

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 61: Percentage of Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Applied	59.5% (n=320)	28.9% (n=878)	39.8% (n=2172)	37.3% (n=3370)
Another organization applied on the library's behalf	7.4% (n=40)	19.4% (n=589)	14.4% (n=788)	15.7% (n=1417)
Did not apply	30.9% (n=166)	46.9% (n=1422)	41.8% (n=2282)	42.9% (n=3870)
Did not know	2.2% (n=12)	4.7% (n=144)	3.9% (n=214)	4.1% (n=370)

Figure 61 details the library systems that applied for an E-rate discount across metropolitan status. In comparison to 2008-2009, very little has changed overall. The biggest change is that more urban library systems are applying for E-rate discounts than in the past – up to 59.5 percent from 45.8 percent in 2008-2009.

Figure 62: Percentage of Public Library Systems Receiving E-Rate Discount by Category by Metropolitan Status

E-Rate Categories	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Internet Connectivity	70.0% (n=252)	49.8% (n=726)	55.4% (n=1634)	54.8% (n=2612)
Telecommunications services	93.6% (n=337)	83.5% (n=1216)	82.8% (n=2440)	83.8% (n=3993)
Internal connections cost	18.9% (n=68)	9.4% (n=137)	8.4% (n=249)	9.5% (n=454)

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

E-rate discounts in library systems have increased for almost every category across metropolitan status (see Figure 62). The biggest increase can be witnessed in the telecommunications services category, where discounts are up to 83.8 percent overall from 76.0 percent in 2008-2009. There was also a dramatic increase in the Internet connectivity category of E-rate discounts for urban public library systems, jumping to 70.0 percent from the previous 59.6 percent.

Figure 63: Percentage of Public Library Systems that Not Applying for E-Rate Discounts by Metropolitan Status

Reasons	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
The E-rate application process is too complicated	38.4% (n=63)	41.5% (n=584)	41.5% (n=937)	41.4% (n=1584)
The library staff did not feel that the library would qualify	8.5% (n=14)	15.5% (n=218)	13.7% (n=310)	14.2% (n=542)
Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate in the program	36.0% (n=59)	33.8% (n=476)	31.9% (n=720)	32.8% (n=1255)
The library receives E-rate discounts as part of a consortium, so therefore does not apply individually	9.8% (n=16)	11.8% (n=166)	5.3% (n=119)	7.9% (n=301)
The library was denied funding in the past and thus is discouraged from applying in subsequent years	6.1% (n=10)	3.3% (n=47)	3.7% (n=84)	3.7% (n=141)
The library did not apply because of the need to comply with CIPA's (Children's Internet Protection Act) filtering requirements	44.5% (n=73)	30.3% (n=426)	27.6% (n=622)	29.3% (n=1121)
The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	41.0% (n=16)	28.5% (n=102)	29.3% (n=221)	29.4% (n=339)
Other	63.2% (n=24)	73.2% (n=260)	65.9% (n=550)	72.8% (n=834)

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

Figure 63 demonstrates the reasons why library systems did not apply for the E-rate discounts. The three top reasons for not applying for the E-rate discount were that the application process is too complicated (41.4 percent), the total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate (32.8 percent) and that the library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary (29.4 percent). This is a slight deviation from past findings, with more library systems reporting that they have applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer find it necessary barely surpassing the need to comply with CIPA as one of the main reasons for not applying for the E-rate discount. This represents a dramatic increase. In 2008-2009 only 6.4 percent of libraries reported that they had applied for E-rate in the past and no longer find it necessary.

Operating Funding Sources and Expenditures

Figure 64: FY2009 Public Library Systems Operating Funding Sources Received or Anticipated by Metropolitan Status

Sources of Funding	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	93.8% (n=505)	92.5% (n=2806)	92.7% (n=5055)	92.7% (n=8366)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	81.5% (n=438)	77.9% (n=2363)	69.1% (n=3771)	72.8% (n=6573)
Federal	71.1% (n=383)	46.8% (n=1419)	56.4% (n=3076)	54.0% (n=4878)
Fee/fines	83.4% (n=449)	81.6% (n=2475)	78.2% (n=4267)	79.7% (n=7191)
Donations/local fundraising	88.0% (n=473)	86.0% (n=2607)	87.1% (n=4750)	86.7% (n=7830)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	57.8% (n=311)	45.2% (n=1372)	41.9% (n=2289)	44.0% (n=3972)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	67.5% (n=363)	40.9% (n=1240)	49.2% (n=2683)	47.5% (n=4286)

