140)	50.0% (n=207)

Figure 93 (Part 1, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Digital reference/ Virtual reference			Licensed databases			E-books			Web/business conferencing			Online instructional courses/tutorials		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Wyoming (n=72)	56.9% (n=37)	60.0% (n=39)	27.7% (n=18)	95.8% (n=69)	91.7% (n=66)	--	47.0% (n=31)	51.5% (n=34)	45.5% (n=30)	22.7% (n=15)	11.3% (n=6)	69.7% (n=46)	62.0% (n=44)	47.9% (n=34)	32.4% (n=23)
<b>National</b>	48.0% (n=6,916)	55.1% (n=7,939)	33.1% (n=4,766)	98.1% (n=14,480)	98.6% (n=14,540)	*	32.8% (n=4,747)	45.7% (n=6,618)	60.9% (n=8,815)	8.9% (n=1,238)	41.9% (n=5,987)	89.6% (n=12,438)	42.8% (n=3,011)	48.4% (n=6,925)	40.7% (n=5,819)

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

Key \*=Insufficient data to report

-- = No data to report

Figure 93 (Part 2): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Homework Resources			Audio Content			Video Content			Digitized Special Collections			Library Social Networking			Online Book Clubs		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Alabama (n=215)	72.4% (n=156)	72.2% (n=156)	1.7% (n=4)	54.9% (n=120)	14.7% (n=32)	43.1% (n=94)	42.4% (n=93)	5.7% (n=13)	57.6% (n=126)	17.3% (n=37)	7.2% (n=15)	80.6% (n=170)	51.1% (n=112)	30.3% (n=66)	46.0% (n=101)	15.2% (n=33)	8.2% (n=18)	84.8% (n=183)
Alaska (n=91)	65.6% (n=61)	46.7% (n=43)	8.6% (n=8)	46.7% (n=43)	41.5% (n=38)	25.8% (n=24)	35.0% (n=32)	21.0% (n=19)	47.5% (n=43)	25.4% (n=22)	18.1% (n=16)	58.3% (n=51)	26.7% (n=24)	28.5% (n=25)	47.9% (n=43)	10.9% (n=10)	7.3% (n=6)	80.1% (n=70)
Arizona (n=189)	82.0% (n=155)	68.4% (n=129)	12.9% (n=25)	56.2% (n=106)	66.0% (n=125)	21.3% (n=40)	49.8% (n=93)	52.0% (n=97)	30.6% (n=57)	24.4% (n=45)	37.1% (n=69)	59.7% (n=111)	47.2% (n=88)	52.3% (n=97)	33.5% (n=62)	39.3% (n=73)	36.7% (n=68)	59.0% (n=109)
Arkansas (n=198)	56.2% (n=111)	42.4% (n=84)	33.4% (n=66)	46.3% (n=91)	30.8% (n=61)	39.4% (n=78)	41.8% (n=82)	8.0% (n=16)	52.0% (n=101)	14.4% (n=28)	10.9% (n=21)	78.6% (n=155)	27.5% (n=53)	21.0% (n=41)	61.8% (n=119)	5.9% (n=11)	5.9% (n=11)	89.3% (n=166)
California (n=873)	65.1% (n=567)	75.3% (n=656)	16.1% (n=141)	56.9% (n=497)	68.4% (n=597)	17.6% (n=153)	44.3% (n=383)	41.2% (n=356)	45.3% (n=392)	46.7% (n=405)	51.2% (n=444)	37.6% (n=326)	44.3% (n=384)	53.6% (n=464)	41.2% (n=357)	22.5% (n=192)	24.0% (n=205)	75.2% (n=644)
Colorado (n=208)	76.9% (n=156)	71.1% (n=145)	8.2% (n=17)	71.9% (n=146)	68.7% (n=139)	12.1% (n=25)	58.2% (n=117)	55.5% (n=112)	27.6% (n=56)	28.0% (n=55)	30.9% (n=60)	64.5% (n=126)	50.4% (n=103)	45.7% (n=93)	39.1% (n=80)	35.1% (n=71)	35.4% (n=72)	59.0% (n=121)
Connecticut (n=212)	67.2% (n=142)	75.7% (n=161)	10.9% (n=23)	66.9% (n=142)	75.8% (n=161)	9.7% (n=21)	49.0% (n=101)	50.3% (n=104)	37.0% (n=77)	34.4% (n=73)	31.9% (n=68)	55.8% (n=118)	40.6% (n=86)	47.7% (n=100)	41.3% (n=87)	28.9% (n=61)	36.4% (n=76)	61.2% (n=129)
Delaware (n=28)	73.6% (n=21)	70.1% (n=20)	3.5% (n=1)	82.7% (n=24)	57.4% (n=16)	3.5% (n=1)	56.3% (n=16)	25.4% (n=7)	39.1% (n=11)	35.6% (n=10)	47.2% (n=13)	39.1% (n=11)	49.3% (n=14)	31.0% (n=9)	46.1% (n=13)	15.1% (n=4)	18.7% (n=5)	76.8% (n=22)
Florida (n=450)	76.2% (n=343)	75.4% (n=340)	18.8% (n=85)	71.6% (n=316)	72.0% (n=318)	14.3% (n=63)	72.9% (n=314)	47.2% (n=203)	23.3% (n=100)	71.5% (n=300)	73.5% (n=309)	19.5% (n=82)	55.3% (n=244)	54.4% (n=240)	40.9% (n=180)	29.5% (n=124)	30.6% (n=128)	67.4% (n=283)
Georgia (n=344)	72.1% (n=241)	67.6% (n=226)	16.8% (n=56)	67.1% (n=225)	62.6% (n=210)	19.1% (n=64)	56.5% (n=183)	45.2% (n=146)	35.5% (n=115)	51.5% (n=171)	63.5% (n=210)	27.9% (n=92)	54.6% (n=176)	50.5% (n=163)	32.6% (n=105)	26.1% (n=84)	36.5% (n=117)	61.2% (n=191)
Hawaii (n=47)	66.0% (n=31)	72.3% (n=34)	21.3% (n=10)	40.0% (n=18)	88.9% (n=40)	4.4% (n=2)	10.9% (n=5)	15.2% (n=7)	80.4% (n=37)	19.6% (n=9)	17.4% (n=8)	78.3% (n=36)	17.4% (n=8)	8.7% (n=4)	80.4% (n=37)	9.1% (n=4)	4.5% (n=2)	88.6% (n=39)
Idaho (n=123)	57.1% (n=70)	53.2% (n=65)	15.3% (n=19)	69.0% (n=86)	38.2% (n=48)	21.7% (n=27)	32.1% (n=40)	14.6% (n=18)	56.2% (n=69)	21.5% (n=27)	18.6% (n=23)	72.8% (n=91)	44.8% (n=56)	22.6% (n=28)	48.7% (n=61)	8.9% (n=11)	10.4% (n=13)	82.3% (n=103)
Illinois (n=708)	77.5% (n=542)	44.5% (n=312)	13.3% (n=93)	65.1% (n=458)	39.2% (n=275)	23.4% (n=165)	49.7% (n=346)	21.5% (n=150)	45.5% (n=317)	30.4% (n=213)	23.4% (n=164)	63.1% (n=442)	54.8% (n=380)	38.3% (n=266)	36.3% (n=252)	22.8% (n=154)	19.6% (n=132)	71.0% (n=471)

Figure 93 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Homework Resources			Audio Content			Video Content			Digitized Special Collections			Library Social Networking			Online Book Clubs		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
Indiana (n=383)	74.9% (n=279)	63.2% (n=235)	11.8% (n=44)	68.2% (n=257)	43.9% (n=165)	25.0% (n=94)	52.3% (n=193)	34.2% (n=127)	38.7% (n=143)	45.1% (n=167)	41.7% (n=155)	46.4% (n=172)	53.3% (n=198)	45.8% (n=171)	38.4% (n=143)	39.4% (n=143)	43.9% (n=160)	51.4% (n=188)
Iowa (n=488)	65.2% (n=313)	34.8% (n=167)	20.7% (n=100)	60.4% (n=291)	48.5% (n=234)	21.8% (n=105)	38.7% (n=182)	7.1% (n=33)	59.1% (n=279)	17.6% (n=83)	10.7% (n=50)	78.6% (n=371)	46.2% (n=224)	24.2% (n=118)	43.4% (n=211)	9.9% (n=45)	9.6% (n=44)	88.8% (n=40)
Kansas (n=356)	72.7% (n=257)	56.1% (n=199)	10.6% (n=37)	72.1% (n=255)	55.1% (n=195)	12.2% (n=43)	61.9% (n=215)	35.8% (n=125)	27.4% (n=95)	31.1% (n=107)	27.2% (n=94)	62.0% (n=213)	57.6% (n=203)	30.9% (n=109)	32.4% (n=114)	15.5% (n=54)	12.7% (n=44)	76.5% (n=26)
Kentucky (n=171)	59.9% (n=96)	60.6% (n=97)	21.5% (n=34)	66.3% (n=112)	53.9% (n=91)	18.9% (n=32)	43.4% (n=68)	34.9% (n=55)	37.6% (n=59)	25.7% (n=39)	24.4% (n=37)	59.7% (n=91)	48.7% (n=80)	37.4% (n=61)	40.7% (n=67)	17.7% (n=27)	9.4% (n=14)	81.4% (n=12)
Louisiana (n=283)	87.6% (n=247)	90.3% (n=254)	4.8% (n=14)	63.8% (n=177)	58.3% (n=161)	28.7% (n=79)	51.6% (n=145)	47.3% (n=133)	42.4% (n=120)	43.6% (n=117)	37.3% (n=101)	48.0% (n=129)	45.9% (n=128)	39.5% (n=109)	47.5% (n=132)	37.5% (n=105)	41.3% (n=116)	53.9% (n=15)
Maryland (n=166)	100% (n=162)	96.1% (n=156)	--	86.5% (n=143)	82.4% (n=136)	--	75.1% (n=123)	59.7% (n=98)	19.4% (n=32)	52.2% (n=86)	55.7% (n=92)	41.4% (n=69)	76.4% (n=125)	83.9% (n=138)	10.3% (n=17)	47.6% (n=68)	50.9% (n=73)	43.6% (n=63)
Massachusetts (n=415)	70.4% (n=276)	64.8% (n=254)	16.8% (n=66)	62.4% (n=257)	80.5% (n=332)	7.7% (n=32)	42.6% (n=169)	44.4% (n=176)	43.5% (n=173)	34.9% (n=139)	38.4% (n=153)	50.4% (n=201)	40.1% (n=162)	53.5% (n=216)	35.7% (n=144)	6.6% (n=24)	16.3% (n=61)	82.0% (n=30)
Michigan (n=488)	73.2% (n=356)	66.6% (n=324)	12.4% (n=60)	67.1% (n=328)	56.9% (n=278)	23.7% (n=116)	51.4% (n=248)	27.6% (n=133)	45.0% (n=217)	37.7% (n=184)	31.6% (n=154)	55.5% (n=270)	58.6% (n=289)	46.3% (n=228)	35.0% (n=173)	14.5% (n=68)	13.3% (n=63)	82.8% (n=39)
Minnesota (n=326)	85.8% (n=278)	74.8% (n=242)	11.8% (n=38)	76.8% (n=251)	74.2% (n=242)	13.3% (n=43)	53.2% (n=174)	33.3% (n=109)	45.5% (n=149)	48.6% (n=159)	47.0% (n=153)	48.3% (n=158)	51.1% (n=167)	36.6% (n=120)	43.7% (n=143)	31.4% (n=102)	37/3% (n=121)	61.1% (n=19)
Mississippi (n=223)	86.4% (n=187)	70.5% (n=153)	8.1% (n=17)	68.1% (n=150)	37.8% (n=83)	30.4% (n=67)	45.1% (n=97)	24.7% (n=53)	47.2% (n=101)	23.4% (n=51)	14.0% (n=31)	75.6% (n=165)	47.3% (n=102)	41.2% (n=89)	40.2% (n=87)	27.1% (n=56)	30.4% (n=63)	66.0% (n=13)
Missouri (n=340)	85.5% (n=289)	61.4% (n=207)	6.8% (n=23)	62.2% (n=209)	40.2% (n=135)	31.4% (n=105)	51.9% (n=173)	33.1% (n=110)	41.1% (n=137)	45.6% (n=152)	35.0% (n=116)	51.2% (n=171)	50.4% (n=167)	40.9% (n=136)	43.5% (n=144)	16.8% (n=55)	12.4% (n=41)	80.6% (n=26)
Montana (n=94)	69.3% (n=63)	45.3% (n=41)	14.7% (n=13)	57.3% (n=52)	50.7% (n=46)	20.0% (n=18)	63.8% (n=53)	17.4% (n=15)	34.8% (n=29)	22.4% (n=18)	14.9% (n=12)	74.6% (n=61)	47.9% (n=41)	38.0% (n=33)	35.2% (n=30)	21.9% (n=17)	17.2% (n=13)	75.0% (n=58)
Nebraska (n=266)	60.0% (n=161)	23.2% (n=62)	32.9% (n=88)	66.5% (n=177)	26.7% (n=71)	22.6% (n=60)	44.4% (n=115)	5.3% (n=14)	51.9% (n=134)	28.5% (n=74)	21.0% (n=54)	66.0% (n=171)	34.6% (n=92)	18.4% (n=49)	58.1% (n=155)	16.6% (n=43)	11.1% (n=29)	79.7% (n=20)
Nevada (n=77)	74.2% (n=57)	68.4% (n=52)	4.5% (n=4)	60.0% (n=46)	59.3% (n=46)	20.3% (n=16)	34.7% (n=25)	29.2% (n=21)	42.2% (n=31)	34.0% (n=26)	27.1% (n=20)	61.4% (n=46)	33.3% (n=21)	42.2% (n=26)	43.0% (n=27)	2.4% (n=2)	26.0% (n=19)	59.5% (n=44)
New Jersey (n=354)	67.1% (n=234)	74.0% (n=258)	9.6% (n=34)	61.2% (n=211)	71.2% (n=246)	9.7% (n=34)	38.1% (n=133)	34.6% (n=121)	51.9% (n=179)	35.3% (n=122)	29.2% (n=101)	57.9% (n=200)	39.9% (n=139)	43.2% (n=151)	41.5% (n=145)	15.3% (n=54)	21.8% (n=76)	73.2% (n=25)
New Mexico (n=107)	79.1% (n=86)	37.5% (n=41)	12.5% (n=14)	66.3% (n=71)	26.7% (n=29)	30.7% (n=33)	58.3% (n=62)	18.3% (n=19)	39.7% (n=42)	8.0% (n=8)	5.1% (n=5)	86.9% (n=91)	42.1% (n=45)	22.3% (n=24)	55.9% (n=60)	22.0% (n=23)	18.0% (n=19)	77.0% (n=80)

