

Executive Summary

The goal of this project was to: a. use grant funds to help public libraries of Washington meet the needs of their communities in the current economic downturn; b. help State Library staff learn how to facilitate online peer learning efforts within the Renew Washington project, incorporate peer learning into their other projects and more effectively implement projects around the state; and c. assist Washington public libraries in “amplifying the value” of their library, using the Renew Washington activities as a centerpiece.

The State Library awarded Renew Washington grants to 17 public libraries (plus 3 academic libraries—funded solely by LSTA) in October 2009. The grants helped libraries initiate new services, enhance existing services, conduct outreach and partnership efforts or complete other activities to help people needing access to employment-related information, resources, and services. Each library developed and successfully completed its project. Their evaluations showed that 16 out of 17 libraries agreed or strongly agreed that the grant had helped them better provide service to their customers

The State Library contracted with Full Circle Associates to work with the State Library, its Renew Washington libraries, and public libraries across the state on peer learning issues. The consultant, Nancy White, provided twelve peer learning opportunities, in-person and online, for Washington State Library staff, Renew Washington libraries, and the library community as a whole. As a result, State Library staff have incorporated peer learning into their work and the Renew Washington libraries agreed that including peer learning opportunities within future grant cycles would be helpful.

As a part of this grant, the Gates Foundation contracted with GMMB, a nationally-recognized communication firm, to help the Renew Washington libraries amplify their value within their communities. GMMB reviewed the libraries’ communication activities, assisted them in developing communication plans, provided a one-day in-person training session, and advised libraries on communication issues. Twelve libraries used grants of up to \$6,000 to implement selected activities identified in their communication plans. While most libraries were successful in promoting their projects, not as many actually appeared to reach their decision-makers in the manner in which GMMB expected.

While Renew Washington subgrantees completed their projects, not all funds from the Gates Foundation were spent by the end of December 2010. An extension was granted until May 2011. GMMB was contracted to produce a four-page brochure on the value of public libraries, the Washington State Library, and the Renew Washington project.

The Washington State Library awarded a second round of Renew Washington grants for 2010-2011 using Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. These include seven continuing public libraries, three new public libraries, one continuing academic library and one new academic library.

While no further federal funds will be used for the purpose of enhancing job-searching capabilities in Washington libraries, many individual libraries have incorporated their grant activities into their regular work and some libraries have received local support to continue activities. Peer learning is now incorporated into the work of the State Library.

Progress on Outcomes and Milestones (see Appendix A)

Implementation Successes

The biggest success of the project was the grants to public libraries for initiating or enhancing services to help people with employment-related information, resources, and services.

It appeared that a broad approach was most successful. Libraries that addressed the needs of unemployed from a variety of perspectives—not just introducing one service—were more successful. Just adding more computers or a resume class was not enough. However, adding a combination of computers, allowing more time on the computers, and having staff available to assist the public was successful.

In developing classes, it was necessary to provide many levels of assistance from basic computer classes to the broader job searching skills (resume writing, letter writing, interviewing) to effectively serve library customers. Several libraries discovered that they needed to provide very basic computer skills classes since many people were unable to manage participating in the higher level job application, resume writing, and other similar classes.

When it was possible to make a local link with the WorkSource group, libraries found this partnership was successful. Two libraries were able to serve as an extension of WorkSource sites. One library had Workforce employees train library employees in serving job seekers. Other libraries developed more informal partnerships with WorkSource. Partnerships with other community organizations such as Goodwill, Chamber of Commerce, and Service Corp of Retired Executives were also very beneficial.

Not surprisingly, larger libraries were more able to implement more complex projects. Some developed job and business centers. Several libraries concentrated on collaborating with small business groups to provide better access to information—often using sophisticated web approaches, podcasts, and video segments. The connections with local business groups were quite successful for both library users and for the library's presence in the community.

Smaller libraries selected more modest approaches such as increasing collections, computer labs, and providing classes. In their communities, those activities had great impact and the libraries received significant public notice.

Giving libraries large latitude in which to develop their projects was successful. Each library could build on its current strengths, address the specific needs of their community and expand or enhance services they were already envisioning. This meant that these projects had a better chance of continuing beyond their limited grant period.

