

**From:** Hainer, Gene  
**Sent:** Friday, July 11, 2008 7:10 PM  
**To:** cpld@listserve.com  
**Subject:** public library ILS survey results summary

---

Yesterday, LRS staff and I reviewed the results of the ILS survey that was generated after the Aspen meeting. A summary of highlights is attached. Since too many attachments causes bounce-back, we'll look on Monday into getting the raw data file posted for download.

The data were cc'd to Jamie, who was crucial in coalescing the survey and distributing it to all of you. Many thanks to him, Jim Duncan, Nicolle Steffen, and Zeth Lietzau for the quick turnaround on this. Thanks too to all who responded. This provides much fodder to clarify the ILS feast.

The survey purpose as you recall was two-fold: assess interest in a statewide ILS, and seek answers to what people pay (and would be willing to put toward) such a system. This would set a baseline of both interest, and what level of local support to expect for a cooperative system.

We had several conversations over what the results mean. No doubt you'll find your own meanings, musings, and questions. Here is a short replay of ours (e.g. the digest version of what's attached):

About one-quarter (26 of 115) responded. Two said their ILS would change in the next 12 months. This can be taken two ways. 1) assume that a non-response indicates lack of support for the issue. That's certainly not the case - many issues and circumstances lead to non-response. But reality is that for whatever reason three-quarters didn't put this on the to-do list in the time allotted. 2) assume there is strong interest even from the small response. All but one who answered the question said they'd be willing to participate in a consortial ILS.

This doesn't mean all will be able to actually participate in moving forward, but it suggests that a core of libraries would. Several of the larger systems are represented which would be key. Regarding a timeframe, the majority are seeking ILS changes between 24 and 36+ months from now. So there seems to be time to approach planning methodically over the next 6-12 months since nothing in the survey results indicates an immediate need by a critical mass of libraries.

Another interesting result is the gap between what people are claiming they might invest in a consortial ILS and what they pay now. Even in this snapshot, spending is almost four times what people said they'd be willing to put into a consortial ILS (\$360k vs. \$1.1m). This could be due just not understanding the question, or a lack of data to answer. But if due to unrealistic expectations of what a statewide system will save, then that's something that bears further investigation.

In my response last month to the letter that arrived after the Aspen meeting saying this was a top priority, I agreed; and offered the services of the CSL on possible follow-up activities after these results were known. Conversations on ILS directions are underway in various venues, and will continue to involve key CSL staff in cooperation with other critical library organizations such as CLiC and the Alliance, and of course, library directors or their designated staff as well.

---

*Eugene Hainer, Executive Director*  
*Colorado State Library, CO Dept. of Education*  
*201 E. Colfax #309, Denver, CO 80203*  
*ph. 303.866.6733*  
*fx. 303.866.6940*  
*[hainer\\_g@cde.state.co.us](mailto:hainer_g@cde.state.co.us)*  
*<http://genehainer.blogspot.com> (blog)*