Figure 93 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Homework Resources			Audio Content			Video Content			Digitized Special Collections			Library Social Networking			Online Book Clubs		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
New York (n=958)	63.8% (n=604)	56.0% (n=531)	21.2% (n=201)	71.2% (n=677)	76.2% (n=725)	5.9% (n=56)	59.0% (n=540)	46.0% (n=421)	32.1% (n=294)	48.9% (n=458)	46.1% (n=432)	43.9% (n=412)	60.8% (n=567)	57.8% (n=539)	27.5% (n=257)	35.1% (n=317)	36.5% (n=329)	58.6% (n=531)
North Carolina (n=358)	80.7% (n=284)	84.4% (n=297)	3.7% (n=13)	73.4% (n=264)	75.1% (n=270)	8.1% (n=29)	72.2% (n=259)	71.9% (n=258)	9.1% (n=33)	55.4% (n=195)	67.9% (n=240)	28.0% (n=99)	54.2% (n=191)	59.2% (n=208)	32.3% (n=114)	23.1% (n=78)	38.0% (n=129)	59.2% (n=208)
Ohio (n=649)	83.1% (n=533)	83.1% (n=533)	2.4% (n=16)	69.7% (n=445)	72.2% (n=461)	11.2% (n=71)	58.6% (n=371)	52.6% (n=333)	28.3% (n=179)	57.4% (n=362)	53.0% (n=334)	32.8% (n=207)	48.6% (n=302)	54.7% (n=340)	32.6% (n=202)	30.8% (n=186)	33.0% (n=199)	58.8% (n=351)
Oklahoma (n=189)	63.0% (n=120)	60.7% (n=116)	18.0% (n=34)	60.5% (n=112)	43.1% (n=80)	29.0% (n=54)	54.2% (n=99)	27.2% (n=50)	43.5% (n=79)	31.5% (n=58)	26.9% (n=50)	65.0% (n=120)	48.3% (n=88)	33.0% (n=60)	48.2% (n=88)	5.9% (n=11)	15.3% (n=28)	81.2% (n=141)
Oregon (n=191)	73.5% (n=141)	71.9% (n=138)	10.6% (n=20)	51.6% (n=99)	79.1% (n=152)	9.4% (n=18)	49.1% (n=94)	75.9% (n=145)	13.3% (n=25)	20.4% (n=38)	28.3% (n=53)	66.7% (n=125)	28.2% (n=53)	38.6% (n=73)	53.5% (n=101)	9.1% (n=16)	30.1% (n=53)	68.0% (n=121)
Rhode Island (n=68)	86.4% (n=59)	89.9% (n=61)	6.5% (n=4)	89.6% (n=59)	93.3% (n=61)	--	66.8% (n=42)	46.5% (n=29)	30.0% (n=19)	21.7% (n=15)	27.2% (n=19)	72.8% (n=50)	51.4% (n=35)	43.2% (n=29)	42.1% (n=29)	7.4% (n=5)	3.7% (n=2)	92.6% (n=61)
South Carolina (n=157)	81.4% (n=126)	64.0% (n=99)	4.7% (n=7)	65.7% (n=102)	43.9% (n=68)	22.6% (n=35)	67.5% (n=104)	19.0% (n=29)	32.5% (n=50)	40.9% (n=63)	9.3% (n=14)	57.9% (n=89)	42.9% (n=66)	32.1% (n=49)	38.4% (n=59)	39.2% (n=60)	24.5% (n=38)	42.0% (n=64)
South Dakota (n=138)	72.8% (n=102)	37.8% (n=53)	16.5% (n=23)	58.6% (n=82)	23.7% (n=33)	22.4% (n=31)	58.6% (n=82)	18.9% (n=26)	36.6% (n=51)	25.1% (n=35)	13.2% (n=18)	74.9% (n=103)	41.4% (n=58)	28.4% (n=40)	53.9% (n=75)	22.8% (n=30)	15.2% (n=20)	75.9% (n=99)
Tennessee (n=310)	73.4% (n=277)	47.3% (n=146)	15.6% (n=48)	69.4% (n=207)	50.0% (n=149)	12.3% (n=37)	56.2% (n=168)	20.8% (n=62)	37.8% (n=113)	25.9% (n=76)	23.7% (n=70)	64.8% (n=191)	51.9% (n=156)	33.6% (n=101)	37.2% (n=112)	21.8% (n=62)	22.3% (n=63)	70.2% (n=191)
Texas (n=784)	67.9% (n=526)	61.8% (n=478)	17.1% (n=133)	65.7% (n=488)	39.7% (n=295)	22.2% (n=165)	46.6% (n=345)	25.2% (n=186)	44.1% (n=327)	30.4% (n=223)	26.4% (n=194)	62.9% (n=461)	40.6% (n=305)	38.8% (n=291)	44.4% (n=333)	23.8% (n=175)	27.1% (n=199)	67.5% (n=491)
Utah (n=104)	75.1% (n=77)	89.8% (n=92)	3.9% (n=4)	74.8% (n=78)	83.9% (n=87)	2.0% (n=2)	64.3% (n=66)	74.4% (n=76)	19.6% (n=20)	37.1% (n=36)	41.4% (n=41)	54.5% (n=53)	45.5% (n=45)	39.4% (n=39)	37.3% (n=37)	24.5% (n=22)	12.3% (n=11)	73.4% (n=67)
Vermont (n=169)	67.3% (n=111)	36.5% (n=61)	20.0% (n=33)	78.0% (n=130)	52.8% (n=88)	7.2% (n=12)	57.0% (n=95)	11.7% (n=20)	40.8% (n=68)	24.1% (n=40)	8.6% (n=14)	73.6% (n=122)	42.3% (n=71)	25.4% (n=43)	44.2% (n=74)	6.3% (n=11)	3.5% (n=6)	90.3% (n=151)
Virginia (n=342)	79.6% (n=268)	78.1% (n=263)	11.1% (n=38)	68.4% (n=234)	58.0% (n=198)	25.2% (n=86)	51.7% (n=175)	32.1% (n=109)	44.7% (n=152)	48.0% (n=163)	44.8% (n=152)	43.4% (n=147)	60.9% (n=202)	61.6% (n=204)	27.6% (n=91)	25.0% (n=85)	32.3% (n=109)	60.9% (n=201)
Washington (n=321)	91.4% (n=292)	83.9% (n=268)	4.4% (n=14)	45.8% (n=145)	76.6% (n=243)	10.7% (n=34)	40.4% (n=126)	23.9% (n=75)	59.6% (n=186)	42.4% (n=135)	32.3% (n=103)	57.0% (n=182)	64.1% (n=206)	54.1% (n=174)	24.6% (n=79)	24.3% (n=78)	27.1% (n=86)	72.9% (n=231)
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	29.2% (n=16)	100% (n=55)	--	95.8% (n=53)	91.7% (n=51)	4.2% (n=2)	95.7% (n=51)	91.3% (n=48)	4.3% (n=2)	100% (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	--	--	100% (n=55)

Figure 93 (Part 2, continued): Public Library Services Available to Users, by State

State	Homework Resources			Audio Content			Video Content			Digitized Special Collections			Library Social Networking			Online Book Clubs		
	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer	Offer in Library	Offer outside Library	Does not offer
West Virginia (n=166)	64.6% (n=105)	56.9% (n=92)	19.8% (n=32)	66.9% (n=110)	48.3% (n=80)	20.4% (n=34)	53.3% (n=83)	18.3% (n=29)	43.2% (n=68)	11.6% (n=18)	7.1% (n=11)	83.8% (n=130)	42.1% (n=69)	20.1% (n=33)	51.9% (n=86)	15.7% (n=22)	11.6% (n=16)	76.4% (n=106)
Wisconsin (n=423)	72.6% (n=300)	64.2% (n=266)	15.8% (n=65)	77.4% (n=323)	72.8% (n=304)	4.4% (n=18)	61.6% (n=252)	54.3% (n=222)	22.9% (n=94)	38.3% (n=153)	40.0% (n=160)	51.3% (n=206)	48.2% (n=193)	48.5% (n=194)	36.4% (n=146)	23.0% (n=92)	26.6% (n=106)	68.1% (n=277)
Wyoming (n=72)	72.2% (n=52)	63.9% (n=46)	18.1% (n=13)	81.9% (n=59)	73.6% (n=53)	1.4% (n=1)	67.6% (n=48)	49.3% (n=35)	21.1% (n=15)	35.4% (n=23)	47.7% (n=31)	47.7% (n=31)	40.9% (n=27)	47.0% (n=31)	43.9% (n=29)	14.1% (n=9)	18.8% (n=12)	79.7% (n=51)
<b>National</b>	74.0% (n=10,779)	66.2% (n=9,646)	13.0% (n=1,894)	65.6% (n=9,557)	59.5% (n=8,672)	17.2% (n=2,508)	52.4% (n=7,515)	36.8% (n=5,278)	38.7% (n=5,557)	37.9% (n=5,411)	35.8% (n=5,119)	53.9% (n=7,698)	48.2% (n=6,936)	43.7% (n=6,292)	39.9% (n=5,749)	23.1% (n=3,230)	25.3% (n=3,540)	69.4% (n=9,711)

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

Key -- = No data to report

Figure 93 (Parts 1 and 2) report the availability of services for remote or in-library use. 100 percent of Washington, DC libraries offer digital/virtual reference in-library and remote, with 100 percent of Maryland libraries also offering remote access to this service. Washington, DC and Maryland also have the highest percentage of libraries offering e-books in-library (100 percent and 88.3 percent, respectively) and remotely (100 percent and 98.1 percent, respectively); online instructional courses/tutorials in-library (100 percent and 78.8 percent, respectively) and remotely (100 percent and 77.0 percent, respectively); homework help in-library (both 100 percent) and remotely (100 percent and 96.1 percent, respectively); and library social networking in-library (100 percent and 76.4 percent, respectively) and remotely (100 percent and 83.9 percent). Licensed databases are available for use in the library and remotely at 100 percent of libraries in Delaware; Hawaii; Idaho; Minnesota; Montana; Nevada; New Mexico; North Carolina; Oregon; Tennessee; Washington; Washington, DC and West Virginia. Web/business conferencing is the least offered service; Alabama (61.2 percent) has the highest percentage of libraries providing it in the library and Wyoming (11.3 percent) has the highest percentage outside of the library. The highest percentages of libraries offering audio content in-library are in Rhode Island (89.6 percent) and remotely in Washington, DC (100 percent). Again, Washington, DC has the highest percentage of libraries offering video content in-library (95.7 percent) and remotely (91.3 percent), followed by Florida (71.5 percent and 73.5 percent, respectively). Maryland has the highest percentage of libraries offer online book clubs in-library (47.6 percent) and remotely (50.9 percent), followed by Indiana (39.4 percent and 43.9 percent, respectively). 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.