The State Library identified the following suggestions for a successful effort, based on the libraries' experiences:

- Listen to the needs of your public
- Develop services that fit your budget and your community's needs
- Train staff to help with job-related materials
- Work with local WorkSource and other community groups
- Develop a variety of services not just one
- Adjust services as circumstances change

Implementation Challenges and Risks

All outcomes were accomplished. All milestones were completed.

Only one activity mentioned in the original proposal to the Gates Foundation was not technically accomplished—having *each* Library Development staff member conduct a peer learning session. Each of the core members of the Library Development team which worked on the Renew Washington did conduct portions of each peer learning online session. While other Library Development staff did not specifically lead sessions for the Renew Washington project, staff members have incorporated peer learning techniques in the meetings of their own projects, including Early Learning, Broadband (Libraries at Light Speed), and Rural Heritage.

The biggest challenge was the delay in getting the subgrant funds to the libraries. It meant that they were several months behind in starting work on their projects. This occurred because the State Library had promised the award of funds to the libraries beginning in October 2009. The signing of the contract with Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the initial kick off ceremony in late October delayed the beginning of the contracting process until the beginning of November and thus delayed the beginning of activity on the grant projects until early December. Developing, finalizing, and signing contracts is a time-consuming process in a state agency.

Several libraries were in the midst of other large library-wide efforts, such as building remodels or migrating to a new online system. Because of this, several libraries scaled back their original proposals, with the consent of the State Library. Several libraries were unable to spend the entire dollar amount that they had been granted because they couldn't complete all the activities in the time allotted.

To meet these circumstances, the State Library tried to be lenient in allowing appropriate changes to projects as long as they continued to work towards their originally stated goals and fit within the context of what they wished to accomplish.

Strategic Lessons Learned

Libraries made a concerted effort—when time permitted—to participate in the peer learning sessions. The smaller libraries had the most difficulty as the manager of their Renew Washington project was often the only person available to keep their library open. Even the larger libraries were stretched thin with budget cuts or didn't feel they could learn enough during the sessions to take time away from their regular scheduled duties.

Jargon was a barrier in introducing peer learning. The library community was not familiar with the meaning of peer learning. Once people realized that it was learning with and from others, it was embraced and understood, mostly with enthusiasm and the knowledge that they were already doing it informally anyway.

Providing value in the peer learning sessions was critical. In the case of the Renew Washington project, it had to be "specific" to their effort. While most libraries participated in one or more sessions, there was not an overwhelming turnout. People were too busy except to do what they perceived would directly enhance their work. The consultant and the State Library staff asked what the participants felt was the next most important aspect of their work on their projects and planned the following session on that issue. However, unless the staff members felt that a session would give them significant insight or assistance, they didn't attend.

The core team absorbed the most about peer learning because they actually had to plan the events, facilitate some of the sessions, and follow up on the suggestions. Involving as many of the State Library staff as possible ensures that the ideas and techniques don't get lost in the rush of daily pressing responsibilities.

Technology issues continued to plague the peer learning groups, especially new users. It was necessary to have at least one person available online for technical support. Involving the technical person early in the planning sessions is important. They bring a different perspective and can assure that the sessions are more efficient.

Since there is a lot to keep track of in an online peer learning environment, the State Library discovered that it was advantageous to have at least three designated people during a session: a technical person, a facilitator, and a person to track written conversations and other activity. The two latter people could change within one session for variety's sake. Having one person conduct a mini-session on how to use the Elluminate software at the beginning of each session was helpful to new and fairly new users.

In retrospect on the subject of peer learning, it would have helped if the State Library had stated in the original grant guidelines that it was expected that libraries receiving funds would participate in online sessions to discuss the progress of their projects in a peer learning-type environment. Because the grant guidelines were written and the grants were awarded before it was known that peer learning would be a part of the project, the libraries did not realize that participation in peer learning sessions was an expectation.

The process for handling contracts within a state agency can be time-consuming which sometimes meant libraries had a difficult time completing activities in the time originally identified. Some libraries must go through their city departments adding more time to the process. It is important significant time for finalizing appropriate contract documents.

