

National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment (NILPPA): Phase 2

The American Library Association (ALA) seeks **\$498,805** in IMLS National Leadership Research in Service to Practice funding for a three-year grant to conduct Phase 2 exploratory research of the National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment (NILPPA). In this first-of-its-kind project, ALA will bring together a network of researchers, practitioner-researchers, and advisors to implement a comprehensive research strategy to understand and document the characteristics, audiences, outcomes, and value of U.S. library programming.

Building on ALA's previous IMLS-supported research, NILPPA Phase 2 will take the next steps in developing a foundational and actionable understanding of library programming by exploring what impact looks like for libraries and communities and how libraries partner with other organizations and leaders to achieve that impact. Our central research questions are:

Research Question #1: What key indicators can demonstrate the local, state, and national impacts of library programming? These indicators will be heavily informed by the program dimensions identified in NILPPA Phase 1 and will continue to refine them.

Research Question #2: How can we describe and categorize the range of community partnership models used by libraries, taking into account shifts in service delivery that have emerged during the COVID-19 era?

This project aligns with IMLS's agency-level goal to build capacity. Building the field's understanding of library programming and its commitment to teaching programming skills to today's and tomorrow's library professionals will help libraries strategically serve their communities and achieve their goals.

Our methodological framework is consensus-driven and participatory to ensure that perspectives of the full breadth of library practitioners are brought into the process. Our goal will be the creation of a suite of tools and indicators that support sub-populations, engage members of culturally diverse groups to clarify information relevant to their needs, and produce results that focus on increased social justice in representation across the program.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL NEED

This project will conduct foundational research, documenting and illuminating the potential of library programs to fortify libraries, strengthen communities, and improve lives. In Phase 1, the research identified [nine competencies](#) of effective library programs and put forth a [multidimensional framework](#) depicting the current state of library programming. Scholarly and practitioner response to Phase 1 (May 2019) have been strong: peer-reviewed articles were published in the [Journal of Education for Library and Information Science](#) and [Library Quarterly](#); NILPPA.org has received more than 17,000 pageviews; and the white paper and practitioner tools have been downloaded more than 2,700 times and received hundreds of social media responses. NILPPA practitioner-researcher-led webinars have been viewed approximately 1,000 times since their June 2019 air dates. Finally, NILPPA Phase 1 has brought the significance of library programming into the mainstream of library research, spurring related research (e.g. the IMLS-funded project *A Taxonomy of Black History Month Programming*) and citations in numerous journal articles.

Phase 2 will explore and document the ways that libraries partner for community impact, with focus on the innovative partnerships forged and developed during the COVID-19 crisis, and will capture the indicators that contribute to impact. In the past year of acute crisis, we have seen large shifts in the specific needs that

communities around the US are facing, but we have not seen a shift in the need for libraries themselves. Many libraries were able to respond flexibly to COVID-related challenges — for example, pivoting rapidly to a virtual and socially distanced programming and service delivery model — in large part due to partnerships that expanded capacity of both libraries and other organizations. Understanding just how well libraries were able to respond to those needs requires consistent ideas of what and how to measure, something that has not yet been explored in the field. This research will look back at the historic pandemic moment to study the mechanisms and relationships that enabled libraries/library workers to adapt to such unforeseen challenges, and will provide a national standard for measuring libraries' programming impact.

PROJECT DESIGN

Background: NILPPA Phase 1 (2017-19)

NILPPA Phase 1, completed in 2019, addressed two foundational research questions: “*How can we characterize and categorize public programs offered by libraries today?*” and “*What competencies and training are required for professionals working with library programming today?*” The findings, reported in a comprehensive report, an ALA white paper¹, and two peer-reviewed articles², established the foundation for subsequent work, as described in the following research plan.

Phase 1 produced two main outputs: a categorization framework of public programs (“Program Dimensions,” page 3) and a set of nine skill areas required for effective public programming (“Library Programming Competencies,” page 3). We turned each of these outputs into an easy-to-understand visual tool, disseminated widely to practitioners through blogs, webinars, and conferences.