Figure 94: 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. e-readers, netbooks)	
	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer
Alabama (n=215)	89.0% (n=187)	11.0% (n=23)	54.3% (n=114)	45.7% (n=96)	69.6% (n=146)	30.4% (n=64)	46.5% (n=98)	53.5% (n=113)	21.2% (n=36)	78.8% (n=135)
Alaska (n=91)	75.0% (n=69)	13.8% (n=13)	68.2% (n=62)	19.2% (n=18)	63.0% (n=57)	37.0% (n=34)	46.4% (n=43)	52.5% (n=48)	27.5% (n=18)	72.5% (n=46)
Arizona (n=189)	97.8% (n=185)	1.1% (n=2)	49.0% (n=92)	51.0% (n=95)	46.9% (n=89)	51.6% (n=98)	61.9% (n=116)	38.1% (n=71)	32.8% (n=44)	67.2% (n=90)
Arkansas (n=198)	82.8% (n=164)	17.2% (n=34)	64.2% (n=126)	35.8% (n=70)	31.5% (n=61)	68.5% (n=133)	45.7% (n=91)	52.6% (n=104)	31.2% (n=45)	68.8% (n=100)
California (n=873)	94.3% (n=818)	5.7% (n=49)	43.3% (n=372)	56.7% (n=487)	29.4% (n=255)	68.5% (n=595)	69.0% (n=600)	28.9% (n=252)	23.9% (n=196)	76.1% (n=625)
Colorado (n=208)	97.8% (n=203)	2.2% (n=5)	67.0% (n=136)	33.8% (n=69)	53.9% (n=110)	46.1% (n=94)	71.0% (n=144)	29.0% (n=59)	34.3% (n=52)	65.7% (n=99)
Connecticut (n=212)	93.7% (n=191)	6.3% (n=13)	56.5% (n=115)	43.5% (n=89)	54.1% (n=110)	45.9% (n=94)	64.9% (n=129)	35.1% (n=69)	42.5% (n=75)	57.5% (n=101)
Delaware (n=28)	100% (n=28)	--	81.7% (n=23)	18.3% (n=5)	65.5% (n=19)	34.5% (n=10)	45.8% (n=13)	54.2% (n=15)	19.8% (n=5)	80.2% (n=20)
Florida (n=450)	97.2% (n=436)	2.8% (n=13)	66.2% (n=293)	33.8% (n=150)	51.0% (n=225)	48.6% (n=214)	84.9% (n=377)	15.1% (n=67)	16.8% (n=67)	83.2% (n=332)
Georgia (n=344)	100% (n=329)	--	71.6% (n=233)	28.4% (n=92)	49.9% (n=163)	50.1% (n=164)	71.4% (n=231)	28.6% (n=93)	44.9% (n=99)	55.1% (n=122)
Hawaii (n=47)	95.7% (n=45)	4.3% (n=2)	51.1% (n=23)	48.9% (n=22)	8.7% (n=4)	91.3% (n=42)	2.2% (n=1)	97.8% (n=45)	9.8% (n=4)	90.2% (n=37)
Idaho (n=123)	98.6% (n=121)	1.4% (n=2)	76.0% (n=93)	24.0% (n=30)	59.1% (n=72)	40.9% (n=50)	73.8% (n=91)	26.2% (n=32)	25.2% (n=27)	74.8% (n=79)
Illinois (n=708)	89.3% (n=627)	10.7% (n=75)	63.7% (n=438)	36.3% (n=250)	52.7% (n=367)	47.3% (n=330)	63.4% (n=437)	36.6% (n=252)	29.2% (n=153)	70.8% (n=372)
Indiana (n=383)	96.2% (n=371)	3.8% (n=15)	70.3% (n=266)	29.7% (n=112)	53.8% (n=203)	46.6% (n=176)	77.6% (n=298)	22.0% (n=85)	24.4% (n=74)	76.1% (n=232)
Iowa (n=488)	89.5% (n=434)	10.5% (n=51)	78.4% (n=377)	21.6% (n=104)	65.0% (n=307)	33.5% (n=158)	70.8% (n=339)	29.2% (n=140)	29.6% (n=127)	70.4% (n=303)
Kansas (n=356)	90.6% (n=324)	9.4% (n=34)	81.7% (n=292)	18.3% (n=65)	63.9% (n=227)	36.1% (n=129)	65.9% (n=233)	34.1% (n=121)	34.8% (n=115)	65.2% (n=216)
Kentucky (n=171)	95.7% (n=162)	4.3% (n=7)	74.6% (n=126)	25.4% (n=43)	69.3% (n=115)	30.7% (n=51)	61.6% (n=102)	38.4% (n=64)	43.6% (n=60)	56.4% (n=77)
Louisiana (n=283)	94.1% (n=266)	5.9% (n=17)	58.4% (n=165)	41.6% (n=118)	50.6% (n=142)	49.4% (n=138)	67.7% (n=191)	32.3% (n=91)	33.5% (n=68)	66.5% (n=135)
Maryland (n=166)	94.5% (n=156)	5.5% (n=9)	41.1% (n=68)	58.9% (n=98)	43.0% (n=71)	55.0% (n=91)	80.8% (n=132)	19.2% (n=31)	11.0% (n=9)	89.0% (n=75)
Massachusetts (n=415)	93.8% (n=3389)	6.2% (n=26)	63.1% (n=257)	35.9% (n=146)	58.2% (n=237)	40.8% (n=166)	70.9% (n=291)	28.1% (n=115)	32.9% (n=112)	67.1% (n=229)
Michigan (n=488)	95.4% (n=477)	4.6% (n=23)	77.6% (n=384)	22.4% (n=111)	60.4% (n=297)	39.6% (n=195)	75.6% (n=368)	24.4% (n=120)	47.2% (n=212)	52.8% (n=237)
Minnesota (n=326)	97.6% (n=317)	2.4% (n=8)	74.5% (n=241)	25.5% (n=83)	81.4% (n=253)	18.6% (n=58)	82.6% (n=266)	17.4% (n=56)	20.7% (n=51)	79.3% (n=195)

**Figure 94 (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. e-readers, netbooks)	
	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer
Mississippi (n=223)	85.0% (n=188)	15.0% (n=33)	60.0% (n=133)	40.0% (n=89)	61.3% (n=135)	38.7% (n=85)	52.7% (n=114)	47.3% (n=102)	21.5% (n=38)	78.5% (n=138)
Missouri (n=340)	86.1% (n=288)	13.9% (n=46)	56.8% (n=187)	42.5% (n=140)	46.1% (n=150)	53.9% (n=176)	77.1% (n=257)	47.3% (n=102)	25.2% (n=65)	74.8% (n=193)
Montana (n=94)	90.8% (n=83)	9.2% (n=9)	94.7% (n=86)	5.3% (n=5)	68.5% (n=61)	31.5% (n=28)	80.3% (n=69)	19.7% (n=17)	27.9% (n=21)	72.1% (n=53)
Nebraska (n=266)	87.5% (n=241)	12.5% (n=34)	81.0% (n=216)	19.0% (n=51)	65.6% (n=175)	34.4% (n=92)	66.8% (n=180)	32.3% (n=87)	22.8% (n=53)	77.2% (n=179)
Nevada (n=77)	97.7% (n=75)	2.3% (n=8)	38.1% (n=29)	61.9% (n=47)	34.6% (n=26)	65.4% (n=49)	32.0% (n=24)	53.1% (n=40)	18.9% (n=11)	81.1% (n=49)
New Jersey (n=354)	90.2% (n=318)	9.8% (n=35)	55.3% (n=190)	44.7% (n=153)	48.6% (n=169)	51.1% (n=178)	70.7% (n=249)	29.3% (n=103)	26.6% (n=58)	73.4% (n=159)
New Mexico (n=107)	88.4% (n=98)	11.6% (n=13)	75.7% (n=82)	24.3% (n=26)	48.9% (n=54)	51.1% (n=57)	64.5% (n=71)	35.5% (n=39)	26.9% (n=27)	73.1% (n=74)
New York (n=958)	95.7% (n=916)	4.3% (n=41)	71.6% (n=678)	28.4% (n=269)	40.1% (n=374)	59.9% (n=559)	71.1% (n=658)	28.9% (n=268)	21.5% (n=166)	78.5% (n=606)
North Carolina (n=358)	90.7% (n=326)	9.3% (n=33)	61.6% (n=222)	38.4% (n=138)	60.3% (n=215)	39.7% (n=142)	55.6% (n=201)	44.4% (n=160)	15.1% (n=40)	84.9% (n=227)
Ohio (n=649)	96.6% (n=621)	3.4% (n=22)	75.5% (n=475)	24.5% (n=154)	55.9% (n=349)	44.1% (n=275)	79.7% (n=510)	19.1% (n=122)	20.1% (n=109)	79.9% (n=434)
Oklahoma (n=189)	89.8% (n=170)	10.2% (n=20)	73.9% (n=140)	25.0% (n=47)	74.2% (n=142)	24.7% (n=47)	66.0% (n=125)	34.0% (n=64)	24.6% (n=30)	75.4% (n=92)
Oregon (n=191)	92.3% (n=177)	7.7% (n=15)	80.9% (n=153)	19.1% (n=36)	60.7% (n=115)	39.3% (n=74)	78.4% (n=147)	21.6% (n=41)	19.6% (n=30)	80.4% (n=121)
Rhode Island (n=68)	89.3% (n=61)	10.7% (n=7)	75.7% (n=52)	24.3% (n=17)	52.5% (n=36)	47.5% (n=32)	83.4% (n=57)	16.6% (n=11)	35.2% (n=19)	64.8% (n=35)
South Carolina (n=157)	100% (n=155)	--	61.5% (n=93)	38.5% (n=58)	35.4% (n=54)	64.6% (n=99)	73.5% (n=113)	26.5% (n=41)	17.0% (n=8)	83.0% (n=37)
South Dakota (n=138)	95.3% (n=133)	4.7% (n=7)	72.8% (n=102)	27.2% (n=38)	44.4% (n=62)	55.6% (n=78)	66.9% (n=93)	33.1% (n=46)	33.9% (n=39)	66.1% (n=76)
Tennessee (n=310)	91.1% (n=288)	8.9% (n=28)	52.5% (n=159)	47.5% (n=144)	39.8% (n=122)	60.2% (n=184)	55.6% (n=173)	44.4% (n=138)	28.3% (n=68)	71.7% (n=171)
Texas (n=784)	92.6% (n=716)	7.4% (n=58)	62.8% (n=479)	36.0% (n=275)	62.1% (n=476)	37.5% (n=288)	64.2% (n=488)	34.3% (n=261)	21.7% (n=128)	78.3% (n=461)
Utah (n=104)	98.0% (n=102)	2.0% (n=2)	82.0% (n=85)	18.0% (n=19)	47.1% (n=49)	52.9% (n=55)	60.5% (n=63)	39.5% (n=41)	25.0% (n=21)	75.0% (n=62)
Vermont (n=169)	90.8% (n=156)	9.2% (n=16)	85.3% (n=143)	14.7% (n=25)	75.8% (n=127)	24.2% (n=41)	68.0% (n=115)	31.1% (n=53)	36.9% (n=48)	63.1% (n=83)
Virginia (n=342)	98.4% (n=336)	1.6% (n=6)	72.9% (n=244)	27.1% (n=91)	78.8% (n=270)	21.1% (n=73)	63.1% (n=208)	33.6% (n=111)	20.8% (n=43)	79.2% (n=163)
Washington (n= 321)	98.8% (n=315)	1.2% (n=4)	67.5% (n=213)	32.5% (n=102)	73.5% (n=229)	26.5% (n=82)	89.4% (n=241)	10.6% (n=29)	36.6% (n=62)	63.4% (n=108)

**Figure 94 (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. e-readers, netbooks)	
	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer	Offers	Does not offer
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	--	100% (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=166)	94.1% (n=158)	5.9% (n=10)	70.3% (n=116)	29.7% (n=49)	66.9% (n=110)	33.1% (n=55)	65.9% (n=108)	34.1% (n=56)	54.1% (n=79)	45.9% (n=67)
Wisconsin (n=423)	95.7% (n=405)	4.3% (n=18)	72.9% (n=297)	26.7% (n=109)	58.1% (n=237)	41.5% (n=170)	80.3% (n=328)	19.7% (n=80)	49.3% (n=164)	50.7% (n=169)
Wyoming (n=72)	98.6% (n=70)	--	98.5% (n=66)	--	77.6% (n=52)	20.9% (n=14)	80.3% (n=53)	16.7% (n=11)	36.6% (n=15)	63.4% (n=26)
<b>National</b>	93.4% (n=13,736)	6.5% (n=950)	66.6% (n=9,664)	33.1% (n=4,807)	55.1% (n=7,980)	44.6% (n=6,462)	68.7% (n=9,926)	30.6% (n=4,425)	27.8% (n=8,257)	72.2% (n=8,283)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive										
<b>Key</b> -- = No data to report										

Figure 94 presents the peripherals made available at public libraries. Washington, DC offers use of all five peripherals at 100 percent of branches. Use of USBs and other portable devices is also allowed at 100 percent of libraries in Delaware, Georgia and South Carolina. Wyoming (98.5 percent) follows Washington, DC in the highest percentage of libraries allowing users to connect digital cameras and manipulate content. Following Washington, DC in allowing patrons to burn CDs and DVDs is Minnesota (81.4 percent). The state of Washington (89.4 percent) follows in access to recreational gaming and West Virginia (54.1 percent) follows in providing access to mobile devices.