In the grant proposal the State Library did not include funds to pay for clerical support. Our staff person estimated that during the major part of the project, the workload increased by 30% handling contracts, amendments, budgets, reports, and other clerical aspects of the project. Future proposals should include funds to pay for clerical support.

Evaluation

Libraries—large and small, urban and rural—reported that the project had significant impact in their communities. The Renew Washington grants helped libraries show their value by providing critical services in response to current crises.

Evaluation of the Renew Washington grants was self-reported by libraries answering questions on the final report. (1. Do you feel this grant has helped you provide better service to your customers? 2. Summarize the project. 3. Summarize the results of the project. 4. Quantify, where possible, the results of the project. 5. Did the project meet its stated objectives?)

In the final evaluation, Renew Washington libraries were asked if they felt the Renew Washington subgrant had helped them better provide service to their customers. Out of 17 public libraries, 15 stated that they "strongly agreed", one said that they "agreed" and one was "neutral." In responding to the above question, the director of Mount Vernon City

Library said, "Actually, if there were a category above 'strongly agree' called 'lights out good stuff' I would have chosen that one.

The incorporation of peer learning techniques in the Renew Washington project was successful. Over three quarters of both the Library Development staff of the State Library and the managers of the Renew Washington grant projects agreed that peer learning made a difference in their work. The final evaluation of peer learning was conducted by the peer learning consultant, Full Circle Associates.

When WSL staff was asked if peer learning made a difference in their work, approximately 25% strongly agreed, 50% agreed, and 25% disagreed. When the Renew Washington project grantees were asked if peer learning made a difference, approximately 27% strongly agreed, 73% agreed, and 1% disagreed.* The disparity may have been because the entire staff of WSL Library Development, including support/clerical staff, participated in the training whereas only library managers and others directly involved in the Renew grant projects were involved in the peer learning sessions.

Libraries with Renew Washington projects wholeheartedly agreed that the peer learning sessions added value to their work. When the Renew Washington project grantees who attended the online peer learning sessions were asked, approximately 93% said that the sessions added value to their work, 90% said they gained something of value from hearing the experiences of others, and 85% said they felt that they had contributed something to the sessions.

When WSL staff was asked if they would support including peer learning in future projects, approximately 25% strongly agreed and 75% agreed. Renew Washington project grantees said: approximately 35% strongly agreed and 65% agreed that they would support including peer learning in future projects.

Evaluation of the communication grants was self-reported by libraries answering questions on the final report. (1. This grant has helped amplify the value of our library with decision-makers. 2. Summarize the project. 3. Summarize the results of the project. 4. Quantify, where possible, the results of the project. 5. Did the project meet its stated objectives?)

When the libraries that received communication grants were asked if the grant helped them amplify the value of their library with decision-makers in their community, they answered in the following manner. Nine of the twelve libraries marked "strongly agree" and two marked "agree." One library forgot to answer the question. However it appeared that that library's communication experience was very successful since it received some of the best newspaper coverage of all the Renew Washington libraries and it was the only library that was featured in a segment on TV.

Every library had at least one article in their local newspaper about their Renew Washington project. Of the two libraries that held receptions or events for local decision-makers, the response was positive.

*All percentages are only approximate as they were derived from visual color charts provided in the peer learning consultant's final report.

Intellectual Property No issues to discuss.

Organizational Capacity No issues to discuss.

Financial Report (See Appendix B: Budget will be sent by mid-June when final figures are known for salaries and benefits)

Project Budget Narrative

Several libraries did not spend all of the funds in their allotted grant amount. This happened for a variety of reasons: lack of time to complete all projected activities because of the shortened time frame of the project, overestimates on some costs, unexpected assistance from other sources, and difficulty in contracting for work in a shortened time frame.

In the grant proposal to Gates Foundation, it stated that approximately \$5,000 (beyond the initial grant award) would be granted to each library to assist with costs in implementing portions of their own communication plan. Twelve libraries of the seventeen libraries opted to apply for these extra funds. Of those who did not opt for the funds it was because they felt either that they had an adequate marketing budget or that they could not take on another task.