FIGURE 65: FY2010 PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEMS OPERATING FUNDING SOURCES RECEIVED OR ANTICIPATED BY METROPOLITAN STATUS

Sources of Funding	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	91.6% (n=493)	86.6% (n=2626)	84.8% (n=4626)	85.8% (n=7745)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	77.9% (n=419)	71.8% (n=2177)	62.0% (n=3382)	66.2% (n=5977)
Federal	69.8% (n=376)	44.3% (n=1344)	52.2% (n=2848)	50.6% (n=4567)
Fee/fines	81.2% (n=437)	75.9% (n=2302)	72.1% (n=3932)	73.9% (n=6670)
Donations/local fundraising	85.1% (n=458)	79.4% (n=2408)	79.8% (n=4351)	80.0% (n=7217)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	55.8% (n=300)	39.5% (n=1199)	36.9% (n=2014)	38.9% (n=3514)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	60.7% (n=327)	33.5% (n=1015)	41.4% (n=2258)	39.9% (n=3600)

Figures 64 and 65 display the percentages of libraries receiving or expecting operating funds from seven categories of listed sources by fiscal year. From FY2009 to FY2010, there is a noticeable decline across all funding categories and across all libraries, independent of metropolitan status.

Figure 66: FY2010 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased up to 2%	14.5% (n=75)	18.1% (n=532)	17.9% (n=963)	17.8% (n=1570)
Increased 2.1-4%	11.4% (n=59)	12.9% (n=379)	14.9% (n=799)	14.0% (n=1237)
Increased 4.1-6%	2.3% (n=12)	4.1% (n=121)	6.0% (n=324)	5.2% (n=457)
Increased 6.1-10%	3.3% (n=17)	3.0% (n=88)	3.9% (n=212)	3.6% (n=317)
Increased more than 10%	1.9% (n=10)	3.1% (n=92)	3.3% (n=175)	3.1% (n=277)
Decreased up to 2%	6.0% (n=31)	8.2% (n=241)	6.8% (n=368)	7.2% (n=640)
Decreased 2.1-4%	10.1% (n=52)	6.5% (n=192)	5.1% (n=275)	5.9% (n=519)
Decreased 4.1-6%	8.1% (n=42)	4.1% (n=121)	3.6% (n=191)	4.0% (n=354)
Decreased 6.1-10%	13.2% (n=68)	5.8% (n=170)	3.7% (n=200)	5.0% (n=438)
Decreased more than 10%	17.2% (n=89)	11.6% (n=341)	7.3% (n=394)	9.3% (n=824)
Stayed the same	11.4% (n=59)	22.7% (n=670)	27.5% (n=1478)	25.0% (n=2207)

Figure 67: FY2011 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased up to 2%	10.6% (n=52)	17.6% (n=478)	17.5% (n=881)	17.1% (n=1411)
Increased 2.1-4%	8.1% (n=40)	11.4% (n=310)	14.2% (n=713)	12.9% (n=1063)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.3% (n=21)	3.4% (n=92)	5.0% (n=249)	4.4% (n=362)
Increased 6.1-10%	1.4% (n=7)	1.7% (n=47)	2.1% (n=105)	1.9% (n=159)
Increased more than 10%	1.4% (n=7)	1.5% (n=40)	1.3% (n=65)	1.4% (n=112)
Decreased up to 2%	6.3% (n=31)	8.0% (n=218)	5.1% (n=256)	6.1% (n=505)
Decreased 2.1-4%	9.0% (n=44)	6.6% (n=180)	4.5% (n=224)	5.4% (n=448)
Decreased 4.1-6%	9.0% (n=44)	4.9% (n=132)	3.6% (n=182)	4.3% (n=358)
Decreased 6.1-10%	12.0% (n=59)	4.7% (n=128)	3.4% (n=170)	4.3% (n=357)
Decreased more than 10%	12.8% (n=63)	9.4% (n=256)	6.5% (n=329)	7.9% (n=648)
Stayed the same	24.8% (n=122)	30.9% (n=840)	36.9% (n=1853)	34.2% (n=2815)

Figures 66 and 67 display changes in operating budget for public library systems by fiscal year. In FY2010, the majority of public libraries experienced varying degrees of increase in their operating budget with 25 percent reporting the budget remained the same. However, almost 10 percent reported a decrease of 10 percent or more to their operating budget, with 17.2 percent of urban libraries reporting a 10 percent or more budget decrease.