Figure 95: 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=215)	84.2% (n=181)	93.6% (n=201)	64.0% (n=137)	83.5% (n=179)	17.9% (n=39)	7.1% (n=15)	7.9% (n=17)	18.1% (n=39)	9.5% (n=20)	29.3% (n=63)	--
Alaska (n=80)	63.8% (n=51)	82.1% (n=65)	35.9% (n=29)	49.8% (n=40)	12.0% (n=10)	4.0% (n=3)	4.0% (n=3)	16.0% (n=13)	9.4% (n=7)	16.0% (n=13)	8.0% (n=6)
Arizona (n=162)	68.4% (n=111)	75.1% (n=121)	48.5% (n=78)	51.9% (n=84)	27.3% (n=44)	22.5% (n=36)	27.1% (n=44)	37.4% (n=61)	22.5% (n=34)	31.1% (n=50)	1.3% (n=2)
Arkansas (n=179)	70.9% (n=127)	92.0% (n=165)	48.1% (n=86)	64.8% (n=116)	3.0% (n=5)	1.0% (n=2)	9.1% (n=16)	19.7% (n=35)	3.1% (n=5)	13.8% (n=25)	1.9% (n=3)
California (n=795)	81.8% (n=649)	91.6% (n=727)	60.7% (n=482)	67.4% (n=536)	18.1% (n=144)	12.3% (n=98)	13.0% (n=104)	25.6% (n=204)	6.1% (n=48)	17.4% (n=138)	1.7% (n=13)
Colorado (n=199)	75.5% (n=150)	78.1% (n=155)	47.7% (n=94)	65.1% (n=130)	20.5% (n=41)	9.7% (n=19)	11.3% (n=23)	24.4% (n=49)	2.8% (n=5)	11.6% (n=23)	1.8% (n=4)
Connecticut (n=201)	68.7% (n=138)	89.2% (n=180)	42.0% (n=85)	54.1% (n=109)	13.7% (n=28)	4.7% (n=9)	7.3% (n=15)	15.8% (n=32)	7.4% (n=15)	14.8% (n=30)	5.9% (n=12)
Delaware (n=27)	81.9% (n=22)	100% (n=27)	57.9% (n=16)	67.5% (n=18)	18.1% (n=5)	4.8% (n=1)	9.6% (n=3)	42.1% (n=11)	14.0% (n=4)	22.9% (n=6)	--
Florida (n=448)	72.1% (n=323)	97.3% (n=436)	48.4% (n=217)	65.5% (n=293)	35.4% (n=159)	13.4% (n=60)	18.7% (n=84)	50.6% (n=227)	21.2% (n=91)	44.0% (n=197)	4.7% (n=21)
Georgia (n=300)	70.1% (n=210)	92.3% (n=277)	39.2% (n=118)	53.8% (n=162)	25.1% (n=75)	2.9% (n=9)	2.9% (n=9)	20.1% (n=60)	2.1% (n=6)	9.4% (n=28)	*

Figure 95 (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=47)	74.5% (n=35)	89.4% (n=42)	31.9% (n=15)	53.2% (n=25)	12.8% (n=14)	6.4% (n=3)	10.6% (n=5)	14.9% (n=7)	2.1% (n=1)	12.8% (n=6)	2.1% (n=1)
Idaho (n=119)	88.0% (n=105)	91.0% (n=109)	46.6% (n=56)	74.5% (n=89)	12.0% (n=14)	1.5% (n=2)	3.8% (n=5)	38.3% (n=46)	3.1% (n=4)	9.8% (n=12)	1.5% (n=2)
Illinois (n=686)	85.1% (n=583)	88.6% (n=607)	50.0% (n=343)	72.6% (n=498)	15.5% (n=107)	4.5% (n=31)	4.9% (n=34)	22.0% (n=151)	8.2% (n=54)	20.5% (n=141)	5.9% (n=40)
Indiana (n=383)	87.7% (n=335)	92.6% (n=353)	48.2% (n=184)	78.2% (n=300)	45.7% (n=175)	17.5% (n=67)	6.1% (n=24)	34.3% (n=131)	5.8% (n=19)	35.7% (n=137)	2.2% (n=8)
Iowa (n=423)	83.1% (n=352)	86.6% (n=366)	34.8% (n=147)	70.2% (n=297)	13.2% (n=56)	5.4% (n=23)	3.3% (n=5)	22.3% (n=95)	5.6% (n=22)	18.6% (n=79)	1.2% (n=5)
Kansas (n=344)	90.2% (n=309)	87.4% (n=300)	41.3% (n=142)	74.1% (n=254)	20.1% (n=69)	2.2% (n=8)	3.8% (n=13)	27.6% (n=95)	6.3% (n=20)	24.4% (n=84)	6.9% (n=24)
Kentucky (n=168)	77.1% (n=130)	85.4% (n=144)	47.2% (n=79)	72.7% (n=122)	18.3% (n=31)	9.4% (n=16)	5.8% (n=10)	33.9% (n=57)	6.3% (n=20)	36.5% (n=61)	--
Louisiana (n=276)	82.6% (n=228)	92.2% (n=254)	50.9% (n=140)	61.2% (n=169)	25.9% (n=72)	9.7% (n=27)	1.8% (n=5)	21.5% (n=59)	7.9% (n=22)	7.1% (n=20)	3.9% (n=11)
Maryland (n=173)	79.5% (n=138)	98.5% (n=171)	70.2% (n=122)	77.0% (n=134)	23.9% (n=42)	9.8% (n=17)	3.3% (n=6)	39.6% (n=69)	13.5% (n=23)	11.6% (n=20)	*
Massachusetts (n=394)	78.1% (n=308)	87.9% (n=346)	49.6% (n=195)	61.8% (n=243)	11.3% (n=44)	*	6.3% (n=25)	16.4% (n=65)	8.3% (n=32)	17.8% (n=70)	3.7% (n=15)
Michigan (n=485)	88.0% (n=427)	92.6% (n=449)	47.7% (n=232)	70.1% (n=340)	24.3% (n=118)	13.9% (n=68)	12.7% (n=62)	26.1% (n=127)	14.3% (n=65)	29.4% (n=143)	2.9% (n=14)

Figure 95 (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
Oklahoma (n=187)	86.2% (n=161)	85.1% (n=159)	56.4% (n=105)	88.5% (n=165)	33.4% (n=62)	18.8% (n=35)	5.7% (n=11)	21.8% (n=41)	1.2% (n=2)	22.9% (n=43)	2.3% (n=4)
Oregon (n=184)	74.5% (n=137)	85.9% (n=159)	37.7% (n=69)	49.8% (n=92)	7.6% (n=14)	3.5% (n=7)	3.5% (n=6)	27.0% (n=50)	1.7% (n=3)	8.8% (n=16)	1.8% (n=3)
Rhode Island (n=68)	71.1% (n=48)	89.3% (n=61)	53.3% (n=36)	73.0% (n=50)	--	--	3.6% (n=2)	10.7% (n=7)	--	2.0% (n=1)	--
South Carolina (n=150)	78.3% (n=117)	84.6% (n=127)	46.6% (n=70)	59.7% (n=89)	12.4% (n=19)	7.0% (n=11)	1.2% (n=2)	18.4% (n=28)	4.2% (n=6)	1.3% (n=2)	--
South Dakota (n=130)	57.0% (n=74)	79.7% (n=103)	34.1% (n=44)	51.7% (n=67)	5.1% (n=7)	1.3% (n=7)	2.5% (n=3)	12.7% (n=17)	1.3% (n=2)	5.1% (n=7)	10.2% (n=13)
Tennessee (n=296)	90.7% (n=269)	84.6% (n=250)	51.6% (n=153)	80.9% (n=240)	11.9% (n=35)	2.8% (n=8)	2.8% (n=8)	26.0% (n=77)	6.0% (n=17)	20.4% (n=60)	2.2% (n=6)
Texas (n=731)	72.6% (n=531)	85.5% (n=625)	44.8% (n=327)	67.9% (n=496)	20.3% (n=149)	7.7% (n=57)	8.9% (n=65)	20.9% (n=153)	4.5% (n=31)	22.0% (n=161)	7.3% (n=54)
Utah (n=98)	83.4% (n=81)	83.4% (n=81)	55.2% (n=54)	66.2% (n=65)	17.0% (n=17)	11.3% (n=11)	10.2% (n=10)	24.6% (n=24)	1.2% (n=1)	22.4% (n=22)	--
Vermont (n=161)	76.5% (n=124)	79.8% (n=129)	45.3% (n=73)	62.5% (n=101)	5.9% (n=10)	--	3.9% (n=6)	22.1% (n=36)	8.1% (n=13)	16.3% (n=26)	5.2% (n=8)
Virginia (n=331)	94.1% (n=312)	96.7% (n=321)	68.5% (n=227)	82.2% (n=272)	19.7% (n=65)	14.5% (n=48)	5.1% (n=17)	29.8% (n=99)	16.6% (n=53)	24.5% (n=81)	*
Washington (n= 303)	93.6% (n=283)	95.5% (n=289)	62.7% (n=190)	43.1% (n=131)	2.6% (n=8)	*	2.1% (n=6)	15.8% (n=48)	2.6% (n=8)	4.8% (n=15)	12.6% (n=38)

Figure 95 (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
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	91.7% (n=51)	87.5% (n=48)	79.2% (n=44)	4.2% (n=2)	--	--	--	--	--	--
West Virginia (n=153)	81.8% (n=125)	91.8% (n=140)	43.7% (n=31)	65.7% (n=100)	12.0% (n=18)	1.8% (n=3)	2.7% (n=4)	23.8% (n=36)	4.7% (n=7)	9.1% (n=14)	--
Wisconsin (n=401)	81.5% (n=327)	87.2% (n=350)	43.3% (n=173)	65.3% (n=262)	22.6% (n=91)	6.7% (n=27)	5.8% (n=23)	25.3% (n=102)	3.6% (n=14)	16.9% (n=68)	2.2% (n=9)
Wyoming (n=65)	78.5% (n=51)	92.3% (n=60)	47.7% (n=31)	63.1% (n=41)	12.3% (n=8)	1.5% (n=1)	4.6% (n=3)	20.0% (n=13)	--	9.2% (n=6)	--
<b>National</b>	80.7% (n=11,363)	89.7% (n=12,630)	50.2% (n=7,067)	67.8% (n=9,549)	18.0% (n=2,530)	8.4% (n=1,187)	7.3% (n=1,031)	24.7% (n=3,485)	7.8% (n=1,052)	19.3% (n=2,711)	2.8% (n=392)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive <b>Key</b> *=Insufficient data to report -- = No data to report											

The E-government roles and services played by public libraries is presented in Figure 95. The states with the highest percentage of libraries providing assistance in applying and accessing E-government services are Washington, DC (100 percent) and Virginia (94.1 percent). Delaware (100 percent) and Maryland (98.5 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries providing assistance in accessing and using E-government websites. Washington, DC (87.5 percent) and Maryland (70.2 percent) have the highest percentage of libraries assisting with understanding government programs and services. The highest percentages of libraries assisting with online government forms are Montana (88.7 percent) and Oklahoma (88.5 percent). Indiana (45.7 percent) and Florida (35.4 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries developing tools to assist patrons with E-government. New York (23.4 percent) and Arizona (22.5 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 (27.1 percent) and Florida (18.7 percent). Florida (50.6 percent) and Maryland (39.6 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries partnering with government agencies and others to provide E-government services. Arizona (22.5 percent) and Florida (21.1 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries working with government agencies to improve E-government services. Florida (44.0 percent) and Kentucky (36.5 percent) have the highest percentages of libraries with at least one staff member with significant expertise in providing E-government services.



