

**System (Administrative) Level Findings**

Participating libraries provided data regarding their applications for E-rate, operating budgets, and information technology budgets. This section of the report presents the analysis of these system (administrative) level data.

**E-rate Application Data**

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

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

Weighted missing values, n=2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Figure 51: Public Library Systems Applying for a National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) award(s) in either Wave I or Wave II, by Metropolitan Status**

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

Weighted missing values, n=156

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Public Library Operating Budget Details**

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

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

Weighted missing values, n=336

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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