Figure 68: Percentage of Public Library Systems that Anticipate Changes to Its Total Operating Budget for the Current Fiscal Year by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Remain unchanged	37.0% (n=192)	56.0% (n=1649)	55.8% (n=2995)	54.8% (n=4836)
Decrease	43.2% (n=224)	28.3% (n=833)	24.0% (n=1289)	26.6% (n=2346)
Increase	8.5% (n=44)	8.7% (n=256)	13.3% (n=713)	11.5% (n=1013)
Don't Know	11.4% (n=59)	7.0% (n=206)	6.9% (n=373)	7.2% (n=638)

Figure 68 displays whether or not the library system anticipates or has already experienced changes to its total operating budget for the current fiscal year. Overall, the majority of public library systems anticipate that the total operating budget will remain unchanged for the current fiscal year (54.8 percent). A larger number of urban library systems (43.2 percent) by comparison are reporting that they anticipate a decrease in its total operating budget.

Figure 69: FY2010 Overall Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

Sources of Funding	FY2010		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$1,020,545 (n=5,679)	\$195,536 (n=4,729)	\$442,920 (n=4,320)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$205,080 (n=1,059)	\$61,009 (n=1,840)	\$60,784 (n=1,369)
Federal	\$49,019 (n=95)	\$7,601 (n=166)	\$50,358 (n=467)
Fees/fines	\$27,447 (n=407)	\$19,888 (n=1,145)	\$28,912 (n=1,001)
Donations/local fundraising	\$21,718 (n=422)	\$14,003 (n=1,853)	\$24,687 (n=1,457)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$54,227 (n=247)	\$9,972 (n=572)	\$33,729 (n=797)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$25,618 (n=366)	\$12,765 (n=513)	\$15,668 (n=1,305)
Reported average total	\$1,024,856 (n=5,970)	\$199,551 (n=5,614)	\$421,535 (n=5,123)
Reported average percent	62.3%	12.1%	25.6%

Figure 70: FY2011 Overall Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

Sources of Funding	FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$970,967 (n=4,682)	\$188,512 (n=3,919)	\$421,282 (n=3,558)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$214,336 (n=846)	\$49,689 (n=1,431)	\$67,362 (n=1,094)
Federal	\$45,584 (n=65)	\$6,833 (n=109)	\$40,554 (n=342)
Fees/finances	\$33,520 (n=316)	\$19,692 (972)	\$31,584 (n=814)
Donations/local fundraising	\$19,712 (n=318)	\$13,543 (n=1,483)	\$20,974 (n=1,177)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$52,934 (n=201)	\$9,460 (n=458)	\$34,799 (n=559)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$25,485 (n=125)	\$9,898 (n=365)	\$19,764 (n=837)
Reported average total	\$966,713 (n=4,925)	\$183,951 (n=4,663)	\$398,685 (n=4,205)
Reported average percent	62.4%	11.9%	25.7%

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 69 and 70.

Though libraries in the 2008-2009 survey reported anticipated increases for the upcoming fiscal year, Figure 9 shows that average expenditures decreased significantly. Salary expenditures decreased \$657,929, collection expenditures fell \$169,633 and other expenditures went down \$218,480. Figure 70 shows that further decreases are expected.

The most significant differences in funding sources between the 2008-2009 survey and this year were in donations/local fundraising and private foundation grants, which both decreased significantly for all types of expenditure. Funding for salaries from donations/local fundraising went from \$165,614 to \$21,718 and funding from private foundations went from \$253,864 to \$25,618. The most significant increase in funding came from federal funds, which almost doubled for other expenditures and more than quadrupled for salaries.

Despite these significant decreases, the proportion of expenditures remained consistent. Salaries accounted for 62.3 percent (62.5 percent in 2008-2009), collections 12.1 percent (13.7 percent in 2008-2009) and other expenditures 25.6 percent (23.8 percent in 2008-2009).

The average total operating expenditures by metropolitan status reported by libraries for FY2010 and FY2011 are presented in Figures 71-76. The funding and expenditures of all three metropolitan areas are consistent with the overall findings: expenditures have decreased and are expected to decrease in the future.