When it was discovered that the costs for the general training workshop and the number of libraries requesting \$5,000 was less than expected, the State Library gave the twelve participating libraries the opportunity to add approximately \$1,000 each to the amount they were receiving in their communication grants. Again, most libraries did apply for the extra \$1,000 although several did not for a variety of reasons—mostly the extra time and effort needed.

Around November 2010, it was clear that there still would be unused funds. Therefore, based on conversations and the agreement of the staff of the Gates Foundation, the State Library advertised for and contracted with GMMB to implement an additional project.

Working with the staff of the Washington State Library, GMMB developed and printed a four-page brochure on the value of public libraries, the results of the Renew Washington project, and the value of the Washington State Library to the library community.

Even with that additional work, the State Library will return some unused funding.

Sustainability Plans

In addition to the grant funds from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Washington State Library used Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to fund three academic libraries to work with their students and communities during the project period October 2009 through September 2010. In the summer of 2010, again using LSTA funds, the State Library awarded Renew Washington grants to three new public libraries, one new academic library, and to seven public libraries to continue their projects.

While the State Library does not have immediate plans to provide another round of LSTA-funded Renew Washington grants in 2011-12, several libraries who received original grants noted in their final reports that they are planning to incorporate some of the lower cost activities into their general library services. These libraries include: Ft. Vancouver Regional Library, Pierce County Library, and Spokane Public Library.

Several individual libraries were very successful in receiving additional local support for their individual projects and for continuing their activities into the next several years. The Inland

Northwest Community Foundation gave the Spokane Public Library funds to hire an employment specialist for 2011. The local Goodwill will provide the employee.

Pierce County Library has received additional funding from community sources to continue the services. They said: "Due to the timeliness of the Job + Business Center implementation, thanks to the initial Renew Washington grant, the Pierce County Library Foundation approached other funding organizations and was awarded more than \$100,000 to carry out the project." Puyallup Public Library received a grant from EDLab Group to expand curriculum and provide additional capacity for job-searching computer classes.

The reauthorized Museum and Library Services Act of 2010 expanded the broad purposes of LSTA to include enhancement and expansion of services and resources related to workforce development. If the down economy is still an issue and libraries in the state still express need for assistance in the area of workforce development, the Washington State Library's 2013-17 LSTA Five-Year Plan will reflect this.

The State Library staff is already incorporating the peer learning approach into their current projects. This is being accomplished at no extra cost—just the additional time, thought and planning needed for incorporating peer learning techniques. Since March 2010, State Library staff has used Elluminate almost exclusively for conducting their meetings and training. In addition, the staff is now more sensitive to place emphasis on incorporating peer learning techniques within their sessions.

Two staff members have already worked with the peer learning consultant to redesign their activities (one who is working with library trustees, the other who is working with children's librarians) to incorporate peer learning experiences into their efforts. A third, the training consultant, has increased her use of peer learning involvement as a result of the training received by the peer learning consultant.

As the State Library is proceeding in its work with implementing the broadband project (Libraries at Light Speed) effort, the staff is already incorporating peer learning approaches when appropriate. In the last year, other Library Development staff has incorporated peer learning techniques in the meetings of their own projects, including Early Learning and Rural Heritage.

The State Library has been accepted to present a program on the Renew Washington project at the 2011 Pacific Northwest Library Association conference in August in Spokane, August 3-4, 2011.

Reports/Publications

Working with the staff of the Washington State Library, GMMB developed and printed a four-page brochure on the value of public libraries, the results of the Renew Washington project, and the value of the Washington State Library.

The Fact Sheet was distributed at the exhibit and showcase at the Washington Library Association conference, April 6-8, 2010. It will be distributed at the Pacific Northwest Library Association conference in Spokane, August 3-4, 2011; and the Washington Library Media Association conference and Washington Association of Library Employees conference October 13-14, 2011. It will be available for distribution at other events where the State Library provides information and/or sets up an exhibit as well as distributed to state and national representatives and senators.

