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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to address an important but neglected aspect of evidence-based management, how to apply actionable data to strategic decision making to support the organization in reaching appropriate decisions. This process involves connecting advocacy work with active measures to collect and interpret impact data, which are the real ingredient to help understand the big picture and make advocacy more efficient.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper presents two complementary models of intervention to better use relevant data to help management decisions, within the program team and beyond the program team. In both cases the paper attempts to identify the key factors in understanding outcome evidence in order to have better communication and help the decision-taking process.

Findings – Customizing evaluation results in order to present the information in an accessible form for various stakeholders appears to be a key factor in delivering the right message and having a successful advocacy campaign.

Originality/value – This paper reports on two complementary approaches to persuade stakeholders (program managers, or stakeholders external to the program team) to take action based on specific impact or management data delivery. The idea is potentially appropriate for any program, or project, where advocacy processes are needed to determine appropriate actions. Processing and presenting data in an actionable way is a key success factor to determine the expected management decision or successful advocacy step.
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1. Context

This paper draws on the author’s experience of working at national level to communicate the key results of a major national public library development program in ways that encourage them to take action.

The Biblionet Program – Romania is part of the Global Libraries initiative funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The program’s overall objective is to improve peoples’ lives by facilitating free access to information through the internet.

Global Libraries – Biblionet has four major objectives:

(1) Objective 1. Community members’ informational needs are increasingly met at public libraries.

The author would like to thank Janet Sawaya, Program Officer, Global Libraries for her constant interest in using advocacy. This helped the author a lot by raising interesting questions and challenges on how to better use data for advocacy. The author also thanks David Streatfield, Impact Consultant, Global Libraries, for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and for continuous support in the work. Last, but not least, the author thanks the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for funding Biblionet – without it this work could not be possible.
(2) Objective 2. Librarians are increasingly able to provide better services to the community.

(3) Objective 3. The Library Association’s capacity to provide services to their members is increased.


The Global Libraries – Biblionet program in Romania is working with 2,280 public libraries across the country (about 80 percent of the total) and with 3,250 librarians. Embedding a proficient system to collect, process and analyze impact data is an essential ingredient to secure a customer-oriented and sustainable program. It is also vital to translate the results of this work into clear advocacy messages and actions. “Advocacy is the actions individuals or organizations undertake to influence decision making at the local, regional, state, national, and international levels that help create a desired policy or funding change in support of public libraries” (Advocacy manual – Global Libraries initiative).

In many programs, there is a lot of enthusiasm around sharing measurement data as much as possible, as often as possible and quite often people ask for it. Glossy reports are printed and distributed, filled with tables, charts, data and details. Presentations are made to interested people who want to see “how we are,” before going on to ask questions, debate about conclusions and make predictions. People may even organize conferences to present study conclusions, where the nicely printed materials are distributed. Recipients of these materials may often respond with “this is fascinating,” “how interesting!” or “happy we learned this.” However, aside from the enthusiastic response and appreciation of the effort, very little action is taken as a result of the data shared, if any! Quite rarely we see managers adjusting their work plans based on what they learn from reports, or asking for analysis sessions to take advantage of the leveraging possibilities they see in the data. Even more rarely do we see discussion of new options to better integrate work across the whole program in order to be able to maximize resource usage and impact, with the expectation that the program will be more efficient and effective.

Delivering the right message, to the right people, at the right time is something which seems painfully difficult with performance data too. In relation to organization performance, or program/project performance, we cannot assume that everyone around has the same skills, and the interest to understand and to use performance data, even if in most cases they are supposed to. Very often if we want to see any reaction based on performance metrics analysis it is necessary to adjust the message to the needs and expertise level of the people with whom we are communicating. What does this really mean? Sometimes people around us might not have all the expected technical skills to understand some of the metrics we use, or they might relate better to some metrics which we just do not use to track program performance. In such cases, in order to have efficient communication we have to use new metrics, and be able to make analogies or correlations, so that our messages can reach their target. This is true whether the communication is internal – within the program team, with our colleagues, or external – beyond our program, with various types of stakeholders. In both cases, there are situations when we need to work hard to understand what message will trigger the expected action.

2. Advocating within the program team
Quite often we might see miscommunication within the program team, despite everybodies efforts to share the necessary information in an easy to understand and
usable way. Selecting the right metric, which can be easily understood by its beneficiary, is the key to getting the expected action. To give an example.