Figure 71: FY2010 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source			
Sources of Funding	FY2010		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$7,723,125 (n=377)	\$1,403,872 (n=337)	\$3,182,193 (n=334)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$912,580 (n=84)	\$224,125 (n=159)	\$370,762 (n=105)
Federal	\$132,503 (n=16)	\$23,745 (n=9)	\$212,124 (n=51)
Fees/fines	\$337,797 (n=17)	\$163,285 (n=58)	\$180,511 (n=70)
Donations/local fundraising	\$121,588 (n=19)	\$62,663 (n=107)	\$144,842 (n=94)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$276,660 (n=17)	\$26,014 (n=26)	\$208,770 (n=61)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$128,047 (n=17)	\$82,592 (n=33)	\$84,277 (n=86)
Reported average total	\$7,910,684 (n=388)	\$1,463,182 (n=376)	\$3,234,992 (n=86)
Reported average percent	62.7%	11.6%	25.7%

Figure 72: FY2011 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source			
Sources of Funding	FY2011		
	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 73: FY2010 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source			
Sources of Funding	FY2010		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$1,052,875 (n=1,822)	\$186,810 (n=1,618)	\$370,665 (n=1,457)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$187,042 (n=362)	\$73,688 (n=643)	\$46,757 (n=506)
Federal	\$16,702 (n=19)	\$7,469 (n=47)	\$23,580 (n=102)
Fees/fines	\$21,276 (n=149)	\$20,209 (n=414)	\$24,642 (n=364)
Donations/local fundraising	\$24,782 (n=97)	\$17,363 (n=558)	\$23,348 (n=450)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$87,403 (n=78)	\$10,694 (n=173)	\$22,462 (n=265)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$23,211 (n=43)	\$6,928 (n=132)	\$15,613 (n=324)
Reported average total	\$1,044,232 (n=1,916)	\$200,819 (n=1,848)	\$360,454 (n=1,666)
Reported average percent	65.0%	12.5%	22.5%

Figure 74: FY2011 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source			
Sources of Funding	FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$1,035,340 (n=1,448)	\$197,390 (n=1,301)	\$388,001 (n=1,155)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$181,748 (n=279)	\$38,826 (n=487)	\$55,695 (n=395)
Federal	\$6,676 (n=9)	\$8,607 (n=24)	\$21,485 (n=64)
Fees/fines	\$19,338 (n=114)	\$19,895 (n=326)	\$18,871 (n=284)
Donations/local fundraising	\$17,435 (n=73)	\$16,834 (n=419)	\$22,711 (n=343)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$70,194 (n=59)	\$6,588 (n=130)	\$15,007 (n=161)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$13,427 (n=24)	\$7,101 (n=88)	\$14,199 (n=201)
Reported average total	\$1,019,286 (n=1,528)	\$197,747 (n=1,472)	\$374,289 (n=1,318)
Reported average percent	64.1%	12.4%	23.5%

Figure 75: FY2010 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

Sources of Funding	FY2010		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$276,825 (n=3,480)	\$53,743 (n=2,773)	\$123,140 (n=2,529)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$118,952 (n=613)	\$28,142 (n=1,037)	\$27,267 (n=757)
Federal	\$37,454 (n=61)	\$6,371 (n=110)	\$32,971 (n=315)
Fees/fines	\$8,694 (n=240)	\$7,418 (n=674)	\$12,956 (n=566)
Donations/local fundraising	\$14,459 (n=305)	\$8,063 (n=1,189)	\$12,940 (n=914)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$11,480 (n=151)	\$8,509 (n=373)	\$17,338 (n=471)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$13,754 (n=142)	\$8,318 (n=347)	\$9,127 (n=895)
Reported average total	\$286,351 (n=3,666)	\$58,911 (n=3,391)	\$122,312 (n=3,093)
Reported average percent	61.2%	12.6%	26.1%

Figure 76: FY2011 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

Sources of Funding	FY2011		
	Salaries (including benefits)	Collections	Other Expenditures
Local/county	\$256,718 (n=2,932)	\$53,924 (n=2,347)	\$124,087 (n=2,132)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$112,031 (n=499)	\$27,526 (n=818)	\$25,834 (n=622)
Federal	\$47,704 (n=47)	\$6,243 (n=82)	\$11,137 (n=240)
Fees/fines	\$10,738 (n=186)	\$7,559 (n=597)	\$14,648 (n=471)
Donations/local fundraising	\$17,360 (n=231)	\$8,214 (n=979)	\$12,940 (n=914)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$12,260 (n=126)	\$10,248 (n=310)	\$12,800 (n=350)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$16,741 (n=91)	\$7,131 (n=252)	\$16,736 (n=587)
Reported average total	\$265,698 (n=3,086)	\$57,869 (n=2,888)	\$120,263 (n=2,592)
Reported average percent	59.9%	13.0%	27.1%