A Renew Washington project website was set up to share information on the Renew Washington grant projects, national economic and value studies, promotional materials developed by the grant libraries, news articles about the projects, and final reports.
<http://www.sos.wa.gov/library/libraries/projects/RenewWashington>

The State Library presented the results of the Renew Washington project at a program and a showcase exhibit at the Washington Library Association conference in Yakima, April 6-8, 2011. For use in the exhibit, a sheet showing the types of activities libraries implemented and a revolving power point slide show was developed to demonstrate what each library accomplished and to encourage other libraries to adapt some of the strategies.
<http://www.sos.wa.gov/assets/library/libraries/projects/renewwashington/RenewWashingtonProjectsReview.pdfshow>)

An article about the Renew Washington project, co-authored by Karen Goettling and Jennifer Fenton, was submitted May 15 for inclusion in the July issue of ALKI, Washington Library Association's quarterly journal.

Foundation Relationship

When possible, working within the timeframe of the grant recipient would have helped the individual libraries that received subgrants. Because of the delay in contract negotiations with the Gates Foundation and the kick off ceremony, libraries had almost two months less to complete their projects. Part of the contract negotiation issue, however, is the amount of state and federal requirements that must be followed by the State Library.

Clearer direction on what types of reports should be submitted could have helped. No narrative progress reports were sent to the Gates Foundation about the grant because the project manager was not aware of them.

Success Story

Port Townsend Public Library contracted with a consultant to provide workshops and networking groups. In the words of one participant: "The *Transition Yourself* Workshop helped me in many ways. I learned how to better organize my search process. I discovered that much of what I was already doing was good, and how to improve other areas. My resume improved remarkably, and I felt more confident about the interview process. The support group helped me stay positive, and allowed me to help others. I believe that lessons and support of the group helped me connect with the right people at Shine Micro, and to become employed there. "

In their final reports, several libraries identified unexpected outcomes from participation in the project—added enthusiasm and increased morale. In its final report, Whatcom County Library stated, "An unexpected outcome is the enthusiasm for this project from staff at all levels and particularly from the Library Board. One board member has volunteered to contact our state and federal legislators to express appreciation for the opportunities that this grant has provided the low income and disadvantaged populations in Whatcom County."

Staff morale increased. Fort Vancouver Regional Library stated: "...the grant lifted up the staff's morale as we had a sense of doing something positive in this very negative environment, especially following the library's budget and hour cuts last year."

Appendices

- Appendix A (Milestones)
- Appendix B (Financial report)
- Appendix C (Fact sheet)
- Appendix D (Library activities)
- Appendix E (Peer Learning Evaluation)
- Appendix F (Libraries with grants)
- Appendix G (Web page)

APPENDIX A

GRANT OUTCOME 1 Enhance access to services to support the community during the economic downturn	<i>Current Status/ Baseline</i>	<i>Anticipated Progress or Completion - Year 1-2</i>
Milestone 1-a Create and implement a grant opportunity for Washington libraries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Announce the grant cycle - Receive applications - Review applications and recommend awards to the Washington State Librarian; - Appoint a project manager - Award sub-grants; - Finalize contracts 	<i>Complete</i>	5/11/2009 6/26/2009 8/19/2009 10/16/2009 10/1/2009 10/29 – 11/18/2009
Milestone 1-b Sub-grantees implement projects	<i>Complete</i>	9/30/10
Milestone 1-c Sub-grantees submit quarterly project reports	<i>Complete</i>	12/31/2009-6/31/2010
Milestone 1-d Sub-grantees complete projects and submits final report	<i>Complete</i>	9/30/2010
Milestone 1-e Identify and contract with one or more peer learning experts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalize contract with Full Circle Associates 	<i>Complete</i>	2/6/2010
Milestone 1-f Train State Library staff in facilitating peer learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Held in-person peer learning session for WSL staff - Held online peer learning facilitation session for WSL staff - Held a online session on web cams for WSL staff and others - Held half-day session for Library Council of Washington - Held two-day session at WSL staff retreat 	<i>Complete</i>	2/23/2010 4/29/2010 8/24/2010 11/4/2010 12/16/2010