**Work planning issues**

In a 35 million dollar program, with a team of about 45 experts, the monitoring and evaluation (m&e) manager was working hard to define the key performance indicators for the whole team. These were supposed to be aligned with those contracted with the donor organization. This meant that the team had very well-defined strategic objectives, but it was necessary to clarify how each department was going to contribute to the contracted objectives and the specific metrics. This work started after about two months with each individual department and then a whole week of teamwork together with a team from the organization’s head office in Washington, DC, which had flown over for this effort. After a few discussions with some of the departments it became obvious that some were facing significant challenges to align their work with one or more of the already contracted strategic objectives, and to design a manageable work plan for the next calendar year. Trying to discuss this with one of the organization managers, the discussion rapidly became interesting. The manager was totally convinced that the team of experts from head office had helped the local team to understand how to design, plan and implement the program work, and this would be clearer to the m&e manager a few months later, after he had become more familiar with the program and the work. The message was “just relax, calm down, everything is fine, you’ll see it over the next few months!” This was even more alarming for the m&e manager, it was a clear sign of a problem, but the real dimensions were not yet clear, and the management did not seem to be aware of this, indeed, they were confident that everything was under control. Any type of explanation and examples did not help at all, they even engendered a patronizing attitude. It was obvious, but not to everyone unfortunately, that something should be done quickly so that the whole program did not start off in the wrong direction, or face huge delays. The m&e manager remembered the classic project management saying, that if a project is troubled, delayed or jeopardized in the first 20 percent of its time, afterwards it will be running to catch up, with little chance of finishing on time, in budget and at the expected quality standards. In other words, this was a warning signal that something should be done. He asked the manager to take two simple actions:

1. **To join for departments’ meetings where they were supposed to speak about their activities’ alignment with strategic objectives and to define some metrics.** Initially those meetings were scheduled to last 20 minutes. It soon became obvious that the teams were not very clear what to do and what their objectives were, since some people responded in different ways to simple questions in diametrically opposite ways. (This was not just a case of variant answers or attitudes, which is normal.) As a consequence, some of these 20 minute scheduled meetings were lasting two hours easily, with the prospect of continuing. In this way over about two weeks, the manager had the opportunity to spend useful time with some of the teams and to reach a point where it was possible to say clearly how departments’ activities aligned with the strategic objectives and what the relevant metrics could be.

2. **To ask every person (except the ones from support units – IT, HR, finance and administrative) to fill out a simple template with each activity they wanted to
The results came as a surprise, even for the m&e manager, who expected some difficulty. The first five hardest working people estimated this (Table I).

In a usual year, there are about 225 working days, if we subtract the vacation days, we end with a little over 200. Estimates from about 20 percent of the staff were well above 250. A few were between 220 and 250, and the rest were at a realistic level. This was a very clear sign that 20 percent of the team needed serious support to better understand what they were expected to do, so that they could completely restructure their work plan. As a consequence of this some management decisions were taken and finally everyone had a work plan with a manageable number of days for the next 12 months.

**Work plan readjustment**

This example comes from same program, but from one year and a half later into implementation. Based on m&e data analysis, periodic updates and discussion with teams, it became clear that the team was implementing different types of activities which were grouped in three categories by the m&e manager:

1. Activities which had a clear connection between their outputs/outcomes and strategic objectives contracted with the client.

2. Activities which had an almost clear connection between their outputs/outcomes and strategic objectives contracted with the client. Some of them were reaching some of the objectives, but were also producing some other outputs/outcomes which either was not necessary, in which case they could be restructured to save some resources or others which with little adjustment could be aligned to the results.

3. Activities which did not have any clear connections with the strategic objectives and which probably could be strongly restructured, or even cut, but only after understanding the dimensions of this work (time, resources allocated, etc.). The activities counted here included those asked for on ad hoc basis by the funder, which normally cannot be turned down, but if additional resources are required, this could probably be negotiated with the client, because doing too many activities like this would prevent the team from reaching program objectives. There were also some activities initiated by the individual teams, without analyzing their alignment with strategic objectives, which in fact were not offering any type of tangible impact.