Information Technology Sources and Expenditures

Figure 77: Public Library System Receipt of “on Behalf of” Financial Support for Technology Expenditures by Metropolitan Status

Financial Support	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The library pays directly for ALL of its technology costs	58.6% (n=286)	54.5% (n=1441)	53.4% (n=2643)	54.0% (n=4,370)
The library pays directly for SOME of its technology costs	39.3% (n=192)	36.3% (n=961)	37.7% (n=1867)	37.3% (n=3,019)
The library does not pay directly for any of its technology costs	2.1% (n=10)	9.2% (n=244)	8.9% (n=443)	8.6% (n=697)

A majority of libraries (54.0 percent) paid for their technology costs with no assistance from another government agency or outside entity (see Figure 77). Just over 37 percent reported receiving some direct support for library technology costs and another 8.6 percent indicated that all technology costs were paid on the library’s behalf; these libraries were more likely to be in suburban and rural communities. The percentage of libraries receiving direct support for all or some of their technology costs was fairly equally distributed among the metropolitan status and poverty level categories.

Figures 78-81 present the detail by metropolitan status of libraries that indicated all or some of their technology costs were paid on their behalf.

Figure 78: FY2010 Overall Public Library Systems Technology Expenses that are Paid by Another Government Office or Organization by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Agency or Organization	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local government (e.g., municipal IT department)	75.6% (n=874)	42.1% (n=486)	62.4% (n=720)	79.8% (n=771)
County government	33.8% (n=411)	16.5% (n=205)	75.5% (n=340)	73.3% (n=330)
Regional library network, cooperative or consortia	33.5% (n=410)	38.8% (n=474)	60.6% (n=740)	55.6% (n=679)
State government (including the state library)	19.2% (n=229)	28.0% (n=334)	48.4% (n=578)	59.2% (n=707)
Private funder (e.g., endowment, board/trustees)	6.6% (n=46)	17.3% (n=119)	87.1% (n=598)	18.5% (n=127)
Other	12.9% (n=65)	20.7% (n=104)	44.6% (n=224)	65.8% (n=331)

Figure 79: FY2010 Urban Public Library Systems Technology Expenses that are Paid by Another Government Office or Organization, by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Agency or Organization	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local government (e.g., municipal IT department)	61.7% (n=51)	40.4% (n=33)	76.6% (n=63)	82.1% (n=56)
County government	27.5% (n=24)	16.7% (n=16)	80.0% (n=28)	65.0% (n=23)
Regional library network, cooperative or consortia	18.8% (n=10)	50.0% (n=28)	56.3% (n=31)	59.4% (n=33)
State government (including the state library)	17.0% (n=14)	34.0% (n=28)	51.1% (n=42)	51.1% (n=42)
Private funder (e.g., endowment, board/trustees)	7.7% (n=3)	19.2% (n=9)	84.6% (n=38)	7.7% (n=3)
Other	9.1% (n=2)	18.2% (n=3)	36.4% (n=7)	81.8% (n=16)

Urban libraries reported greater levels of “on behalf of support” in all categories (see Figure 79). Urban libraries reported particularly strong growth in “on behalf support” from local and county government, particularly for hardware/software and telecommunications expenses. 76.6 percent of urban libraries reported receiving local government support for hardware/software expenses (up from 45.5 percent in 2008-2009) and 82.1 percent reported receiving local government support for telecommunications expenses (up from 42.7 percent in 2008-2009). 80 percent of urban libraries reported receiving support for hardware/software expenses from the county government (up from 9.8 percent in 2008-2009) and 65 percent reported receiving support for telecommunications expenses from the county government (up from 9.7 percent in 2008-2009).

Figure 80: FY2010 Suburban Public Library Systems Technology Expenses that are Paid by Another Government Office or Organization by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Agency or Organization	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local government (e.g., municipal IT department)	73.7% (n=324)	45.7% (n=201)	67.2% (n=296)	86.2% (n=296)
County government	26.1% (n=109)	14.5% (n=62)	78.0% (n=109)	76.3% (n=106)
Regional library network, cooperative or consortia	42.5% (n=213)	37.7% (n=189)	67.5% (n=338)	66.0% (n=331)
State government (including the state library)	17.9% (n=62)	23.4% (n=80)	46.9% (n=161)	61.4% (n=211)
Private funder (e.g., endowment, board/trustees)	6.1% (n=9)	18.2% (n=28)	95.5% (n=149)	10.6% (n=17)
Other	8.7% (n=9)	26.1% (n=28)	45.7% (n=50)	63.0% (n=69)