Milestone 1-g Establish venue through which sub-grantees will engage in peer learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organized online Elluminate sessions 	<i>Complete</i>	 3/1/2010
Milestone 1-h Facilitate peer learning among sub-grantees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Held five peer learning sessions for sub-grantees - Held online First Tuesday session about Renew Washington projects - Held general online session open to all libraries in the state - Held online session on facilitating peer learning open to all libraries in the state 	<i>Complete</i>	 4/6 – 6/15/2010 8/3/2010 10/19/2010 11/17/2010
Milestone 1-i Develop and conduct evaluation of peer learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted survey of Renew WA libraries and WSL staff - Informal survey of WSL staff - Peer learning evaluation report completed 	<i>Complete</i>	 9/2010 12/2010 9/30/2010 and 1/5/2011

(Anticipated) External Factors or Challenges

Sub-grantees fail to complete projects successfully

Sub-grantees will choose not to participate

WSL staff will not practice facilitation of peer learning and will lose knowledge

Sub-grantees will not benefit from peer learning experiences

All libraries completed their Renew Washington projects. Of the last several grant cycles, the State Library received some of the most enthusiasm for this particular project.

Most staff from Renew Washington libraries participated in peer learning sessions. In all, 32 different people attended the six peer learning online Elluminate sessions for Renew Washington libraries with a total of 64 attendees. Some attended all sessions, others attended only one or two sessions. (There was potential total attendance of about 20-25: 17 project managers plus 5-10 assistants connected in some other way.)

Core members of the State Library staff continue to practice peer learning facilitation and will incorporate those skills in future projects. A majority of the rest of the State Library staff have experimented with peer learning in their own projects.

Renew Washington libraries agreed that including peer learning in future grant cycles would be appropriate. It is less clear that they will incorporate peer learning in their own libraries as a result of this project. However, the State Library has heard informally that at least three or four libraries are using peer learning techniques.

GRANT OUTCOME 2 Amplify the role of the library	Current Status/ Baseline	Anticipated Progress or Completion – Year 1-2
Milestone 2-a Hire Marketing/Peer Learning project manager who will work with the marketing firm to determine services to be provided by the firm and expectations of the subgrantees	<i>Complete</i>	10/16/09
Milestone 2-b Contract with sub-grantees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Finalize contracts for communication services – Finalize contracts for funds for communication activities – Finalize amendments for additional funds for communication activities 	<i>Complete</i>	11/24/2009 4/13 – 5/7/2010 6/10 – 7/7/2010
Milestone 2-c Sub-grantees implement projects	<i>Complete</i>	4/15 – 9/30/2010
Milestone 2-d Project manager will monitor sub-grantees' progress (working both with marketing firm and sub-grantees)	<i>Complete</i>	11/24/09 – 09/30/2010

(Anticipated) External Factors or Challenges

Sub-grantees will choose not to participate

Miscommunication between marketing firm and sub-grantee

Sub-grantee will fail to take the necessary steps to effectively communicate with decision makers and the community about the value of the project and of the library

Sub-grantee will fail to successfully complete the project

All libraries chose to participate in the communication activities with GMMB. However, only twelve of the seventeen libraries chose to accept funds to implement communication activities.

The libraries made good progress toward marketing their projects, getting the word out to the media, and letting the public know about the projects. They were less comfortable and less effective, in some cases, with more general advocacy on the value of libraries within the community, in the manner which GMMB was trying to establish.

After receiving the communication grant proposals from libraries, it was clear that the State Library—in its effort to streamline the process—had not provided the appropriate level of guidance. Both the State Library and GMMB had go back and work with many of the libraries to help them adjust the activities to reflect the larger goal of “amplifying the value of the library” rather than just publicizing the activities of their projects.

Time was a big issue. Many libraries had their hands full just to complete the activities of the project and found doing the extra work to communicate about the project a challenge. A few libraries did not request communication funds one or two because they had an adequate budget and one or so because they didn't have time to fill out appropriate forms and commit to more activities.

There is a great disparity in the ability of Washington libraries to communicate and market themselves. Eight of the Renew Washington libraries had at least one communication person on staff. The larger libraries—Seattle Public Library and King County Library had even more staff, more funds for communication, and their communication managers were highly skilled, experienced and knowledgeable.