The detailed discussions on contracted strategic objectives and departments’ work results in order to clarify these points were having limited success. The management did not see a need to analyze some of the activities in order to understand what activities mentioned at (2) should be restructured and how to keep a better control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total working days for next 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I.**

Estimated number of working days for the next 12 months
on activities at (3). This was the point at which it became clear that all the analysis should be translated into a language which is universally understood – money. Since salaries are confidential it was not possible to go into individual financial data, but it was easy to make a time allocation for each department and to link it to various objectives from the work plan. The conclusions were formulated in an easy to understand form:

1. in all, 55 percent of time was allocated on tasks which help to meet the targets (the equivalent of (1) above); and

2. in all, 45 percent of the time was spent on activities which may reach the target or will not (administrative, IT not included here) (the equivalent of (2) and (3) above).

The indirect conclusion was of the order “we probably waste up to 45% of the budget; do we plan to do something about this?”

Presenting the data and message in this way had a powerful effect! In a short time activities at (2) were analyzed and some were restructured, and better management of activities at (3) began.

In both examples there was a need to determine, or persuade, management to take a decision based on well-informed data. But the first methods applied proved to be inefficient, or even creating surprisingly funny situations. In both cases a clear analysis was needed to understand what information the recipient will understand better and will lead to informed action. None of that information is usually tracked by the m&e department. In the first example, of inadequate planning, in some organizations there might be people in charge with business planning processes which analyze tasks allocations and can make the appropriate corrections, but this was not the case in the example. There was a clear need for flexibility and to deliver information to management that they were confident to handle to be able to perform their job appropriately.

3. Advocating beyond the program team

When implementing the Global Libraries program, one of the biggest challenges we faced was to educate and persuade program beneficiaries (librarians working in public libraries) to use evaluation data in their advocacy efforts to better communicate and cooperate with public administration in order to obtain a higher budget, or more support for their activities. Initially we believed that it would be an easy task, since quite early in the program we understood something very important both for public libraries and for public administration: through their successful work public libraries are efficiently reaching public administration development objectives. Using computers and the internet, the librarians are assisting their patrons to look for new jobs, and even find a new job, helping small entrepreneurs to find useful information for their businesses, aiding farmers to fill out online agriculture subsidies applications and so on. All these achievements are included as priorities into every local council development strategy in Romania. It was much more challenging than expected to make the shift from class exercises, and role play, to real life situations. We decided to start using evaluation data ourselves, so that librarians could benefit by grasping the idea in a practical way. We began to write to every county councilor in Romania (about 1,400 letters in total) a tailored letter, starting 2011. Since we knew that the politicians did not identify very fast with traditional library reports (number of books,
number of people and number of events) and because Global Libraries is about technology use and information, we decided to take a different approach in the letters. First, we aimed to capture each councilor’s attention to fully read a letter about public libraries. To achieve this, the first paragraph includes an estimate of the total donation value of Global Libraries for that particular county. Here we included the hardware value (computers, printer, router, projectors and video camera), software value and training value. In most of the cases this total value is in the range of half million US dollars, in some it goes higher. This proved to be a good start in the letters because most of the councilors were impressed to learn that the libraries in their county succeeded in attracting such a donation. In the letter text we mentioned some other figures which were expected to be relevant for local development – the total amount of agricultural subsidies which were attracted with the help of public libraries, the number of citizens who were trained in personal financial management (Letter sample in Appendix 1). We also included relevant data for each individual county to help people understand the picture: library patrons by age groups, including some relevant quote from patrons for that county (Tailored data sample in Appendix 2).

By sending the letters we were targeting several objectives:

1. Promote libraries and their work to public administration: quite often politicians do not know much about libraries, and do not understand the potential benefit of using libraries to solve social and economic problems within their communities.

2. Sell impact data and the impact process in an easy to understand form to both librarians and politicians: quite often the librarians are trying to demonstrate the usefulness of library activity using traditional library statistics: such as number of books/materials, registered users, visits and circulation figures. This has a limited effect on a few politicians. We tried, and succeeded, in being different. We spoke about the total value of the donation (hardware, software, training), the number of computers donated and the number of trained librarians. We also spoke about other kind of impact: people looking for jobs and finding jobs, people developing their business or farms, people getting better access to education resources and health information. In this way we showed that libraries are actively contributing to community, social and economic development. All this information was tailored for each county and was supplemented by relevant popup survey data for each county and a national datasheet. This year we added for the counties active in The Agency for Payment and Intervention in Agriculture cooperation (filling agricultural subsidies online application in public libraries) the total value of agricultural subsidies obtained through public libraries.