**Figure 96: 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=240)	3.0 (n=231)	2.5 (n=238)	2.5 (n=238)	2.5 (n=238)	4.0 (n=240)	3.6 (n=234)	3.2 (n=207)	--
Alaska (n=84)	3.0 (n=84)	2.9 (n=78)	3.7 (n=84)	2.4 (n=67)	3.4 (n=83)	4.0 (n=83)	2.4 (n=73)	3.0 (n=3)
Arizona (n=187)	3.1 (n=187)	2.3 (n=187)	2.2 (n=187)	1.5 (n=177)	2.9 (n=185)	3.1 (n=187)	2.5 (n=177)	--
Arkansas (n=200)	3.2 (n=200)	2.4 (n=198)	2.4 (n=196)	2.0 (n=190)	3.8 (n=200)	4.1 (n=197)	3.5 (n=197)	--
California (n=833)	3.1 (n=828)	3.0 (n=825)	2.7 (n=833)	1.7 (n=808)	3.6 (n=767)	3.4 (n=766)	2.6 (n=591)	3.0 (n=7)
Colorado (n=200)	2.7 (n=186)	2.6 (n=185)	2.2 (n=190)	1.7 (n=187)	3.5 (n=199)	3.4 (n=200)	2.9 (n=175)	4.0 (n=2)
Connecticut (n=199)	2.8 (n=199)	2.3 (n=195)	2.2 (n=196)	1.7 (n=181)	3.7 (n=194)	3.4 (n=194)	2.5 (n=178)	5.0 (n=2)
Delaware (n=27)	2.5 (n=25)	2.3 (n=25)	1.9 (n=22)	2.3 (n=20)	3.8 (n=27)	3.6 (n=26)	3.0 (n=23)	--
Florida (n=365)	3.3 (n=365)	2.9 (n=355)	2.8 (n=359)	1.9 (n=341)	3.8 (n=364)	3.0 (n=364)	3.0 (n=344)	3.0 (n=2)
Georgia (n=334)	3.0 (n=328)	2.9 (n=319)	2.4 (n=324)	2.0 (n=326)	4.0 (n=328)	3.8 (n=334)	3.5 (n=298)	4.9 (n=12)
Hawaii (n=48)	3.3 (n=47)	3.2 (n=47)	3.6 (n=47)	2.5 (n=41)	3.5 (n=46)	3.4 (n=48)	2.9 (n=42)	--
Idaho (n=119)	3.2 (n=117)	2.9 (n=118)	3.3 (n=116)	1.7 (n=112)	3.7 (n=119)	3.7 (n=118)	2.3 (n=109)	5.0 (n=2)

**Figure 96 (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=689)	2.7 (n=686)	2.3 (n=674)	2.2 (n=663)	1.8 (n=626)	3.5 (n=689)	3.6 (n=686)	2.6 (n=646)	2.7 (n=12)
Indiana (n=371)	2.6 (n=365)	2.0 (n=355)	2.0 (n=365)	1.7 (n=364)	3.4 (n=371)	3.2 (n=370)	2.8 (n=321)	3.3 (n=4)
Iowa (n=456)	2.4 (n=455)	2.2 (n=443)	2.0 (n=456)	1.7 (n=421)	3.6 (n=438)	3.7 (n=445)	2.8 (n=437)	3.5 (n=10)
Kansas (n=348)	2.6 (n=348)	2.2 (n=333)	2.5 (n=346)	1.9 (n=328)	3.3 (n=341)	3.5 (n=348)	2.6 (n=328)	2.8 (n=7)
Kentucky (n=169)	3.3 (n=169)	2.5 (n=164)	2.5 (n=162)	1.9 (n=162)	3.5 (n=166)	3.6 (n=169)	2.8 (n=166)	--
Louisiana (n=286)	2.8 (n=264)	2.3 (n=280)	2.1 (n=278)	1.7 (n=265)	3.6 (n=286)	3.9 (n=265)	3.6 (n=283)	4.5 (n=12)
Maryland (n=169)	3.6 (n=140)	3.7 (n=146)	2.7 (n=140)	1.7 (n=146)	3.5 (n=169)	2.7 (n=164)	2.2 (n=149)	3.0 (n=3)
Massachusetts (n=406)	2.7 (n=387)	2.5 (n=369)	2.1 (n=383)	1.5 (n=346)	3.8 (n=406)	3.6 (n=401)	2.6 (n=356)	3.7 (n=10)
Michigan (n=524)	2.9 (n=523)	2.9 (n=515)	2.3 (n=524)	1.6 (n=456)	3.8 (n=518)	3.4 (n=521)	3.0 (n=501)	4.0 (n=3)
Minnesota (n=321)	2.9 (n=319)	3.0 (n=311)	2.2 (n=321)	1.9 (n=308)	3.8 (n=312)	3.6 (n=309)	2.9 (n=287)	5.0 (n=2)
Mississippi (n=221)	3.4 (n=221)	2.6 (n=209)	2.9 (n=217)	2.1 (n=213)	3.7 (n=207)	3.8 (n=206)	3.1 (n=214)	5.0 (n=2)
Missouri (n=335)	2.6 (n=334)	2.0 (n=332)	1.8 (n=332)	1.7 (n=326)	3.1 (n=334)	3.1 (n=335)	3.2 (n=326)	5.0 (n=1)
Montana (n=91)	3.0 (n=89)	2.5 (n=89)	2.8 (n=91)	1.5 (n=79)	3.6 (n=88)	3.6 (n=89)	2.8 (n=80)	5.0 (n=1)

**Figure 96 (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
Nebraska (n=260)	2.8 (n=258)	2.3 (n=246)	2.3 (n=256)	2.1 (n=244)	3.4 (n=253)	3.5 (n=260)	2.7 (n=232)	5.0 (n=5)
Nevada (n=77)	3.5 (n=75)	2.9 (n=75)	2.6 (n=75)	1.6 (n=67)	3.5 (n=74)	2.8 (n=77)	2.1 (n=70)	--
New Jersey (n=342)	2.7 (n=342)	2.5 (n=334)	2.2 (n=340)	1.8 (n=325)	3.6 (n=338)	3.3 (n=337)	2.5 (n=327)	4.0 (n=5)
New Mexico (n=111)	2.9 (n=108)	2.7 (n=105)	2.8 (n=111)	2.1 (n=102)	3.6 (n=104)	3.6 (n=107)	2.7 (n=102)	4.6 (n=7)
New York (n=918)	2.7 (n=899)	2.5 (n=883)	1.8 (n=884)	1.5 (n=818)	3.7 (n=907)	3.4 (n=918)	2.3 (n=828)	--
North Carolina (n=347)	2.8 (n=340)	2.7 (n=342)	2.3 (n=337)	1.7 (n=333)	3.8 (n=345)	3.6 (n=347)	2.6 (n=318)	1.0 (n=1)
Ohio (n=636)	3.3 (n=632)	2.5 (n=636)	2.4 (n=636)	1.7 (n=616)	3.4 (n=615)	3.3 (n=623)	2.6 (n=609)	3.7 (n=4)
Oklahoma (n=187)	3.4 (n=185)	3.0 (n=180)	2.4 (n=187)	2.1 (n=185)	3.7 (n=185)	3.5 (n=178)	2.6 (n=182)	1.0 (n=2)
Oregon (n=188)	2.8 (n=187)	2.7 (n=188)	2.1 (n=183)	1.9 (n=172)	4.1 (n=187)	3.9 (n=187)	3.1 (n=176)	4.7 (n=4)
Rhode Island (n=68)	2.7 (n=66)	2.0 (n=68)	2.2 (n=68)	1.8 (n=66)	3.7 (n=66)	3.7 (n=68)	2.6 (n=61)	--
South Carolina (n=145)	3.4 (n=145)	2.4 (n=145)	2.2 (n=145)	1.5 (n=145)	4.1 (n=143)	4.0 (n=143)	2.7 (n=143)	--
South Dakota (n=128)	2.4 (n=121)	2.0 (n=121)	2.3 (n=128)	1.8 (n=115)	3.3 (n=125)	3.6 (n=125)	2.5 (n=115)	1.0 (n=3)
Tennessee (n=306)	3.1 (n=299)	2.2 (n=303)	2.5 (n=296)	2.0 (n=281)	3.7 (n=301)	3.4 (n=306)	2.8 (n=281)	--

**Figure 96 (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
Texas (n=747)	2.9 (n=723)	2.5 (n=705)	2.5 (n=729)	1.9 (n=707)	3.6 (n=742)	3.5 (n=747)	2.8 (n=703)	3.3 (n=6)
Utah (n=104)	2.8 (n=104)	2.6 (n=100)	1.9 (n=104)	1.9 (n=104)	3.6 (n=104)	3.4 (n=102)	3.2 (n=98)	--
Vermont (n=163)	2.7 (n=161)	2.4 (n=149)	2.5 (n=152)	1.8 (n=135)	3.8 (n=161)	3.8 (n=163)	2.5 (n=141)	4.5 (n=4)
Virginia (n=337)	3.3 (n=312)	2.7 (n=305)	2.6 (n=306)	2.0 (n=290)	3.9 (n=337)	3.5 (n=309)	2.5 (n=266)	--
Washington (n= 310)	2.9 (n=304)	2.8 (n=304)	2.1 (n=306)	1.3 (n=295)	3.8 (n=310)	3.6 (n=308)	2.1 (n=292)	5.0 (n=36)
Washington, DC (n=55)	3.1 (n=55)	3.1 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=151)	3.1 (n=151)	2.3 (n=147)	2.7 (n=150)	2.7 (n=147)	3.7 (n=147)	3.8 (n=146)	3.3 (n=139)	3.0 (n=1)
Wisconsin (n=416)	3.0 (n=411)	2.6 (n=396)	2.6 (n=405)	1.7 (n=370)	4.0 (n=416)	3.9 (n=414)	2.6 (n=394)	4.3 (n=5)
Wyoming (n=69)	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=3)
<b>National</b>	2.9 (n=13,982)	2.5 (n=13,776)	2.3 (n=13,949)	1.8 (n=13,312)	3.6 (n=14,058)	3.5 (n=14,008)	2.7 (n=12,996)	4.0 (n=199)
<b>Key</b> -- = No data to report								

Figure 96 indicates the challenges that public libraries face in providing E-government services. Not having enough staff to meet patrons needs for E-government services was the top rated challenge nationally, and for most states as well. Library not having the necessary expertise to meet

patrons' needs was rated highest by libraries in Alaska; Arizona; Arkansas; Illinois; Iowa; Kansas; Kentucky; Louisiana; Mississippi; Nebraska; South Dakota; West Virginia; and Wyoming. These two challenges were rated equally most important by libraries in Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Rhode Island and Vermont. Libraries in Arizona rated having too few workstations the biggest challenge, while libraries in Nevada and Washington, DC had it tied at the top with other challenges. Workstation time limits were rated the most important challenge by libraries in Maryland, and tied with too few workstations in Washington, DC. Libraries in Hawaii rated the slow connection speed as the most important challenge and libraries in Montana identified liability issues as the biggest challenge to providing E-government services.

**Figure 97: 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=269)	98.6% (n=265)	85.6% (n=230)	88.5% (n=238)	52.9% (n=142)	20.8% (n=56)	31.7% (n=85)	30.7% (n=82)	80.1% (n=215)	4.0% (n=11)
Alaska (n=88)	80.1% (n=70)	49.2% (n=43)	47.1% (n=41)	27.2% (n=24)	1.8% (n=2)	10.9% (n=10)	5.4% (n=5)	56.2% (n=49)	1.8% (n=2)
Arizona (n=185)	94.9% (n=176)	65.1% (n=120)	67.4% (n=125)	31.7% (n=59)	25.6% (n=47)	27.8% (n=51)	35.0% (n=65)	56.4% (n=104)	3.3% (n=6)
Arkansas (n=209)	92.4% (n=193)	69.7% (n=145)	74.5% (n=155)	9.1% (n=19)	12.6% (n=26)	3.4% (n=7)	7.6% (n=16)	80.3% (n=167)	2.5% (n=5)
California (n=834)	96.9% (n=808)	89.7% (n=748)	67.0% (n=559)	37.4% (n=312)	30.3% (n=252)	13.5% (n=113)	29.7% (n=247)	80.5% (n=671)	4.0% (n=33)
Colorado (n=205)	89.5% (n=184)	75.4% (n=155)	75.1% (n=154)	40.7% (n=84)	24.7% (n=51)	20.5% (n=42)	32.7% (n=67)	74.9% (n=154)	1.8% (n=4)
Connecticut (n=209)	92.9% (n=194)	67.6% (n=142)	74.9% (n=157)	27.7% (n=58)	14.2% (n=30)	21.5% (n=45)	33.0% (n=69)	68.2% (n=143)	4.8% (n=10)
Delaware (n=28)	100% (n=28)	90.8% (n=26)	90.8% (n=26)	46.1% (n=13)	24.3% (n=7)	19.7% (n=6)	32.5% (n=9)	86.3% (n=25)	--
Florida (n=442)	95.6% (n=423)	87.5% (n=387)	54.9% (n=243)	27.2% (n=121)	31.0% (n=137)	13.4% (n=59)	40.6% (n=180)	77.2% (n=341)	1.5% (n=7)
Georgia (n=337)	95.8% (n=322)	80.4% (n=271)	65.4% (n=220)	32.1% (n=108)	21.1% (n=71)	17.9% (n=60)	13.4% (n=45)	87.1% (n=293)	2.4% (n=8)
Hawaii (n=48)	83.3% (n=40)	87.5% (n=42)	62.5% (n=30)	8.3% (n=4)	8.3% (n=4)	2.1% (n=1)	6.3% (n=3)	41.7% (n=20)	2.1% (n=1)
Idaho (n=121)	92.6% (n=112)	61.6% (n=75)	63.6% (n=77)	20.0% (n=24)	17.6% (n=21)	5.9% (n=7)	10.5% (n=13)	70.4% (n=85)	3.0% (n=4)
Illinois (n=705)	81.1% (n=572)	60.4% (n=426)	74.6% (n=526)	24.2% (n=171)	13.0% (n=92)	16.2% (n=114)	28.8% (n=203)	70.2% (n=495)	2.8% (n=20)