Program Dimensions: Phase 1 introduced a framework that identifies the primary and sub-dimensions of library programs, *including library profile, program characteristics, program audience, and program administration*. Through surveys and case studies of library public programs across library types, Phase 1 researchers assembled a baseline list of current intended outcomes for programs: *participants learn new knowledge; participants learn new skills; participants change their attitudes; participants change their behaviors; participants gain awareness of library resources, services, or programs; participants have fun or are inspired; and, together, libraries and participants build stronger and healthier communities*.

The research team developed the program dimensions through a robust mixed-methods, iterative, and sequential methodological approach that engaged library expert panels and solicited broad input from across the library field. Engagement was highly representative of library types and communities and employed a validity survey and case studies. The inherent adaptability of the framework — as well as its outcome-centric design — ensures that the program dimensions will continue to reflect the diversity of programming, even as programs' content and nature will change over time.

¹ Sheppard, B., Flinner, K., Norlander, R.J., & Fournier, M.D. (2019.) *National Impact of Library Public Programs Assessment: Phase 1, A White Paper on the Dimensions of Library Programs & the Skills and Training for Library Program Professionals*. Chicago: American Library Association & New Knowledge Organization Ltd.

² Norlander, R.J., Barchas-Lichtenstein, J., Fraser, J., Davis-Fournier, M., Voiklis, J. & Danter, E. (In press). *Getting consensus about competencies: What's needed for effective library programs*. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*. 61(2).

What Makes a Library Program?

DIMENSION		PRIMARY SUBDIMENSION	OTHER SUBDIMENSIONS
LIBRARY PROFILE		Library Type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Academic K-12 Special 	Library Subtype Geographic Area Community Demographics Library Size and Capacity
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS		Primary Intended Outcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants learn new knowledge Participants learn new skills Participants change their attitudes Participants change their behaviors Participants gain awareness of library resources, services, or programs Participants have fun or are inspired Together, libraries and communities build stronger and healthier communities 	Program Topic Program Format Location Deliverer Program Frequency
PROGRAM AUDIENCE		Audience Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appealing to a library's entire audience Appealing to a subset of the library's entire audience 	Target Audience Demographics Actual Audience Demographics
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION		Development Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed by the library itself Developed by or with a community partner Developed by a national or regional organization 	Funding (library, patron, partner, etc.) Specific Sponsors or Partners

FIGURES:
 Program Dimensions (top) and
 Library Programming Competencies
 (bottom), NILPPA Phase 1

Library Programming Competencies



Library Programming Competencies: Phase 1 also named nine core competency areas — *knowledge of the community, interpersonal skills, creativity, content knowledge, evaluation, financial skills, outreach and marketing, event planning and organizational skills* — that, together, encompass the unique skill set required of library programming professionals.

Researchers surveyed and interviewed library programming professionals from all library types, representing a broad spectrum of service communities, to learn where and how they gained the skills needed to do their jobs. The findings indicated that, unlike other areas of library service, the skills needed to deliver great programs are often acquired at different career points and often in ad hoc circumstances. Likewise, many aspects of library programming have developed through situational necessity and happenstance. Other notable findings included:

- 50 of the 58 masters-level library degree programs offered courses that address programming. However, no university required students to take these courses; all were offered as electives.
- 93 percent of respondents said they learned to run programs on the job, 62 percent from colleagues, and 74 percent from other informal learning. Half of survey respondents said they learned programming skills in their degree program.

The original nine competencies have required supplemental clarification following their initial publication, largely due to new questions and skills that came to light during the pandemic (e.g., the growing importance of skills related to running effective online programs). The competencies are currently being refined through another IMLS-funded project (*Skills for 21st-Century Librarians: Task Force for the Development of a NILPPA-Informed Programming Librarian Curriculum*) that supports a working group of library leaders in developing recommendations for a new programming curriculum for library students and practitioners, based on the findings of NILPPA Phase 1.

Phase 2 Research Plan

The Phase 2 research plan recognizes the profound effect on library workers and library patrons in the COVID-19 era. It augments the findings of Phase 1 and applies its tested foundational approach to the goals of Phase 2: developing key impact indicators and building successful library and community partnerships. Together with Knology and 10 researchers/advisors, we will ask the following research questions:

Research Question #1: What key indicators can demonstrate the local, state, and national impacts of library programming? These indicators will be heavily informed by the program dimensions identified in NILPPA Phase 1 and will continue to refine them.