3. Educate librarians to communicate and advocate in a proactive and practical way: speaking about positive effects on the community is the best way to impress politicians. Making them understand that libraries can help local authorities to reach their community development objectives (social and economic) seem the best way to open an effective communication channel.

In the first year of the letter-writing campaign, 2011, we received four messages of appreciation from county councilors and county library managers, which confirmed that we had made a good step forward, but probably this was not enough. In 2012 we
received about 11 thank you notes, asking us to continue. We performed follow-up research and here are the main findings on the 2012 letters:

1. In six counties the librarians declared that our letter helped to obtain a higher budget compared to the previous year.

2. In more than one-third of the places the County Council’s attitude toward the public library had significantly changed (in 36 percent of the counties the County Council president asked for more information on public libraries and Global Libraries following our letters).

3. In all, 70 percent of them felt that the County Council had a better understanding of what libraries are doing.

4. Almost 60 percent reported that they had obtained more support from County Council for further projects.

5. Librarians started to use impact data widely in PR communication activities. In a lot of places they used the information in several ways: in press conferences, web publishing, TV news and radio news. Moreover, after seeing this information, in some places local media took the initiative and created their own articles and interviews. Some of the librarians used our letters during the budget hearings.

6. We proved that impact work done properly has a tangible impact on libraries and librarians’ lives and communities, and YES it makes for efficient advocacy!

7. We feel that our work has a good prospect of being sustainable.

Detailed research results are presented in Appendix 3.

4. Consequences of the letter-writing campaign

Some of the main results of the campaign were as follows.

Librarians saw the steps we took, understood the data we used and how we presented it in the form of brief but effective letters to local government authorities. The overwhelmingly positive reaction of public administrations and the measurable change in attitudes toward public libraries has resulted in long-term commitment which has shown great results. After three years, in 2013 we obtained a tangible result which was worth all the effort we invested.

Librarians started to use data in an independent and constructive way. They organized press conferences where they delivered all the information we provided plus other local information, started to collect, process and use data independently, and their awareness of data collection usage improved dramatically. As a consequence their messages are getting through more effectively and efficiently to local politicians, and several of them reported improved cooperation with local administration and increased support from them.

What did we do differently?

1. We analyzed the types of data to which local politicians respond.

2. We presented the processed data in a short, crisp and clear way. We always followed the idea presented above – that through their successful work public libraries are effectively reaching public administration development objectives.
We started to use data in a proactive way so that librarians understood and liked the difference.

This approach is very similar to what Belgian chocolate stores are doing; they offer free samples to create the need until the addiction appears! It worked in our case too, without any Belgian chocolates.

5. Conclusions
Quite often the solution to some of our problems is in our “backyard,” the real challenge is to understand where to look for, what type of information to collect, how to process it and most important, in what form to present it to the right managers, or stakeholders.

Understanding the language our stakeholders understand, or are comfortable with, it is a key factor in order to help us advance in our work. Speaking that language might be the difference between success and failure.

Processing and using data in this way for management purposes can be a useful tool for any type of activities and industries. It does not matter if we speak about libraries, education, IT, manufacturing or business services. The concept and the methodology is the same, the language and technical terms might differ. Actually the case studies from Section 3 are coming from a library program; the ones from Section 2 are from a governance program.

If someone is interested in their projects or programs’ sustainability, here is something to learn here on how to stay flexible to any warning sign we see during implementation. Also here there are suggestions on how to better communicate with stakeholders which might not have similar technical background with project, or program team, but which have same objectives.

Appendix 1. Letter sample

February 12, 2014

XXX County Council

To: .....

County Council Member

Dear Mr. ............

I take this opportunity to thank you for your constant and generous support given to “xxxx” County Library to implement the Biblionet program in your county. Through this program, 69 local libraries have been equipped with computers and software, and 71 librarians have been trained, resulting in an investment of 1,657,408 RON in xxxx County.