**Figure 97: Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State**

<b>States</b>	<b>Provides access to jobs databases and other resources</b>	<b>Provides access to civil service exam materials</b>	<b>Helps patrons complete online job applications</b>	<b>Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications</b>	<b>Helps patrons develop business plans and other materials</b>	<b>Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials</b>	<b>Offers classes on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.</b>	<b>Offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials</b>	<b>Other</b>
Indiana (n=380)	90.7% (n=343)	64.9% (n=246)	64.5% (n=245)	32.1% (n=122)	25.4% (n=97)	21.3% (n=81)	24.0% (n=91)	83.2% (n=316)	3.1% (n=12)
Iowa (n=450)	79.2% (n=356)	53.9% (n=243)	83.6% (n=376)	22.1% (n=100)	6.3% (n=28)	7.1% (n=32)	11.5% (n=52)	61.8% (n=278)	1.6% (n=7)
Kansas (n=344)	84.2% (n=288)	53.1% (n=182)	82.0% (n=281)	29.5% (n=101)	7.2% (n=25)	9.9% (n=34)	5.4% (n=19)	61.5% (n=212)	2.8% (n=10)
Kentucky (n=169)	91.4% (n=154)	77.6% (n=131)	81.0% (n=137)	40.0% (n=68)	12.0% (n=20)	10.1% (n=17)	26.9% (n=45)	79.8% (n=135)	1.4% (n=2)
Louisiana (n=282)	92.9% (n=262)	91.8% (n=259)	73.6% (n=207)	19.0% (n=54)	15.8% (n=45)	13.2% (n=37)	20.1% (n=57)	77.3% (n=218)	2.2% (n=6)
Maryland (n=173)	100% (n=173)	89.5% (n=155)	80.3% (n=139)	22.3% (n=39)	25.3% (n=44)	33.3% (n=58)	50.8% (n=88)	92.6% (n=161)	1.8% (n=3)
Massachusetts (n=392)	85.1% (n=333)	65.4% (n=256)	63.6% (n=249)	14.4% (n=57)	13.6% (n=53)	11.2% (n=44)	31.4% (n=123)	67.2% (n=263)	5.9% (n=23)
Michigan (n=494)	92.4% (n=457)	87.8% (n=434)	72.7% (n=359)	41.3% (n=204)	19.8% (n=98)	26.4% (n=131)	33.9% (n=168)	82.0% (n=405)	1.8% (n=9)

Figure 97 (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
Minnesota (n=324)	95.2% (n=308)	79.3% (n=257)	64.8% (n=210)	17.5% (n=57)	11.6% (n=38)	7.9% (n=26)	16.3% (n=53)	69.5% (n=225)	2.5% (n=8)
Mississippi (n=221)	97.6% (n=215)	92.6% (n=204)	75.6% (n=167)	26.5% (n=59)	9.0% (n=20)	10.5% (n=23)	17.3% (n=38)	74.3% (n=164)	3.0% (n=7)
Missouri (n=345)	92.0% (n=317)	85.9% (n=296)	81.5% (n=281)	21.8% (n=75)	9.7% (n=34)	9.8% (n=34)	15.3% (n=53)	77.2% (n=266)	*
Montana (n=93)	96.1% (n=90)	63.6% (n=59)	81.8% (n=76)	35.1% (n=33)	5.2% (n=5)	10.4% (n=10)	15.6% (n=15)	72.7% (n=68)	3.9% (n=4)
Nebraska (n=251)	79.8% (n=200)	40.8% (n=102)	74.1% (n=186)	18.8% (n=47)	11.3% (n=28)	8.5% (n=21)	6.4% (n=16)	52.0% (n=130)	5.5% (n=14)
Nevada (n=77)	79.4% (n=61)	52.9% (n=41)	79.0% (n=61)	41.3% (n=32)	11.9% (n=9)	7.4% (n=6)	32.9% (n=25)	88.1% (n=68)	7.4% (n=6)
New Jersey (n=351)	94.5% (n=332)	91.8% (n=323)	77.7% (n=273)	22.0% (n=77)	21.6% (n=76)	11.8% (n=42)	37.1% (n=131)	66.1% (n=232)	3.0% (n=11)
New Mexico (n=111)	85.0% (n=95)	56.2% (n=63)	80.0% (n=89)	17.4% (n=19)	9.7% (n=11)	10.3% (n=12)	7.9% (n=9)	78.4% (n=87)	4.1% (n=5)
New York (n=949)	77.6% (n=736)	90.4% (n=858)	60.3% (n=572)	20.7% (n=196)	8.4% (n=80)	10.0% (n=95)	26.8% (n=254)	75.2% (n=714)	4.2% (n=40)
North Carolina (n=352)	98.4% (n=346)	91.8% (n=323)	71.0% (n=250)	38.2% (n=135)	9.7% (n=34)	22.9% (n=81)	33.2% (n=117)	79.2% (n=279)	7.4% (n=26)
Ohio (n=642)	94.7% (n=609)	91.1% (n=585)	77.5% (n=498)	49.2% (n=316)	29.4% (n=189)	34.6% (n=223)	38.6% (n=248)	85.4% (n=548)	1.4% (n=9)
Oklahoma (n=187)	86.2% (n=161)	69.0% (n=129)	81.6% (n=152)	33.4% (n=62)	27.7% (n=52)	3.4% (n=6)	30.0% (n=56)	69.0% (n=129)	1.1% (n=2)
Oregon (n=186)	87.7% (n=163)	74.2% (n=138)	41.4% (n=77)	12.1% (n=23)	9.6% (n=18)	8.1% (n=15)	7.4% (n=14)	84.3% (n=157)	5.8% (n=11)

**Figure 97 (continued): Job Seeking Services of the Public Library Outlets, by State**

<b>States</b>	<b>Provides access to jobs databases and other resources</b>	<b>Provides access to civil service exam materials</b>	<b>Helps patrons complete online job applications</b>	<b>Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications</b>	<b>Helps patrons develop business plans and other materials</b>	<b>Collaborates with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons develop business plans and other materials</b>	<b>Offers classes on job seeking strategies, interview tips, etc.</b>	<b>Offers software and other resources to help patrons create resumes and other employment materials</b>	<b>Other</b>
Rhode Island (n=68)	98.0% (n=67)	89.3% (n=61)	71.4% (n=49)	15.0% (n=10)	3.6% (n=2)	7.1% (n=5)	47.5% (n=32)	57.4% (n=39)	--
South Carolina (n=164)	100% (n=164)	84.9% (n=140)	70.9% (n=117)	43.0% (n=71)	11.7% (n=19)	20.5% (n=34)	39.6% (n=65)	71.5% (n=118)	17.5% (n=29)
South Dakota (n=135)	86.5% (n=116)	66.9% (n=90)	71.1% (n=96)	18.6% (n=25)	3.7% (n=5)	13.7% (n=19)	17.4% (n=23)	58.8% (n=79)	4.9% (n=7)
Tennessee (n=310)	85.5% (n=265)	77.2% (n=239)	81.5% (n=252)	16.0% (n=50)	10.4% (n=32)	9.7% (n=30)	12.2% (n=38)	83.0% (n=257)	4.2% (n=13)
Texas (n=770)	87.2% (n=672)	69.6% (n=536)	78.9% (n=608)	31.2% (n=241)	12.7% (n=98)	13.5% (n=104)	29.2% (n=225)	78.0% (n=601)	3.8% (n=29)
Utah (n=102)	91.9% (n=94)	66.2% (n=68)	59.9% (n=61)	8.1% (n=8)	12.9% (n=13)	--	15.6% (n=16)	52.7% (n=54)	2.1% (n=2)
Vermont (n=161)	77.2% (n=125)	41.3% (n=67)	73.6% (n=119)	18.9% (n=31)	9.4% (n=15)	12.4% (n=20)	9.8% (n=16)	40.1% (n=65)	9.1% (n=15)
Virginia (n=342)	96.5% (n=330)	89.4% (n=306)	89.4% (n=305)	43.8% (n=150)	8.0% (n=27)	6.9% (n=24)	46.4% (n=158)	84.2% (n=288)	1.6% (n=6)
Washington (n= 309)	92.7% (n=286)	81.7% (n=253)	51.4% (n=159)	31.7% (n=98)	15.6% (n=48)	21.9% (n=68)	31.6% (n=98)	78.0% (n=241)	--

**Figure 97 (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
Washington, DC (n=55)	100% (n=55)	8.3% (n=5)	95.8% (n=53)	75.0% (n=42)	66.7% (n=37)	8.3% (n=5)	8.3% (n=5)	100% (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=161)	81.3% (n=131)	80.4% (n=129)	75.3% (n=121)	37.5% (n=60)	7.0% (n=11)	5.2% (n=8)	5.1% (n=8)	77.7% (n=125)	3.5% (n=6)
Wisconsin (n=428)	98.2% (n=420)	78.6% (n=336)	69.4% (n=297)	42.9% (n=184)	15.1% (n=65)	11.4% (n=49)	22.9% (n=98)	75.1% (n=321)	4.8% (n=21)
Wyoming (n=72)	94.4% (n=68)	68.1% (n=49)	68.1% (n=49)	19.4% (n=14)	8.3% (n=6)	15.3% (n=11)	2.8% (n=2)	62.5% (n=45)	1.4% (n=1)
<b>National</b>	90.9% (n=13,254)	77.0% (n=11,231)	71.9% (n=10,486)	29.4% (n=4,290)	16.2% (n=2,362)	14.6% (n=2,133)	25.4% (n=3,706)	74.5% (n=10,862)	3.3% (n=477)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive									
<b>Key</b> *=Insufficient data to report									
-- = No data to report									

Figure 97 presents the job seeking services offered by public libraries. Libraries in Washington, DC and South Carolina report the highest percentages of providing access to jobs databases and other job opportunity resources (100 percent, respectively). 100 percent of libraries in Delaware; Maryland; South Carolina; and Washington, DC report the highest percentages of providing access to civil service exam materials. The highest percentages of assisting patrons complete online job applications were reported by libraries in Mississippi (92.6 percent), Louisiana (91.8 percent), New Jersey (91.8 percent) and North Carolina (91.8 percent). The highest percentages of libraries collaborating with outside agencies or individuals to help patrons complete online job applications were reported in Washington, DC (95.8 percent) and Delaware (90.8 percent). Libraries in Washington, DC (75.0 percent) and Alabama (52.9 percent) reported the highest percentages of helping patrons to develop business plans and other materials to start businesses. Libraries in Washington, DC (66.7 percent) and Florida (31.0 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 Ohio (34.6 percent) and Maryland (33.3 percent). Libraries in

Maryland (50.8 percent) and Rhode Island (47.5 percent) reported the highest percentages of offering software and other resources to help patrons create résumés and other employment materials.

**Figure 98: 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=241)	2.9 (n=238)	2.4 (n=234)	2.0 (n=238)	2.7 (n=235)	4.0 (n=241)	3.4 (n=241)	3.0 (n=203)	--
Alaska (n=88)	2.8 (n=88)	2.8 (n=88)	3.6 (n=88)	2.4 (n=75)	3.5 (n=86)	3.7 (n=88)	2.4 (n=83)	5.0 (n=2)
Arizona (n=185)	2.9 (n=183)	2.3 (n=185)	2.7 (n=185)	1.6 (n=172)	3.2 (n=183)	2.7 (n=185)	2.5 (n=177)	--
Arkansas (n=197)	3.2 (n=191)	2.5 (n=184)	2.4 (n=190)	2.1 (n=191)	3.8 (n=197)	3.7 (n=191)	3.3 (n=191)	--
California (n=786)	3.2 (n=786)	3.1 (n=779)	2.9 (n=781)	1.8 (n=756)	3.6 (n=783)	3.3 (n=768)	2.5 (n=602)	3.0 (n=12)
Colorado (n=202)	2.6 (n=187)	2.6 (n=186)	2.2 (n=190)	1.9 (n=189)	3.2 (n=202)	3.0 (n=198)	2.5 (n=186)	1.0 (n=2)
Connecticut (n=209)	2.6 (n=209)	2.4 (n=204)	2.3 (n=209)	1.8 (n=191)	3.6 (n=207)	3.1 (n=207)	2.4 (n=181)	5.0 (n=2)
Delaware (n=28)	2.6 (n=27)	2.8 (n=27)	2.1 (n=25)	2.7 (n=24)	4.1 (n=28)	3.1 (n=27)	2.6 (n=25)	--
Florida (n=357)	3.2 (n=356)	2.9 (n=347)	2.8 (n=356)	1.9 (n=341)	3.8 (n=357)	2.9 (n=354)	2.9 (n=343)	5.0 (n=2)
Georgia (n=324)	3.2 (n=324)	2.9 (n=319)	2.5 (n=324)	2.1 (n=317)	4.1 (n=317)	3.4 (n=313)	3.5 (n=292)	5.0 (n=11)
Hawaii (n=46)	3.4 (n=46)	3.5 (n=46)	3.6 (n=45)	2.7 (n=44)	3.6 (n=46)	3.4 (n=46)	3.1 (n=39)	--
Idaho (n=121)	3.1 (n=118)	2.7 (n=121)	3.2 (n=117)	1.6 (n=116)	3.6 (n=121)	3.5 (n=121)	2.4 (n=113)	--