Suburban libraries also reported higher levels of “on behalf support” for technology expenses in all categories (see Figure 80). While increases across many categories were rather dramatic, some of the most notable increases were seen in support for hardware/software expenses. Whereas suburban libraries received nearly half the support that urban libraries did for local government support of hardware/software expenses in 2008-2009, this year the suburban

libraries made significant gains, with 67.2 percent reporting local government support for hardware/software expenses as compared to 76.6 percent for urban libraries. 78 percent of suburban libraries also reported county government support for hardware/software expenses, up from 7.7 percent in 2008-2009. Private funder support for hardware/software expenses also increased from 14.3 percent in 2008-2009 to 95.5 percent this year.

Figure 81: FY2008 Rural Public Library Systems Technology Expenses that are Paid by Another Government Office or Organization by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Agency or Organization	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local government (e.g., municipal IT department)	78.7% (n=499)	39.9% (n=252)	57.2% (n=361)	75.6% (n=420)
County government	39.1% (n=277)	17.6% (n=128)	73.7% (n=203)	72.9% (n=200)
Regional library network, cooperative or consortia	28.1% (n=186)	38.6% (n=256)	55.8% (n=371)	47.4% (n=315)
State government (including the state library)	20.0% (n=154)	29.4% (n=330)	48.8% (n=375)	59.1% (n=454)
Private funder (e.g., endowment, board/trustees)	6.7% (n=33)	16.8% (n=82)	84.6% (n=410)	22.1% (n=107)
Other	14.3% (n=54)	19.3% (n=72)	44.7% (n=168)	65.8% (n=247)

Rural libraries also reported significant gains in support for hardware/software funding (see Figure 81): Over three times as many libraries reported receiving local government support (57.2 percent in 2009-2010 versus 17.6 percent in 2008-2009), ten times as many libraries reported receiving county support (73.7 percent in 2009-2010 versus 7.2 in 2008-2009), three times as many libraries reported receiving support from regional library networks (55.8 percent in 2009-2010 versus 17.6 percent in 2008-2009), cooperatives or consortia, three times as many libraries reported receiving support from state governments (48.8 percent in 2009-2010 versus 16.1 percent in 2008-2009) and five times as many libraries reported receiving support from private funders (84.6 percent in 2009-2010 versus 15.8 percent in 2008-2009). Rural libraries also reported three times as much support for salaries from local governments (78.7 percent in 2009-2010 versus 23.5 percent in 2008-2009).

Overall, libraries continued to report the least “on behalf of” support for outside vendor agreements supporting technology, absorbing those costs within the library’s operating budget.

Figure 82: FY2010 Public Library Systems Technology Budget Change by Metropolitan Status				
Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased up to 2%	11.4% (n=54)	13.3% (n=343)	12.5% (n=613)	12.7% (n=1,010)
Increased 2.1-4%	10.3% (n=49)	7.2% (n=187)	7.5% (n=366)	7.6% (n=602)
Increased 4.1-6%	2.6% (n=12)	3.1% (n=80)	3.8% (n=184)	3.5% (n=277)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.8% (n=23)	2.2% (n=57)	2.9% (n=142)	2.8% (n=222)
Increased more than 10%	7.4% (n=35)	6.7% (n=173)	7.1% (n=345)	7.0% (n=553)
Decreased up to 2%	5.5% (n=26)	5.1% (n=132)	3.2% (n=158)	4.0% (n=317)
Decreased 2.1-4%	3.7% (n=17)	2.7% (n=71)	1.6% (n=79)	2.1% (n=168)
Decreased 4.1-6%	3.7% (n=17)	3.0% (n=78)	1.3% (n=63)	2.0% (n=158)
Decreased 6.1-10%	2.2% (n=10)	3.3% (n=85)	2.2% (n=107)	2.6% (n=203)
Decreased more than 10%	14.3% (n=68)	7.8% (n=201)	5.2% (n=256)	6.6% (n=526)
Stayed the same	34.2% (n=162)	45.5% (n=1,173)	52.7% (n=2,578)	49.2% (n=3,914)
Key: -- No data to report * Insufficient data to report				

Overall, reported technology operating budgets are declining. Increased technology budgets dropped seven percentage points from the 2008-2009 survey, while decreased technology budgets rose two points (see Figure 82). The biggest drop were libraries that reported an increase up to 2 percent in their technology budgets, falling from 20.1 percent last year to 12.7 percent in the current study. Due to economic cuts and recessionary spending, the current survey included an additional response options for technology budgets that increased or decreased more than 10 percent. Approximately 7 percent of urban, suburban, and rural libraries reported increases of more than 10 percent in technology expenditures (7.4 percent, 6.7 percent, and 7.1 percent, respectively). The highest percentages amongst libraries with decreased budgets are reported at greater than 10 percent; 14.3 percent of urban libraries, 7.8 percent of suburban libraries, and 5.2 percent of rural libraries have decreased technology budgets at 10 percent or greater.