Those libraries with communication staff had communication plans already in place. However, many of the smaller libraries had little communication experience, very little time, and no communication plans in place. It was harder for them to grasp the intention of communication plans and to find the time to develop them.

**For Attachments B, C, D, and E, see email attachments.
Appendices F and G follow below.**

Appendix F

Renew Washington grant public libraries 2009-2010

LIBRARY	Gates grant	IMLS/LSTA grant	Communication grant
Camas Public Library		X	X
Columbia County Rural Library District		X	X
Everett Public Library		X	X
Ft Vancouver Regional Library	X		X
King County Library System	X		
Liberty Lake Municipal Library		X	
Mt Vernon City Library		X	X
Pierce County Library System		X	X
Pt Townsend Public Library	X		X
Puyallup Public Library		X	X
Seattle Public library	X		X
Sno-Isle Regional Library		X	X
Spokane Public Library	X		
Tacoma Public Library		X	
Timberland Regional Library		X	X
Whatcom County Library	X		
Whitman County Library System	X		X

Appendix G

Renew Washington

RENEW WASHINGTON


A project of the Washington State Library

With the declining economy, libraries faced increased use by the public—especially by those who are out of work and struggling to find employment. To address this issue, the Washington State Library, in partnership with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, developed a special project called Renew Washington.



Pierce County Library System's Renew Washington Project in action

In the major component of the project, grants were awarded to help public libraries initiate new services, enhance existing services, conduct outreach and partnership efforts, or complete other activities that are identified as important to the library in addressing the needs of people searching for employment-related information, resources, and services.

The libraries who received [grants](#) used the funds to help Washington residents in a variety of [activities](#) , including:

- Learning basic computer skills
- Finding and using job and career resources
- Locating job opportunities and completing online applications
- Retooling for new careers by gaining new skills and locating education opportunities
- Preparing resumes and improving interviewing skills
- Starting or growing small businesses
- Surviving with less in a difficult economy

As a result, libraries received significant [news coverage and articles](#) about their projects. A slideshow covering all the Renew Washington projects, as well as photographs, video clips, podcasts, and other materials developed by libraries are available for viewing on our [Promotional Materials](#) page. For background information, [Studies and Reports](#) show the economic value, use, and perceptions of libraries. [Final reports](#) by the libraries and [evaluations of the project](#) are available.



Timberland Regional Library System's "Out of Work" poster, advertising resources available through the Renew Washington Project

A total of \$918,380 was awarded to 20 public libraries and 4 academic libraries in several special grant cycles called the Renew Washington project. The Gates Foundation provided approximately \$515,000. The rest of the funds were provided by Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) from the Institute of Museum and Library Services and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Projects run through September 2011.

With funds from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, many participating public libraries received assistance in communicating the importance of their library to decision-makers and worked together in a peer -learning environment to share and learn from each other.

In an ongoing effort to assist libraries and the public in the tough economy, the Washington State Library researched and gathered together a list of resources, training, and Web sites on job hunting, resume writing, computer instruction, and other helpful economic Web sites at the [Hard Times Resource Portal](#).

Information

- [Renew Washington—Home](#)
- [Grant Libraries and Final Reports](#)
- [Studies and Reports](#)
- [News Articles of Projects](#)
- [Press Releases](#)
- [Promotional Materials](#)
- [Evaluation](#)
- [Hard Times Resource Guide](#)

Connect

- [Elluminate](#)
- [Elluminate Archives](#)
- [Listserv](#)
- [Wiki](#)


Contact

Karen Goettling

karen.goettling@sos.wa.gov

360.570.5561

(Tues-Thurs)

 We encourage your feedback. If you have comments or suggestions, please use our [feedback form](#).



Funded in part by the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) through the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA).

Translate our site into:

Powered by  [Translate](#)

[Phone Numbers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#)

Washington Secretary of State · Washington State Library

Point Plaza East, 6880 Capitol Blvd. Tumwater

PO Box 42460, Olympia WA 98504-2460

(360) 704-5200