Research Question #2: How can we describe and categorize the range of community partnership models used by libraries, taking into account shifts in service delivery that have emerged during the COVID-19 era?

Research Team: In Phase 2, Knology (formerly NewKnowledge) will again be an important partner. A non-profit research organization that produces practical social science for a better world, Knology works to create inclusive, informed, and cooperative societies that can thrive together with the natural systems on which we all depend. Key Knology team members will include President & CEO John Fraser, Researchers Jena Barchas-Lichtenstein and Rebecca Joy Norlander; and Research Fellow Beverly Sheppard.

Phase 2 advisors will examine proposed research questions and instruments, review findings for each research activity, review overall deliverables, author blog posts, and participate in dissemination and presentation of

research findings. They will also participate in virtual workshops to inform our study of indicators, as described below. The following individuals — carefully identified for broad representation in library type, library size, geographic location, community size and demographics, urban/rural representation, experience, research focus, race and ethnic diversity, and other criteria — have been invited to serve as advisors. Fifty percent of the proposed advisor team identify as BIPOC, and we have near equal representation among researchers and practitioners. (See advisor bios in Supporting Doc 2)

- **Jennifer Weil Arns**, Associate Professor, University of South Carolina (NILPPA Phase 1 advisor)
- **Cassandra Barnett**, Program Advisor for School Libraries, Arkansas State Board of Education
- **Adriana Blancarte-Hayward**, Outreach Manager, New York Public Library (Advisor, New Americans Library Project)
- **Terrilyn Chun**, Deputy Director, Multnomah County Library, Portland, OR (Advisor, NILPPA Phase 1)
- **Adrienne Coffey**, Director, Nenana Public Library, Nenana, AK (population: 341)
- **Nicole A. Cooke**, Augusta Baker Endowed Chair and Associate Professor, University of South Carolina (Task Force Member, *Skills for 21st-Century Librarians: Task Force for the Development of a NILPPA-Informed Programming Librarian Curriculum*)
- **Teri Embrey**, Director of Library Services, Pritzker Military Library, Chicago, IL
- **Jody Gray**, Director, Office for Diversity & Inclusion, University of Minnesota College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences; Office for Diversity & Inclusion and Representative, American Indian Library Association
- **Manju Prasad-Rao**, Head, Instructional Media Center, Long Island University-LIU Post Campus (Advisor, NILPPA Phase 1)
- **Crystal Schimpf**, Public Library Specialist, Leadership and Community Development, Colorado State Library

Methodology: As in Phase 1, Phase 2 will employ a mixed-methods model using complementary types of data collection. Each research question corresponds to one main research “activity” — described in detail below — which then breaks down further into multiple steps to allow for triangulation of findings. Our planned research includes workshops, a survey, and a series of focus groups, aimed at validity testing of research findings with the field.

Our process is shaped by the Transformative Paradigm, a research framework of belief systems focused on social justice that engages members of culturally diverse groups³⁴. To be successful, the research must account for cultural norms, language, and power differentials that exist among programming professionals and the service communities they support. The project explicitly focuses on an inclusive model for identifying contrasting perspectives. It also supports the inclusion of minority voices and concerns in a suite of indicators and representations. Our strategy seeks to explicitly acknowledge the challenge of achieving inclusive representation in the data without defaulting to any majority dominating representation of the whole. Our effort focuses on creating a suite of tools and indicators that serve to support sub-populations, engage members of culturally diverse groups to clarify information relevant to their needs, and to produce results that focus on increased social justice in representation across the program.

³ Mertens, Donna M. "Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice." *Journal of mixed methods research* 1.3 (2007): 212-225.

⁴ Mertens, Donna M. "Transformative mixed methods research." *Qualitative inquiry* 16, no. 6 (2010): 469-474.

Activity #1: Developing Impact Indicators

Anecdotally, we know that public programs can yield real-world changes for library communities, but it's not always clear what data is needed to indicate that a change is actually occurring. We can think of "indicators" as the link between data collection and demonstrating impact. An example of an indicator would be "libraries increased their virtual program offerings" or "library staff members felt more supported to implement new programs."