**Figure 98: 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
Illinois (n=700)	2.5 (n=700)	2.3 (n=690)	2.2 (n=694)	1.8 (n=651)	3.5 (n=700)	3.3 (n=700)	2.5 (n=657)	3.0 (n=3)
Indiana (n=376)	2.5 (n=375)	1.9 (n=370)	1.9 (n=371)	1.6 (n=365)	3.4 (n=376)	2.9 (n=375)	2.6 (n=331)	1.0 (n=2)
Iowa (n=448)	2.2 (n=445)	2.0 (n=445)	2.0 (n=447)	1.8 (n=423)	3.5 (n=448)	3.5 (n=446)	2.6 (n=411)	1.0 (n=4)
Kansas (n=346)	2.5 (n=343)	2.2 (n=331)	2.3 (n=341)	1.9 (n=324)	3.4 (n=343)	3.2 (n=346)	2.5 (n=324)	1.0 (n=2)
Kentucky (n=169)	3.1 (n=166)	2.5 (n=161)	2.5 (n=169)	2.0 (n=161)	3.3 (n=166)	3.3 (n=164)	2.6 (n=166)	--
Louisiana (n=283)	2.6 (n=283)	2.4 (n=274)	2.1 (n=275)	1.8 (n=264)	3.4 (n=280)	3.4 (n=283)	3.4 (n=279)	5.0 (n=5)
Maryland (n=171)	3.3 (n=161)	3.5 (n=167)	2.4 (n=160)	1.6 (n=169)	3.6 (n=171)	2.8 (n=168)	1.9 (n=149)	--
Massachusetts (n=400)	2.7 (n=400)	2.5 (n=385)	2.1 (n=385)	1.6 (n=356)	4.0 (n=397)	3.5 (n=400)	2.5 (n=369)	2.5 (n=5)
Michigan (n=497)	2.8 (n=497)	3.1 (n=488)	2.3 (n=495)	1.7 (n=435)	3.8 (n=497)	2.9 (n=494)	2.6 (n=466)	--
Minnesota (n=321)	2.9 (n=319)	3.0 (n=313)	2.1 (n=316)	2.0 (n=313)	3.7 (n=321)	3.3 (n=317)	2.8 (n=295)	--
Mississippi (n=210)	3.3 (n=207)	2.8 (n=205)	3.0 (n=210)	2.2 (n=210)	3.9 (n=202)	3.7 (n=200)	2.9 (n=202)	5.0 (n=2)

**Figure 98 (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
Missouri (n=338)	2.5 (n=334)	2.1 (n=333)	1.9 (n=333)	1.9 (n=333)	3.2 (n=338)	3.0 (n=338)	2.4 (n=329)	--
Montana (n=92)	2.9 (n=92)	2.6 (n=92)	2.7 (n=92)	1.7 (n=80)	3.6 (n=91)	3.3 (n=92)	2.5 (n=79)	--
Nebraska (n=256)	2.6 (n=251)	2.3 (n=251)	2.2 (n=256)	2.1 (n=249)	3.3 (n=256)	3.3 (n=256)	2.6 (n=232)	3.0 (n=5)
Nevada (n=77)	3.4 (n=77)	2.9 (n=74)	2.6 (n=74)	2.2 (n=67)	3.6 (n=74)	2.7 (n=74)	2.0 (n=70)	--
New Jersey (n=343)	2.6 (n=343)	2.4 (n=334)	2.2 (n=333)	1.8 (n=327)	3.4 (n=338)	3.1 (n=338)	2.4 (n=319)	--
New Mexico (n=108)	2.6 (n=108)	2.7 (n=104)	2.6 (n=108)	2.0 (n=104)	3.6 (n=106)	3.1 (n=106)	2.6 (n=101)	3.0 (n=2)
New York (n=931)	2.7 (n=905)	2.5 (n=880)	1.8 (n=884)	1.6 (n=838)	3.7 (n=922)	3.2 (n=931)	2.0 (n=893)	1.0 (n=2)
North Carolina (n=348)	2.9 (n=347)	2.8 (n=347)	2.4 (n=343)	1.8 (n=341)	3.6 (n=348)	3.2 (n=346)	2.3 (n=320)	--
Ohio (n=638)	3.2 (n=638)	2.8 (n=630)	2.4 (n=633)	1.7 (n=598)	3.6 (n=613)	3.1 (n=616)	2.5 (n=592)	4.5 (n=3)
Oklahoma (n=187)	3.4 (n=187)	3.2 (n=178)	2.8 (n=185)	2.3 (n=180)	3.9 (n=185)	3.4 (n=180)	2.8 (n=176)	--
Oregon (n=182)	2.8 (n=180)	2.9 (n=180)	2.1 (n=173)	2.1 (n=164)	4.1 (n=181)	3.7 (n=182)	2.9 (n=177)	3.2 (n=3)
Rhode Island (n=68)	2.6 (n=66)	1.9 (n=67)	2.1 (n=68)	1.7 (n=68)	3.5 (n=68)	3.4 (n=68)	2.5 (n=66)	--
South Carolina (n=154)	3.5 (n=154)	2.6 (n=154)	2.2 (n=154)	1.6 (n=154)	3.9 (n=154)	3.7 (n=154)	2.6 (n=154)	--

**Figure 98 (continued): Challenges that Affect the Ability of the Public Library Outlets to Help Patrons Seek Employment, by State (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)**

<i>States</i>	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
South Dakota (n=130)	2.5 (n=123)	2.1 (n=120)	2.3 (n=125)	2.0 (n=123)	3.2 (n=126)	3.3 (n=130)	2.4 (n=116)	1.0 (n=3)
Tennessee (n=304)	3.2 (n=304)	2.2 (n=295)	2.7 (n=298)	2.1 (n=288)	3.7 (n=304)	3.2 (n=298)	2.6 (n=186)	--
Texas (n=745)	2.9 (n=744)	2.6 (n=719)	2.5 (n=733)	2.0 (n=719)	3.7 (n=745)	3.2 (n=745)	2.6 (n=713)	1.0 (n=2)
Utah (n=104)	2.5 (n=104)	2.7 (n=100)	2.0 (n=104)	1.9 (n=104)	3.4 (n=102)	3.2 (n=104)	2.7 (n=98)	--
Vermont (n=163)	2.7 (n=163)	2.3 (n=149)	2.3 (n=157)	1.9 (n=135)	3.7 (n=159)	3.5 (n=161)	2.5 (n=145)	3.0 (n=2)
Virginia (n=342)	3.1 (n=313)	2.8 (n=306)	2.5 (n=310)	2.1 (n=296)	3.9 (n=342)	3.3 (n=313)	2.5 (n=277)	--
Washington (n= 317)	2.9 (n=306)	2.8 (n=306)	2.2 (n=306)	1.3 (n=297)	3.8 (n=317)	3.4 (n=317)	1.9 (n=300)	5.0 (n=34)
Washington, DC (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	2.9 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	3.0 (n=55)	--
West Virginia (n=155)	3.1 (n=154)	2.3 (n=155)	2.6 (n=155)	2.8 (n=154)	3.4 (n=153)	3.4 (n=148)	3.0 (n=149)	3.0 (n=3)
Wisconsin (n=421)	2.9 (n=414)	2.7 (n=407)	2.6 (n=413)	1.9 (n=378)	3.9 (n=415)	3.7 (n=421)	2.5 (n=405)	5.0 (n=2)
Wyoming (n=71)	2.6 (n=70)	2.2 (n=66)	2.2 (n=69)	1.4 (n=62)	3.2 (n=71)	3.6 (n=69)	2.0 (n=64)	1.0 (n=1)
<b>National</b>	2.9 (n=14,047)	2.6 (n=13,813)	2.4 (n=13,933)	1.9 (n=13,405)	3.6% (n=14,110)	3.3% (n=14,026)	2.6 (n=13,051)	3.7 (n=126)
<b>Key</b> -- = No data to report								

The challenges that affect public libraries' abilities to provide job seeking services (Figure 98) are similar to those that libraries face when providing E-government services (Figure 95). The highest nationally rated challenge is insufficient staff. Only libraries in Alaska, South Dakota and Wyoming rate lack of staff expertise higher. Libraries in Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana and Nebraska rate lack of staff expertise equally high as insufficient staff, while libraries in Hawaii rate their low connections speed equally challenging and libraries in Louisiana rate liability issues 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. 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-elect 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>.

**Elizabeth DeCoster**, a Graduate Research Associate at the center, received her Masters in Library Science at the University of Maryland College Park's College of Information Studies with a concentration in Information and Diverse Populations. She has worked on the *Gates Public Access Computing Benchmarking Project* and the *Public Library Funding and Technology Access Study*.

**Justin Grimes** is a Ph.D. candidate in the College of Information Studies at the University of Maryland and a Research Associate at iPAC. He holds an MLS degree from the University of Maryland as well as a B.S. in Integrated Science and Technology from Marshall University. His research interests include information policy and information access.

**Sarah M. Katz** is a Graduate Research Associate pursuing her Masters in Library Science at the University of Maryland College Park's College of Information Studies focusing on both Archives and E-Government. Her prior work experience includes an extensive background in corporate marketing and communications. As part of iPAC, Sarah is working with members of the various projects to develop a strong voice in branding, messaging and communications for the center and its constituents.

**Lesley A. Langa** is a Graduate Research Associate at iPAC pursuing a doctoral degree at the University of Maryland College Park's College of Information Studies. Ms. Langa researches policy and access issues in cultural institutions. Her contributions to the iPAC team include data management and analysis for the Public Libraries Funding and Technology Access Study; study design and data collection for the Libraries & Advocacy Project, and; grant writing.

**Abigail McDermott** is a Graduate Research Associate at the center and iPAC Operations Manager, is pursuing her Masters degree in Library Science at the University of Maryland College Park's College of Information Studies with a focus on E-Government. She previously worked for the international development organization TechnoServe and the Arctic Studies Center at the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History. Her current projects include PLFTAS data analysis and reports, and the design and development of the new center Website.

Kathryn Sigler, a Graduate Research Associate at the center, recently completed a Masters in Library Science at the University of Maryland College Park's College of Information Studies with a concentration in Information and Diverse Populations. She has been working on the *Public Library Funding and Technology Access Study* since 2009 and she coordinates the center's social media projects.

**Appendix A: 2010-2011 Public Library Funding & Technology Access Survey**

2050 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](mailto: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. The Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study builds on previous studies conducted since 1994, and the national public library survey that follows this letter is managed by the Center for Library & Information Innovation at the University of Maryland. We thank you for your participation in the past, and hope that you will continue to participate in these important surveys. More information on the survey is available at [www.plinternetsurvey.org](http://www.plinternetsurvey.org).

Data from the survey will help you plan or improve technology and service deployment, assess your library's broadband needs, report progress and challenges to your funders regarding the library's public access technology, and identify the impacts of your library's public computer and Internet access on the community your library serves. The study findings also 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. Recently, study data has:

- been cited in hundreds of media outlets including *USA Today*, *Governing*, the *Wall Street Journal* and NPR;
- informed the National Broadband Plan and successful library grant applications for the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program; and
- been used in Congressional and state-level testimony, as well as in comments to agencies like the Federal Communications Commission.

Additional information and materials from the full study is available at <http://www.plinternetfunding>. We greatly appreciate your participation and look forward to sharing the results of the survey and additional research by summer 2011.

***PLEASE COMPLETE THE SURVEY(S) by November 5, 2010.***

Please call or e-mail the Center for Library & Information Innovation at the University of Maryland at (301) 405-9445 or <[support@clii.umd.edu](mailto:support@clii.umd.edu)> with any questions you might have regarding the survey.

Kind Regards,



Keith Fiels  
Executive Director

## 2010 National Survey of Public Library Funding and Technology Access

The American Library Association (ALA) and the Center for Library & Information Innovation 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. Ms. Denise M. Davis and Ms. Larra Clark (ALA Office of Research and Statistics) and Dr. John Carlo Bertot (Center for Library & Information Innovation at the University of Maryland) are the study managers. 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 17 and on the survey Web site.

### Complete the survey, and enter to win an Amazon Kindle

To participate in the 2010 study, please go to <http://www.plinternetsurvey.org> and follow the “Complete 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 5, 2010**. 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 [support@cli.umd.edu](mailto:support@cli.umd.edu).