In addition, I would like to provide you with a comprehensive update on the successes of xxxx County Library management team. Due to the tremendous efforts of xxxx County Library Director, xxxxx, as well as the entire team, the public libraries in your county have benefited from the Biblionet program. We strongly believe that public libraries are key pillars in each community, allowing individuals to pursue personal, professional and group interests, with positive results for the entire community.

Having free public internet access and competently trained librarians through Biblionet, citizens in the communities included in the program manage to solve their medical problems, find jobs, communicate with relatives working abroad, and find information on education and legislation.

In 2013, in partnership with the Visa Europe Foundation, over 980 public libraries in Romania have trained 10,291 Romanian citizens how to better manage their financial resources and how to
get a loan from a bank. We are sure that this financial education program will have a significant impact and many libraries will continue to provide this training.

Also, due to the partnership between the Biblionet program and The Agency for Payment and Intervention in Agriculture (APIA), between 2011 and 2013 approximately 90,000 farmers have filled and submitted the forms for agriculture subsidies, using the computers in the public libraries. The total value of the subsidies amounts to 115 million Euros. Moreover, because of the librarians’ involvement, the farmers have saved 750,000 Euros by eliminating the cost of transportation to APIA centers.

Due to the active involvement of the County Library director, xxxxx and her team, the value of subsidies attracted to xxxxxx County amounts to 5,646,496 Euros. The farmers who benefited from these subsidies have completed and submitted the APIA forms at the public libraries.

The success of the Biblionet program was highlighted by Mrs Neelie Kroes, Vice President of the European Commission and by Mr Dan Ciolos, European Commissioner for Agriculture, during the Biblionet Conference in October 2013.

In the five years of the Biblionet program implementation, libraries have proved to be an effective partner in organizing library services, leading to implementation of the development strategy at local and county level: through access to employment opportunities, information on business development, information on health and education, etc. As a representative of the County Council, we kindly ask you to provide continued support to the County Library and to the public authorities of the localities included in the Biblionet program. Your support is greatly needed for the development and sustainability of the new services offered to communities by public libraries.

Moreover, given the achievements shown in the past years, we hope that you will consider public libraries, as a reliable partner in implementing a wide range of EU funding programs.

We hope that, through an effective partnership between local government and libraries, we will succeed in creating a modern library system for Romanian citizens, to provide assistance in solving the problems the communities are facing.

Yours sincerely,

Paul – Andre Baran, Dragos Neagu,
Biblionet Program Director President of National Association of Public Libraries and Librarians in România
Appendix 2

What users say about the computers in the public library, in Constanta County

Users' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>39%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 14 y.o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 y.o</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25 y.o</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 45 y.o</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 60 y.o</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60 y.o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75% of the respondents said that they solved a personal problem using the computers and Internet at the public library.

Type of information accessed using the computers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with relatives working abroad</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding a Job</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving a medical problem</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping on-line</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes (trainings)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library is more useful if it provides free internet access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know/Don't answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 25% of users say they started accessing the internet at the public library.

Most searched information by different age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>26-45 y.o</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Medical Information &amp; Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 14 y.o</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-45 y.o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 y.o</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>26-45 y.o</td>
<td>Medical Information &amp; Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25 y.o</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Over 60 y.o</td>
<td>Medical Information &amp; Communication with relatives working abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A1.
Tailored data sample

At the public library, citizens are able to solve problems related to education, finding a job, health, agriculture, professional training, and communication with relatives working abroad. This is evidence that the public library can be a great support for public administrations to achieve their development objectives. It is up to you to support the development of these services.
Appendix 3. County councilor’s letters feedback 2013

1. What was the result of the letter send in January 2013 to County Councilors?
County Council has a better image on public libraries 69.4%
We obtained support for further library projects 58.3%
We used the provided information to discuss 2013 budget 55.5%
Local media made articles, news based on letters content 44.4%
One or more County Councilors asked for more information on Global Libraries and public libraries 41.6%
County Council President asked for more information on Global Libraries and public libraries 36.1%
We obtained a higher budget 16.6%

Other results which were mentioned by our partners:
1. The Vice-President of the County Council congratulated the County Library Director.
2. 16 local administrations were persuaded to join the Global Libraries Program in the following round.
3. We have not obtained any support for future projects, because the budget has not been approved yet and all projects and issues have been put on hold. We intend to use these data to ask for support. We cannot measure the impact of the letters at this moment, but this doesn’t mean they didn’t have an impact. The situation is getting complicated for Brasov County Library because the building housing the library has been claimed and returned to The Chamber of Commerce. Also, recently, we have been informed that the land, where the Children's Library building is located, belongs to a factory. We are facing serious problems with paying rent and we are looking for solutions, but maximum diplomacy is needed.
4. Calarasi County Council has designated the public manager, whose mission is, to support reopening public libraries, in communities where libraries have been closed, and persuade local authorities to join the program.
5. The Vice-president of the County Council was impressed by the partnership with APIA.