Increasingly, through initiatives such as the Public Library Association and Association of College & Research Library's Project Outcome platforms and the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies' Measures that Matter effort, the library field is developing more sophisticated ways of tracking or "indicating" those changes. We propose developing impact indicators that complement and build on what is currently used by libraries through these other valuable initiatives. The indicators we develop will take into account the work of both Project Outcome and Measures that Matter, aimed at capturing impact across all library types related to democracy, social issues, civic concerns, etc. We also have representation on our advisor team by an individual (Crystal Schimpf, Colorado State Library) who was involved with both Project Outcome and Measures that Matter research and evaluation initiatives.

To develop a set of impact indicators informed by the Program Dimensions resulting from NILPPA Phase 1, we will start with an assessment of what we have learned over the eight-year course of NILPPA research to date, current awareness of gaps, and then reach out to the members of the advisory group who can speak to the diversity of the field. This effort will produce a tentative set of indicators or indicator categories. We will then convene a virtual workshop starting with this set to enumerate a more comprehensive set of indicators. The comprehensive set will include two types of indicators: (1) those that can represent the programming field as a whole and (2) the unique indicators that represent programming based on type, library focus, or audience.

The virtual workshop will use a series of group discussions and break-out activities to develop a comprehensive list of potential indicators, seeking to be inclusive in the assessment. To achieve this goal, the diversity of our advisory group will help compare across experiences and populations, audiences, and library type. We will facilitate two half-day virtual workshops, considering such questions as:

- Whose reality is privileged by different indicators?
- What mechanisms can we use to challenge what we, as professionals, believe to be evidence of our impact?
- How can we, as a field, ensure that we are not privileging the library's perspective at the expense of the service population?
- What are the consequences of a failure to collect some indicators? Could the omission result in community concerns being suppressed or neglected in future data-informed decision making?
- What indicators and sources of data would library workers consider ethical to use?

After these workshops, we will assess the validity of these potential measures (and the results of the study described in the following section) through a survey deployed to programming professionals working in the different types of libraries across the nation. We will use a stratified sampling frame to ensure we include practitioners who represent the unique conditions of different library types, settings, and audiences. This stratification frame assures input essential to our understanding of the needs and views of multiple sub-groups.

This validation process will occur through a two-step process. We will ensure that different voices are represented by disseminating the survey to the following groups:

- Grantees (n = approximately 650) working in public, college, school, and special libraries who have received funding as part of ALA's *Libraries Transforming Communities: Focus on Small and Rural Libraries* initiative, via an online community forum post
- Members (n = approximately 20,000) of ALA's Programming Librarian Facebook Interest Group, via an invitation post
- Members of the ALA affiliate American Indian Library Association (AILA), serving tribal library communities
- Members (n = approximately 9,000) of the ALA division Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)
- Members (n = approximately 6,000) of the ALA division American Association of School Librarians (AASL)
- Members (n = approximately 12,000) of the Special Libraries Association (SLA)

To ensure distribution of respondents, the survey will ask respondents to identify their region and special interest/urban/suburban/rural/exurban/campus/tribal lands identification of the respondent's service community. As this is a validity survey, we will work carefully to ensure that all groups' concerns and values are reflected in the final suite of indicators. As a principle of the Transformative Paradigm, the final results will include specific items important to represent cultural concerns or issues important to minority voices. We also note that the survey itself may include self-identification data to explore any further concerns that can be addressed and given voice in the final recommendations.

As we anticipate the possibility for under-representation of certain groups of practitioners using this survey approach, and consistent with the principles of the Transformative Paradigm noted earlier, we will follow up using purposeful interviews with at least four representatives of each such group to identify any overlooked concerns.

Activity #2: Understanding Community Partnerships

Results from NILPPA Phase 1 and ALA's 2019 *New Americans Library Project White Paper* identified that library partnerships "*with other community-based organizations enrich and expand service to both of their communities. Mutual benefits are well documented. Both entities enjoy increased capacity, and community members acknowledge that they receive better services and resources.*" The New Americans Library Project identified five broad categories for these programs⁵:

1. **Parallel services:** Libraries and partner organizations work on the same issues or topics in parallel but do not collaborate directly. In these cases, libraries and community organizations are often aware of each other's resources and may refer patrons to one another.
2. **Library as space:** Libraries provide space for programs or events, and partner organizations take the lead in other aspects of the program.