Figure 83: FY2011 Public Library Systems Anticipated Technology Budget Change by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased up to 2%	7.7% (n=35)	17.2% (n=423)	13.1% (n=611)	14.1% (n=1,069)
Increased 2.1-4%	10.4% (n=47)	7.9% (n=194)	9.3% (n=431)	8.9% (n=672)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.2% (n=19)	4.1% (n=102)	4.1% (n=189)	4.1% (n=310)
Increased 6.1-10%	3.1% (n=14)	2.1% (n=52)	3.1% (n=144)	2.8% (n=211)
Increased more than 10%	5.8% (n=26)	4.2% (n=104)	5.6% (n=259)	5.1% (n=389)
Decreased up to 2%	3.5% (n=16)	4.9% (n=121)	3.1% (n=144)	3.7% (n=281)
Decreased 2.1-4%	3.8% (n=17)	2.8% (n=69)	1.6% (n=72)	2.1% (n=158)
Decreased 4.1-6%	4.2% (n=19)	3.2% (n=78)	1.7% (n=79)	2.3% (n=177)
Decreased 6.1-10%	4.2% (n=19)	2.2% (n=54)	2.1% (n=96)	2.2% (169)
Decreased more than 10%	10.4% (n=47)	6.6% (n=163)	4.5% (n=210)	5.5% (n=420)
Stayed the same	42.7% (n=194)	44.7% (n=1,098)	52.0% (n=2,424)	49.1% (n=3,715)
Key: -- No data to report * Insufficient data to report				

Libraries were also asked to report anticipated increase or decrease in the technology budgets of the upcoming fiscal year 2011 (see Figure 83). Similar to the reported changes in current technology budgets, anticipated change in increases is 8 percent and anticipated decreases is 2.3 percent, overall. Urban libraries expect the greatest decrease in FY2011 budgets with 10.4 percent reporting a decrease of greater than 10 percent.

Figure 84: FY2010 Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$131,228 (n=2,114)	\$33,856 (n=2,150)	\$38,025 (n=3,645)	\$20,376 (n=3,258)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$46,532 (n=303)	\$11,076 (n=302)	\$22,034 (n=570)	\$21,038 (n=396)
Federal	\$31,649 (n=31)	\$24,277 (n=32)	\$32,590 (n=80)	\$34,198 (n=342)
Fees/fines	\$3,631 (n=129)	\$3,760 (n=143)	\$5,735 (n=195)	\$5,295 (n=125)
Donations/local fundraising	\$6,293 (n=123)	\$14,917 (n=150)	\$4,694 (n=734)	\$16,297 (n=125)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$10,780 (n=61)	\$8,947 (n=61)	\$7,855 (n=231)	\$13,501 (n=140)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$6,300 (n=88)	\$6,825 (n=117)	\$8,173 (n=1,348)	\$18,176 (n=107)
Reported average total	\$236,413	\$103,658	\$119,106	\$128,881
Reported average percent	40.2%	17.6%	20.3%	21.9%

Note: Low item response can influence the reported average.

This is the fourth year that libraries reported technology-related operating expenditures by fiscal year. For the last two reporting cycles, FY2009 & FY2010, 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.

Salaries are among the most volatile technology-related expenditure with libraries reporting an average total of \$236,413 in the current survey as compared to last year’s average \$117,087 (see Figure 84). In FY2009 data indicated modest increases in these expenditure in salaries, while in FY2010 salaries increased over 100 percent. Local and county expenditures on technology-related salaries remain relatively stable increasing only \$30,445. Other categories such as grants for salaries increased greatly from \$682 to \$10,780 in government grants and \$656 to \$6,300 in private grants.

Federal monies represent the largest source of increase in technology-related expenditures across categories going up \$31,134 in salaries, \$22,235 in outside vendor costs, \$23,997 in hardware and software expenditures, and \$17,951 in telecommunications equipment.