**LIBRARY BRANCH LEVEL QUESTIONS (Sections A & B)**

**Section A: Availability, Connectivity & Access (Questions 1-21)**

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

<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is <b>permanently closed</b>
<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is <b>temporarily closed</b>
<input type="radio"/>	Library branch is <b>open</b> (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"/>	<b>Increased</b> since last fiscal year
<input type="radio"/>	<b>Decreased</b> since last fiscal year
<input type="radio"/>	<b>Stayed the same</b> 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"/>	<b>Yes</b> , the library is the only place in the community that provides <b>free</b> public computer and Internet access services
<input type="radio"/>	<b>No</b> , there are other places in the community that provide <b>free</b> 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 <i>(please determine age as of September 1, 2010)</i>
_____ 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. Please identify if THIS LIBRARY BRANCH 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 7)
<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 9)
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know (please go to question 9)

7. Please specify THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'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):

8. Is THIS LIBRARY BRANCH 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

9. Does THIS LIBRARY BRANCH **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"/>	Other (please specify):

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

<b>Factors Affecting Adding Workstations/Laptops</b>						
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

11. 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):

12. Please indicate who provides **information technology (IT) support** (e.g., troubleshooting workstation problems, contracting for Internet connectivity, managing the library Web page) for THIS LIBRARY BRANCH: (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 (IT specialist)
<input type="radio"/>	System-level IT staff
<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):

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

14. 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)

<b>Use of public Internet workstations</b>	<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	<b>Use of patron technology training classes</b>	<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
<b>Use of library Wi-Fi (wireless) Internet access (if library offers Wi-Fi)</b>	<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	<b>Use of library electronic resources (e.g., e-books, databases)</b>	<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

15. Please indicate whether THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'S **public access Internet connection (or at least one connection if there are multiple connections) is fiber optic:**

<input type="radio"/>	Yes, the library's Internet connection is fiber optic
<input type="radio"/>	No, the library's Internet connection is not fiber optic
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

16. Please indicate **the maximum speed** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'S **public access Internet connection:** (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Less than 256Kbps (kilobits/second)
<input type="radio"/>	257Kbps – 768Kbps
<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 – 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"/>	Greater than 40Mbps
<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")

17. In the last twelve (12) months, **the speed** of THIS LIBRARY BRANCH'S **public access Internet connection:** (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	Increased
<input type="radio"/>	Stayed the same
<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

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

19. If desired, would THIS LIBRARY BRANCH be able to **increase the bandwidth of its public access Internet connection** at this time? (MARK ONE ● ONLY)

<input type="radio"/>	No, this is the maximum speed available to the library branch
<input type="radio"/>	No, there is no interest in increasing the speed of the library's public access Internet connection
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, but we cannot afford the cost of increasing the branch's bandwidth
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, and we have plans to increase the bandwidth within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, but we have no plans to increase the bandwidth within the next year
<input type="radio"/>	Yes, but we do not have the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

20. 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 22)
<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 22)

21. 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 22-29)**

22. Please identify **extent** to which you agree 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, like 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 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

23. 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 <b>formal</b> information technology training classes directly to its patrons (please go to question 24)
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers patrons <b>one-on-one information technology training sessions by appointment</b> with library staff (please go to question 25)
<input type="radio"/>	The library offers <b>informal point-of-use technology assistance</b> (e.g., one-on-one help with Web browsing, using library databases, etc., when patrons ask) (please go to question 25)
<input type="radio"/>	The library provides access to <b>online training material</b> (e.g., Web-based tutorials, Web-based presentations, online technology services such as ElementK, etc.) (please go to question 25)
<input type="radio"/>	The library <b>does not offer</b> any technology training (please go to question 25)

24. 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 medical information (e.g., health literacy)
<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 networking (e.g., blogging, RSS)
<input type="radio"/>	Other (please specify):

25. 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). If the library branch does not offer the service or offers limited access, please also answer question 16b: (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY)

Resources	Library Does Not Offer Service	Library Offers Service On-site	Library Offers Service Remotely (e.g., to home computer users via library Web)
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	<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"/>
Library social networking (e.g., blogs, Flixster, Goodreads)	<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"/>	
Provide access to recreational gaming consoles, software, or Web sites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Provides access to mobile devices (e.g., e-readers, netbooks)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

26. 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):

27. 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

28. 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):

29. 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)****Section C: Funding Public Access (Questions 30-42)**

30. Did the library apply for E-rate discounts during the July 1, 2010, 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 2010**, 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, 2010 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 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 during 2009-2010? (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 applied for either BTOP or BIP, please indicate the type of grant proposal submitted (MARK ● ALL THAT APPLY):

<input type="radio"/>	Public computer center
<input type="radio"/>	Sustainable broadband
<input type="radio"/>	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)

	FY2011 (or current fiscal year)	FY2012 (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 (including LSTA, E-rate discounts, BIP/BTOP)	<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 2011 (or current fiscal year) and 2012 (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
<b>Fiscal Year 2011 (or current fiscal year) Operating Budget</b>	<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"/>
<b>Fiscal Year 2012 (or next fiscal year) Operating Budget</b>	<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. Please indicate in **whole dollars the library's total operating expenditures** (actual or anticipated) and expenditures from various funding sources for **fiscal years 2011 (or current fiscal year) and 2012 (or next fiscal year)**.

NOTE 1: Report all expenditures in "Local/County" if they cannot be isolated to a particular funding source.

NOTE 2: Select N/A (Not Applicable) if the funding category does not apply to this library

	<b>Fiscal Year 2011 (or current fiscal year) Expense Category</b>		
	<b>Salaries (including benefits)</b>	<b>Collections</b>	<b>Other Expenditures (including contractual services)</b>
<b>Source of Funding</b>			
Local/county	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Federal	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Fees/fines	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Donations/local fund raising	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
<b>TOTAL (all sources)</b>	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A

38. (cont'd) Please indicate in **whole dollars the library's total operating expenditures** (actual or anticipated) and expenditures from various funding sources for **fiscal years 2011 (or current fiscal year) and 2012 (or next fiscal year)**.

NOTE 1: Report all expenditures in "Local/County" if they cannot be isolated to a particular funding source.

NOTE 2: Select N/A (Not Applicable) if the funding category does not apply to this library

	<b>Fiscal Year 2012 (or next fiscal year) Expense Category</b>		
	<b>Salaries (including benefits)</b>	<b>Collections</b>	<b>Other Expenditures (including contractual services)</b>
<b>Source of Funding</b>			
Local/county	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Federal	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Fees/fines	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Donations/local fund raising	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A
<b>TOTAL (all sources)</b>	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A	\$ <input type="radio"/> N/A

39. Did the library receive financial support for its **technology expenditures** from outside entities on behalf of the library during the current fiscal year (FY2011)? "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 <b>all</b> of its technology costs
<input type="radio"/>	The library pays directly for <b>some</b> of its technology costs
<input type="radio"/>	The library <b>does not pay directly for any</b> of its technology costs (e.g., all IT staff, hardware and telecommunications costs are paid for by the city or county)

40. Does the library expect its **total technology expenditures** for FY2011 (or current fiscal year) and FY 2012 (or next fiscal year) to increase, decrease or remain the same? If increasing or decreasing, please mark the anticipated amount of change.

	<b>Increased</b>	<b>Decreased</b>	<b>Stayed the Same</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2011 (or current fiscal year) Technology Budget</b>	<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"/>
<b>Fiscal Year 2012 (or next fiscal year) Technology Budget</b>	<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"/>

41. Please indicate in **whole dollars your library's total technology-related operating expenditures** (actual or anticipated) and expenditures from various funding sources for **fiscal year 2011 (or current fiscal year)**. **To the extent possible please EXCLUDE expenditures for staff hardware/software.** NOTE: Report all expenditures in "Local/County" if they cannot be isolated to a particular funding source.

	<b>Fiscal Year 2011 (or current fiscal year) Technology Expense Category</b>			
	<b>Salaries (including benefits)</b>	<b>Outside Vendors</b>	<b>Computer Hardware/ Computer Software</b>	<b>Telecommunications</b>
<b>Source of Funding</b>				
Local/county	\$	\$	\$	\$
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$	\$	\$	\$
Federal	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fees/fines	\$	\$	\$	\$
Donations/local fund raising	\$	\$	\$	\$
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$	\$	\$	\$
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL (all sources)</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$

42. If desired, please provide any additional detail regarding the technology expenditures for your library:

<b>GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS</b>	
<b>Bandwidth/Connectivity Speed</b>	The speed or capacity of a data transmission rate, usually measured in bits per second (i.e., Kbit/s or MBit/s).
<b>Bandwidth Management</b>	A process for measuring, controlling, and managing communications/data transmission of a computer network (e.g., packet shaping, packet prioritizing).
<b>BIP</b>	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.
<b>Broadband</b>	A term used to describe high-speed Internet access.
<b>BTOP</b>	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.
<b>CIPA (Children's Internet Protection Act)</b>	A Federal law requiring the use of filters on public Internet workstations when the library receives either LSTA or E-rate (see below) funds.
<b>Collections</b>	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.
<b>Computer hardware</b>	The physical components that make up a computer.
<b>Computer software</b>	The programs that are run on a computer.
<b>Digital Reference/Virtual Reference</b>	The provision of interactive reference services for patrons via email, chat, or other electronic means.
<b>E-books</b>	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 <a href="http://www.niso.org/emetrics">http://www.niso.org/emetrics</a> ).
<b>E-government</b>	The use of technology, predominantly the Internet, as a means to deliver government services to citizens, businesses, and other entities.
<b>E-rate Funds</b>	Funding provided by the federal government through the Universal Service Fund to libraries to cover expenses associated with Internet access.
<b>Federal Government Revenue</b>	This includes all federal government funds distributed to public libraries for expenditure by the public libraries, including federal money distributed by the state.
<b>Fiber Optic</b>	A high-speed data transmission medium that uses pulses of light.
<b>Firewall</b>	A method for restricting or blocking unauthorized access on a computer network.
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	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).
<b>Formal Technology Training Classes</b>	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

<b>Funding Sources</b>	<p><b>Local/county government</b> - 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><b>State</b> - 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><b>Federal</b> - All federal government funds distributed to the library for expenditure by the library, including federal money distributed by the State.</p>
<b>Hours Open in a Typical Week</b>	If a library is open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, it should report 40 hours per week. Should the library also be open one evening from 7:00PM to 9:00PM, the total hours during which users can find service becomes 42.
<b>Information Technology Training</b>	Formal or informal training sessions that cover specific topics (e.g., Web browser basics, Internet searching, basic computing skills).
<b>Kbps</b>	Kilobits per second.
<b>Library Branch</b>	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.
<b>Library System</b>	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.
<b>Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) State Programs Revenue</b>	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 <a href="http://www.ims.gov/programs/programs.shtm">http://www.ims.gov/programs/programs.shtm</a> )
<b>Licensed Databases</b>	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 <a href="http://www.niso.org/emetrics">http://www.niso.org/emetrics</a> )

## GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS

<b>Local Government Revenue</b>	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.
<b>Mbps</b>	Megabits per second.
<b>“On behalf of”</b>	An outside agency or organization pays directly for the support and no funding passes through the library operating budget.
<b>Online Public Access Catalogs (OPACs)</b>	An electronic catalog of library materials and/or services that patrons can access.
<b>Operating Expenses</b>	<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:  <b>Salaries/benefits</b> - 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><b>Collections</b> - 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><b>Other expenditures</b> - Operating expenditures not included in any other expenditure subcategory. (Also called Miscellaneous Expenditures).</p>
<b>Other Operating Expenditures</b>	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.
<b>Outside Vendor</b>	A service supplier (e.g., technical support, computer repair) who is not directly associated with the library.
<b>PDA (Personal Digital Assistant)</b>	A hand-held computing device.
<b>Public Internet Workstations</b>	Those workstations within the library outlet that provide 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.

## GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS

<b>Recreational gaming</b>	Recreational gaming includes consoles like Xbox, Playstation, or Wii; software like The Sims; or Web sites like Runescape. It does not refer to gambling.
<b>RSS</b>	RSS (or Really Simple Syndication) is a typically free subscription service that syndicates news, video, audio, blog entries, and other content through a standardized, XML format to users. It allows any provider (be it news, corporations, blogs or the government) to provide updates immediately through one channel to users. RSS feeds are universally noted by the symbol  .
<b>State Government Revenue</b>	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).
<b>Technology-Related Expenditures/Technology Budget</b>	<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 FirstSearch or electronic document delivery. Excludes capital expenditures.</p>
<b>Telecommunications</b>	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.
<b>Total Operating BudgetRevenue</b>	This is the sum of Local Government Revenue, State Government Revenue, Federal Government Revenue, and other operating revenue (e.g., fees/fines, grants, etc.).

**GLOSSARY OF SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS/KEY TERMS**

<b>Typical Week</b>	A "typical week" is a time that is neither unusually busy nor unusually slow. Avoid holidays, vacation periods, days when unusual events are taking place in the community or in the library. Choose a week in which the library is open regular hours.
<b>USB (universal serial bus)</b>	A common computer interface for attaching peripherals (e.g., printers) or devices (e.g., flash drives, digital cameras) to a computer.
<b>Wireless (Wi-Fi) Internet Access</b>	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.
<b>Workstation</b>	A computer and related components (including a monitor, keyboard, hard drive, and software) that are capable of displaying graphical images, pictorial representations, and/or other multi-media formats.

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!**

**For questions concerning the survey, please contact:**

**Center for Library & Information Innovation**

College of Information Studies

University of Maryland

4105 Hornbake Building, South Wing

College Park, MD 20742

(301) 405-9445 phone

(301) 314-8620 fax

<support@clii.umd.edu> e-mail