⁵ Kate Flinner, Rebecca Joy Norlander, Kathryn Nock, Joanna Laursen Brucker, & Melanie Welch. *Library Programs & New Americans: A White Paper*. NewKnowledge Publication #NPO.074.518.03. Chicago: American Library Association & New Knowledge Organization Ltd., 2019.

3. **Space plus:** In addition to hosting programs in library space, libraries provide additional resources such as volunteer time or outreach materials. However, partner organizations continue to take the lead.
4. **Library as collaborator:** Libraries and community organizations work together closely to provide programs and services. While staff members from nearly all locations identified this partnership model as the ideal, not all of them are able to implement it in practice due to constraints on time and resources. Programs in this category may take place inside or outside the library. For example, offsite programs may include pop-up health clinics that also provided an opportunity to sign up for a library card, or a food pantry whose baskets included free books.
5. **Library as implementer:** In this model, libraries use a curriculum developed by a partner organization but are responsible for all other elements of the program. The partner organization may provide training or support or may be entirely hands-off.

Unfortunately, there is little to no research on how to assess the affordances of each program partnership model as part of an organizational strategy. Furthermore, few institutions have formalized how to assess their programming efforts across different partnership models to determine if their current mix meets the needs of their service community. NILPPA Phase 2 will build on this initial research and develop a more detailed description of partnership models, according to library type and service population (e.g., academic, public, specialty, and/or specific cultural user needs, such as faith communities, Deaf populations, immigrant groups, etc.). It will further examine how partnerships may continue to influence programming after the pandemic, virtual or in-person.

We will use the same targeted surveying approach described as part of Activity #1 to explore partnership models. Only one survey will be created and disseminated, including questions for Activity #1 and #2. Using skip logic, we can ensure that respondents only see questions relevant to their experience. The survey will ask respondents if they would be willing to engage in a focus group in exchange for a small incentive. Contact information will subsequently be disassociated from survey results, and all findings will be reported anonymously.

Once we have defined partnership models based on survey data, we will purposefully recruit participants into a series of virtual focus groups according to a maximum variation sampling of survey respondents who provided us with contact information. Each focus group of 6 to 8 participants will discuss a different partnership model. Focus groups will engage library staff from across the range of library types, settings, and service population so researchers can identify: 1) how these models adapt and shift; 2) what commonalities remain consistent across partnership needs; and 3) what unique attributes exist among service variations. This research will enhance understanding of how variation among adaptations responds to individual library needs.

Use Cases

The outputs of Phase 2 Research Question #1 (Indicators) will provide a national standard for measuring and comparing the results achieved by a library's programming services. When libraries know and understand how to apply the indicators of program success across their programs, they will be better positioned to track the depth and richness of data that serves both libraries and their community partners. Libraries will be also empowered to use the national standards to make decisions about identifying, selecting, and prioritizing strategies to work with potential community partners in ways that produce the highest-value opportunities for their communities (Research Question #2, Partnerships). When libraries better understand which partnership models are most effective in which situations, they can make more informed decisions about how to spend valuable staff time, budgets, and professional development investments.

As in Phase 1, ALA and Knology will prioritize the creation of practitioner tools that make NILPPA’s findings directly applicable for library workers. While we cannot say with certainty what those tools will be until we conduct the research, we expect brief, downloadable, actionable tools that can be incorporated into professional development or staff meetings. For example, a potential tool might be a worksheet to assess the strength of a potential organizational partnership.

These practitioner tools will have multiple benefits for library programming specialists. They will inform discussions and findings shared between programming professionals; support benchmarking between different service communities; and enrich professional dialogues about how to shift or respond to changing community needs. Based on the uptake of the results from Phase 1, we believe that library practitioners will take a strong interest in the professional development tools we create in Phase 2.

Dissemination

Inclusive dissemination to academics and practitioners in the library field and related fields will be a critical component of Phase 2. Results will be publicly available. ALA staff will disseminate findings throughout the project term, including periodic blog posts authored by project advisors on topics relevant to library practitioners. Examples may include descriptions of creative library partnership models or partner organizations’ recommendations to library workers. Blog posts will be published on the NILPPA website (nilppa.org) and ALA’s Programming Librarian website (programminglibrarian.org) and will be shared via social media in an effort to spark dialogue with library professionals over the project period.