The largest reported decrease was in local/county funding for hardware/software costs down \$2,411 from \$40,436 in FY2009 to \$38,025 in FY2010. Local/county funding also decreased in telecommunication equipment dropping \$1,635 from \$22,011 in FY2009 to \$20,376 in FY2010.

Figures 85-87 present this same data by library metropolitan status.

Figure 85: FY2010 Urban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$507,636 (n=262)	\$179,267 (n=183)	\$244,461 (n=293)	\$127,012 (n=267)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$99,347 (n=19)	\$55,465 (n=21)	\$127,225 (n=54)	\$198,716 (n=26)
Federal	\$100,167 (n=5)	\$166,103 (n=3)	\$161,887 (n=12)	\$202,793 (n=45)
Fees/fines	\$24,435 (n=7)	\$25,774 (n=7)	\$32,494 (n=12)	\$17,218 (n=7)
Donations/local fundraising	\$125,156 (n=3)	\$354,827 (n=5)	\$26,784 (n=37)	\$343,669 (n=5)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$52,353 (n=7)	\$48,430 (n=7)	\$29,114 (n=16)	\$61,021 (n=7)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$5,411 (n=10)	\$24,340 (n=14)	\$44,237 (n=96)	\$188,402 (n=9)
Reported average total	\$914,505	\$854,206	\$666,202	\$1,138,831
Reported average percent	25.6%	23.9%	18.6%	31.9%
Note: Low item response can influence the reported average.				

Figure 86: FY2010 Suburban Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$110,522 (n=714)	\$35,336 (n=743)	\$34,050 (n=1,237)	\$18,349 (n=1,114)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$50,269 (n=114)	\$5,950 (n=118)	\$14,942 (n=194)	\$7,733 (n=135)
Federal	*	*	\$14,742 (n=26)	\$6,158 (n=62)
Fees/fines	\$1,851 (n=69)	\$3,725 (n=71)	\$4,956 (n=92)	\$5,264 (n=83)
Donations/local fundraising	\$2,879 (n=21)	\$1,687 (n=40)	\$6,538 (n=170)	\$3,739 (n=28)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$2,042 (n=14)	\$5,659 (n=19)	\$7,536 (n=73)	\$7,675 (n=38)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$6,550 (n=14)	\$3,785 (n=21)	\$7,572 (n=312)	\$3,763 (n=14)
Reported average total	\$181,363	\$66,289	\$90,336	\$52,681
Reported average percent	46.4%	17.0 %	23.1%	13.5%
Key: * Insufficient data to report				
Note: Low item response can influence the reported average.				

Figure 87: FY2010 Rural Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures by Type and Funding Source

FY2010				
Sources of Funding	Salaries (including benefits)	Outside Vendors	Hardware/Software	Telecommunications
Local/county	\$57,518 (n=1,137)	\$11,160 (n=1,224)	\$11,692 (n=2,114)	\$6,389 (n=1,876)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	\$38,073 (n=170)	\$9,090 (n=163)	\$8,602 (n=322)	\$8,883 (n=235)
Federal	\$20,035 (n=21)	\$5,436 (n=21)	\$5,975 (n=42)	\$8,996 (n=235)
Fees/fines	\$3,196 (n=54)	\$1,441 (n=65)	\$2,926 (n=91)	\$2,986 (n=35)
Donations/local fundraising	\$2,793 (n=98)	\$3,006 (n=105)	\$2,559 (n=527)	\$1,345 (n=91)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	\$6,579 (n=40)	\$2,836 (n=35)	\$5,668 (n=142)	\$12,334 (n=96)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	\$6,392 (n=63)	\$4,617 (n=82)	\$4,684 (n=939)	\$2,895 (n=84)
Reported average total	\$134,586	\$37,586	\$42,106	\$43,828
Reported average percent	52.1%	14.6%	16.3%	17.0%

Note: Low item response can influence the reported average.

In rural libraries, not surprisingly, salaries for technology staff increased about 170 percent, especially in state support rising from \$9,308 in FY2009 to \$38,073 in FY2010 (see Figure 87). Similarly, suburban libraries saw the greatest increase in state-supported salaries jumping from \$13,745 to \$50,269 (see Figure 86). Urban libraries saw increases across all categories, but especially in federal support increasing average salaries from \$3,017 to \$100,167, vendors costs from \$14,806 to \$166,103, hardware/software expenditures from \$50,758 to \$161,887, and telecommunications equipment from \$125,127 to \$202,793 (see Figure 85).