6. Overall you consider the letters as a good tool for communication with public authorities and to promote public libraries?
Yes 100%

7. What was the most important information, based on the degree of interest it raised? (ordered based on scoring)
1st Information on Global Libraries donation (computers, hardware, software, training value)
2nd Information on agricultural subsidies applications filled online in libraries
3rd National impact data
4th County level impact data
Other important information coming from the letters:
1. the opportunity of developing new library services and professional development strategies
2. program content itself

3. Did you use the information from the letters for other purposes? (Press conferences, public events, etc.)
Yes 58.3%

4. If you have used the information provided in the letters for press conferences, other events, or have used it in other materials that you have generated, please give us some details.
1. In Vaslui County the information has been used by both, County Library Director and County Library Coordinator, in interviews for local press and television.
In Olt County, the information has been presented to local media, included in the activity analysis reports of the County Library, used in the correspondence with public authorities, and for planning the objectives of the Library Annual Action Plan.

The data has been included in the Activity Analysis Report and in promotional materials.

We haven’t sent a press release. The information was included in a local German newspaper article, (Allgemeine Deutsche Zeitung no. 5100, from March 15, 2013, page 3), written by journalist Dieter Drotleff, who is also a County Councilor.

Yes, we have used the information provided in the letters and other data from national statistics, in interviews and press releases.

Mehedinti County www.mehedinteanul.ro/component/content/article/91-actualitate/6774-biblionet-um-program-de-sucess-pentru-bibliotecile-din-mehedinti

I have included the content of the letter in the Managerial Activity Evaluation Project for 2009-2012. In addition, the information was used in newspaper articles and other public events related to the library, and it will be published on the library website. The information has been disseminated at every ribbon cutting event, and, during the IT classes for seniors, underlining that this new service is a result of the program.

The information was disseminated in discussions with county councilors, with representatives of other institutions and organizations, with local media, with local authorities, and the public participating in different events organized by the public library.

Cluj County Library www.bjc.ro/new/index.php?programul-biblionet-in-judetul-cluj. The information was included in a newspaper article and a TV material, which aired on Transilvania Live: www.transilvaniaalive.ro/sites/default/files/no256_trreporter.pdf

Arges County: www.youtube.com/watch?v=2l-S8SW4LWg&noredirect=1 http://m.agerpres.ro/n/Arges-Peste-40000-de-utilizatori-activi-inregistrati-la-bibliotecile-publice-din-judet-172801
www.ecomunitate.ro/Peste_40_000_de_utilizatori_activi_sunt_%C3%AEnregistrati_%C3%AEn_bibliotecile_publice_din_Arges(26603).html

Bacău County: The information has been included in the library activity reports.

In Botosani County the information has been widely publicized. It was included in the annual activity report, in promotional materials and on the library website.

Timis http://foto.agerpres.ro/index.php?q=a-duma&d=1&h=1&r=1&md=1&f=1&e=0&x=1&t=1

In Vaslui County the information was used in annual reports, press conferences, radio and television interviews, in promotional materials for the public authorities. The information was also, disseminated to local librarians during regular methodological meetings.

The information has been used in Strategic Development Planning for Gorj public library system.

We have encouraged local librarians to disseminate the information to public authorities for a better understanding of the community interests and needs.

I have posted the information on the public library blog and it had 90 views up to this moment (posted on March 15, 2013).

Statistical data, reporting.
Successful partnership between APIA and public libraries, www.recolta.eu/parteneriat-de-succes-intre-apia-si-biblioteci/

21. Mures County: The information was published on the library website – www.bjmures.ro/Biblionet/index.htm, in local media, including 30 minutes TV footage on Antena 1 Targu-Mures.
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