Advisors will also be called on to leverage their networks and expertise to share research findings broadly and to support engagement with underrepresented sectors of the field. These efforts will mirror the successful dissemination strategy used in the NILPPA planning grant and Phase 1 by using conversation and response prompts that incrementally share findings and foster engagement.

Upon completion of data analysis, ALA will publish Phase 2 findings in a white paper (Y3, Q1-Q2) that will be distributed digitally. Broad-scale communications activities disseminating these overall project findings and the resulting white paper will take place in Y3, Q3-Q4. For this process, ALA will draw upon its many well-established distribution outlets, including member email lists, member initiative groups, e-newsletters, library media outreach, ALA publications, and collaboration with other library associations. The distribution effort will again include public reporting on the NILPPA and Programming Librarian websites with conversation and feedback sought via social media. And as with Phase 1, research outputs will be turned into downloadable tools for practitioners and distributed digitally and via free webinars and national conference presentations (e.g., 2024 ALA Annual Conference, 2024 PLA Conference, 2024 Association for Rural & Small Libraries Conference).

With leadership from project advisors, ALA will seek publication in two peer-reviewed library journals in Y3. A tentative list of potential publication opportunities include [*The Library Quarterly*](#), [*Library Trends*](#); [*Advances in Library Administration and Organization*](#), and [*Library Leadership & Management*](#).

All data and research protocols for this project will be conducted in accordance with Knology’s Federal-Wide Assurance (FWA#00021378) to ensure the protection and safety of human subjects participating in research. The team will be conducting all human subject research for the project and maintain current training certificates through Protecting Human Research Participants (PHRP). The project is designed primarily to focus on professional practices of programming professionals and their observations of user outcomes. We anticipate

receiving an exemption from further review for all aspects of this phase of long-term effort. All study protocols will be conducted under the auspices of HHS IRB Registration Number IRB00005572, IRB Type: OHRP/FDA (TERC). An IRB project identification number will be secured on notification of a pending award.

DIVERSITY PLAN

ALA demonstrates its commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion through its [institutional strategic directions](#). The NILPPA research supports these goals by ensuring that advisory committees are inclusive of race, ethnicity, and gender identification; and that our study addresses library type, community demographics, geographic isolation and distribution, MLIS and non-MLIS library workers, and other considerations to ensure that traditionally underrepresented voices are included. As discussed in the research plan above, our research process will be shaped by the Transformative Paradigm — a framework of belief systems focused on social justice that engages members of culturally diverse groups. The project team has been invited with careful insight in terms of library type, library size, geographic location, community size and demographics, urban/rural representation, experience, research focus, race and ethnic diversity, and other criteria with the knowledge that a broad range of voices and perspectives will help the team collectively identify blind spots in our research plan and ensure a stronger result.

NATIONAL IMPACT

NILPPA Phase 2 will continue ALA’s foundational work in library programming with the long-term goal of creating best practices that can guide the field. The project will ensure that this vital work continues and is informed by the challenges and lessons of COVID-19. The insights we gain into indicators of programming success and partnership models will be shared widely with the field through a white paper, blog posts, webinars, conference presentations, and practitioner tools, assuring that library practitioners can use what we have learned. Through outreach to library science master’s programs, we will also ensure that the information reaches course instructors and others with decision-making power over library worker training.

We are already seeing threads of how NILPPA is leading to systemic change in the library world by giving programming a “seat at the table” as a critical — and teachable — library worker skill. NILPPA-informed projects like the University of Michigan’s *A Taxonomy of Black History Month Programming* and ALA’s *Skills for 21st-Century Librarians: Task Force for the Development of a NILPPA-Informed Programming Librarian Curriculum* are making great headway in bringing programming to the forefront of dialogue in the field as well as MLIS programs and practitioner professional development. We anticipate that Phase 2 research will provide actionable tools for assessing the impact of library public programs, including the role that partnerships can play in shaping national understanding of the value of libraries to society.

Schedule of Completion

	Current Funding Request																															
	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3																							
	Q1	Q1	Q2	Q2	Q2	Q3	Q3	Q4	Q4	Q1	Q1	Q2	Q2	Q2	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q4	Q4	Q1	Q1	Q2	Q2	Q2	Q3	Q3	Q3	Q4	Q4			
Coordination	[Shaded]																															
Indicator Workshops	[Shaded]																															
Indicator Development			[Shaded]																													
Survey Indicators					[Shaded]		[Shaded]																									
Data Collection							[Shaded]																									
Interviews																																
Focus Groups																																
Visuals Development																																
White Paper																																
Peer Review (2)																																
Visuals Feedback																																
White Paper Dissemination																																
Webinars																																
Blog																																



DIGITAL PRODUCT FORM

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) is committed to expanding public access to digital products that are created using federal funds. This includes (1) digitized and born-digital content, resources, or assets; (2) software; and (3) research data (see below for more specific examples). Excluded are preliminary analyses, drafts of papers, plans for future research, peer-review assessments, and communications with colleagues.

The digital products you create with IMLS funding require effective stewardship to protect and enhance their value, and they should be freely and readily available for use and reuse by libraries, archives, museums, and the public. Because technology is dynamic and because we do not want to inhibit innovation, we do not want to prescribe set standards and practices that could become quickly outdated. Instead, we ask that you answer questions that address specific aspects of creating and managing digital products. Like all components of your IMLS application, your answers will be used by IMLS staff and by expert peer reviewers to evaluate your application, and they will be important in determining whether your project will be funded.

INSTRUCTIONS

If you propose to create digital products in the course of your IMLS-funded project, you must first provide answers to the questions in **SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS**. Then consider which of the following types of digital products you will create in your project, and complete each section of the form that is applicable.

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

Complete this section if your project will create digital content, resources, or assets. These include both digitized and born-digital products created by individuals, project teams, or through community gatherings during your project. Examples include, but are not limited to, still images, audio files, moving images, microfilm, object inventories, object catalogs, artworks, books, posters, curricula, field books, maps, notebooks, scientific labels, metadata schema, charts, tables, drawings, workflows, and teacher toolkits. Your project may involve making these materials available through public or access-controlled websites, kiosks, or live or recorded programs.

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

Complete this section if your project will create software, including any source code, algorithms, applications, and digital tools plus the accompanying documentation created by you during your project.

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

Complete this section if your project will create research data, including recorded factual information and supporting documentation, commonly accepted as relevant to validating research findings and to supporting scholarly publications.

SECTION I: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS

A.1 We expect applicants seeking federal funds for developing or creating digital products to release these files under open-source licenses to maximize access and promote reuse. What will be the intellectual property status of the digital products (i.e., digital content, resources, or assets; software; research data) you intend to create? What ownership rights will your organization assert over the files you intend to create, and what conditions will you impose on their access and use? Who will hold the copyright(s)? Explain and justify your licensing selections. Identify and explain the license under which you will release the files (e.g., a non-restrictive license such as BSD, GNU, MIT, Creative Commons licenses; RightsStatements.org statements). Explain and justify any prohibitive terms or conditions of use or access, and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms and conditions.

A.2 What ownership rights will your organization assert over the new digital products and what conditions will you impose on access and use? Explain and justify any terms of access and conditions of use and detail how you will notify potential users about relevant terms or conditions.

A.3 If you will create any products that may involve privacy concerns, require obtaining permissions or rights, or raise any cultural sensitivities, describe the issues and how you plan to address them.

SECTION II: DIGITAL CONTENT, RESOURCES, OR ASSETS

A.1 Describe the digital content, resources, or assets you will create or collect, the quantities of each type, and the format(s) you will use.

A.2 List the equipment, software, and supplies that you will use to create the digital content, resources, or assets, or the name of the service provider that will perform the work.

A.3 List all the digital file formats (e.g., XML, TIFF, MPEG, OBJ, DOC, PDF) you plan to use. If digitizing content, describe the quality standards (e.g., resolution, sampling rate, pixel dimensions) you will use for the files you will create.

Workflow and Asset Maintenance/Preservation

B.1 Describe your quality control plan. How will you monitor and evaluate your workflow and products?

B.2 Describe your plan for preserving and maintaining digital assets during and after the award period. Your plan should address storage systems, shared repositories, technical documentation, migration planning, and commitment of organizational funding for these purposes. Please note: You may charge the federal award before closeout for the costs of publication or sharing of research results if the costs are not incurred during the period of performance of the federal award (see 2 C.F.R. § 200.461).

Metadata

C.1 Describe how you will produce any and all technical, descriptive, administrative, or preservation metadata or linked data. Specify which standards or data models you will use for the metadata structure (e.g., RDF, BIBFRAME, Dublin Core, Encoded Archival Description, PBCore, PREMIS) and metadata content (e.g., thesauri).

C.2 Explain your strategy for preserving and maintaining metadata created or collected during and after the award period of performance.

C.3 Explain what metadata sharing and/or other strategies you will use to facilitate widespread discovery and use of the digital content, resources, or assets created during your project (e.g., an API [Application Programming Interface], contributions to a digital platform, or other ways you might enable batch queries and retrieval of metadata).

Access and Use

D.1 Describe how you will make the digital content, resources, or assets available to the public. Include details such as the delivery strategy (e.g., openly available online, available to specified audiences) and underlying hardware/software platforms and infrastructure (e.g., specific digital repository software or leased services, accessibility via standard web browsers, requirements for special software tools in order to use the content, delivery enabled by IIIF specifications).

D.2. Provide the name(s) and URL(s) (Universal Resource Locator), DOI (Digital Object Identifier), or other persistent identifier for any examples of previous digital content, resources, or assets your organization has created.

SECTION III: SOFTWARE

General Information

A.1 Describe the software you intend to create, including a summary of the major functions it will perform and the intended primary audience(s) it will serve.

A.2 List other existing software that wholly or partially performs the same or similar functions, and explain how the software you intend to create is different, and justify why those differences are significant and necessary.

Technical Information

B.1 List the programming languages, platforms, frameworks, software, or other applications you will use to create your software and explain why you chose them.

B.2 Describe how the software you intend to create will extend or interoperate with relevant existing software.

B.3 Describe any underlying additional software or system dependencies necessary to run the software you intend to create.

B.4 Describe the processes you will use for development, documentation, and for maintaining and updating documentation for users of the software.

B.5 Provide the name(s), URL(s), and/or code repository locations for examples of any previous software your organization has created.

Access and Use

C.1 Describe how you will make the software and source code available to the public and/or its intended users.

C.2 Identify where you will deposit the source code for the software you intend to develop:

Name of publicly accessible source code repository:

URL:

SECTION IV: RESEARCH DATA

As part of the federal government's commitment to increase access to federally funded research data, Section IV represents the Data Management Plan (DMP) for research proposals and should reflect data management, dissemination, and preservation best practices in the applicant's area of research appropriate to the data that the project will generate.

A.1 Identify the type(s) of data you plan to collect or generate, and the purpose or intended use(s) to which you expect them to be put. Describe the method(s) you will use, the proposed scope and scale, and the approximate dates or intervals at which you will collect or generate data.

A.2 Does the proposed data collection or research activity require approval by any internal review panel or institutional review board (IRB)? If so, has the proposed research activity been approved? If not, what is your plan for securing approval?

A.3 Will you collect any sensitive information? This may include personally identifiable information (PII), confidential information (e.g., trade secrets), or proprietary information. If so, detail the specific steps you will take to protect the information while you prepare it for public release (e.g., anonymizing individual identifiers, data aggregation). If the data will not be released publicly, explain why the data cannot be shared due to the protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, and other rights or requirements.

A.4 What technical (hardware and/or software) requirements or dependencies would be necessary for understanding retrieving, displaying, processing, or otherwise reusing the data?

A.5 What documentation (e.g., consent agreements, data documentation, codebooks, metadata, and analytical and procedural information) will you capture or create along with the data? Where will the documentation be stored and in what format(s)? How will you permanently associate and manage the documentation with the data it describes to enable future reuse?

A.6 What is your plan for managing, disseminating, and preserving data after the completion of the award-funded project?

A.7 Identify where you will deposit the data:

Name of repository:

URL:

A.8 When and how frequently will you review this data management plan? How will the implementation be monitored?