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Introduction

Jefferson County Public Library (JCPL) conducts an annual benchmarking study as a tool to

- compare and evaluate key operating and performance indicators of library services and their value to the community by key measures of library use
- inform JCPL’s strategic planning process
- monitor progress against the overall goal of performing at or above the median compared to a selected pool of public peer libraries
- identify trends, key areas of opportunity and focus in the allocation of future resources

The Benchmarking Study 2018 uses national library data published annually by the Public Library Data Service (PLDS) www.plametrics.org. The data is collected through an annual online survey which is administered by the Center for Informatics Research in Science and Scholarship (CIRSS) at the University of Illinois, and is run on behalf of the Public Library Association (PLA). Participation in the survey is voluntary. In 2018 a total of 4,402 US libraries completed the questionnaire.

JCPL conducted a benchmarking study using a sample of eleven national libraries in 2018, including JCPL. The study compares key data from finance, resources, technology, library services and use, based on 2018 fiscal year data.

Peer selection

JCPL selects its benchmarking peers based on population size and operating revenue per capita, recognizing these variables as most significant in sampling a comparative group of benchmarking peers from the PLDS dataset of public libraries.

Benchmarking based on population size ensures comparison of key performance indicators relative to libraries needing to serve a similar sized community. For the purpose of this study the selection criteria “population” is defined as the number of people residing in the Legal Service Area (LSA) of a public library. For JCPL the LSA refers to Jefferson County.

Revenue per capita refers to the funds received for operating the libraries, measured per county resident. As such, operating revenue per capita represents the relative spending power of the library based on population size, and determines investment capabilities.
JCPL uses dynamic benchmarking by applying the same selection criteria year over year, and allowing the peer group to adapt accordingly, rather than using fixed peers over time. Similar to last year JCPL used a +/- 22 percent range for both selection criteria, JCPL’s population, and operating revenue per capita. This resulted in a pool of 11 peers including JCPL.

**Peer group**

The benchmarking peers including JCPL were selected based on a defined range of:

- **Population LSA +/- 22 percent of JCPL’s**
  (579,631 in 2018, range 452,112 – 707,150)

- **Operating revenue per capita +/-22 percent of JCPL’s**
  ($66.24 in 2018; range $51.67 - $80.82)

Eleven public libraries including JCPL were selected as part of the 2018 benchmarking peer group. The following graphs show JCPL’s placement in the 2018 peer group as the midpoint of the operating revenue per capita values range, and in the lower range of the group in terms of size of population served.

![Peer group based on +/- 22% of JCPL's Population (LSA)](image)

* added as out-of-range local benchmarking peer.
The following libraries are new or newly returned peers in 2018.

- **CA – SONOMA COUNTY LIBRARY** (new)
- **OK – TULSA CITY COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM** (newly returned)

The following 2017 peers are not included in the 2018 benchmarking data set due to falling outside the defined range for peer selection.

- **FL – LEE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM** (population too high)
- **TN – NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY** (operating revenue per capita too low)

The following Colorado public libraries are consistently included in the peer group as important local benchmarking partners since 2012, even in the years they fall outside of the defined range for any of the peer selection criteria. Their relevance to JCPL drove this decision.

- **CO – PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT** (operating revenue per capita slightly too low in 2018)
- **CO – DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY** (population slightly too high in 2018)
**Executive summary**

2018 was JCPL’s third consecutive year of operating on a higher budget after a successfully passed mill levy in 2015. Since then JCPL has followed a long-term plan focused on increasing access to library services for Jefferson County. After expanding library public service hours by 25 percent in 2016, JCPL has focused on updating its existing library facilities. The remodel of the Columbine Library in 2017 was followed by the expansion of library services in the new Civic Center in Edgewater in November 2018.

As JCPL continues to fulfill its promises to the community by investing in collection, services, staff, and buildings, the return on these investments shows in high use of the library by the community when benchmarked against the peer libraries. We see this trend from previous years continued in 2018, with JCPL again ranking high in circulation, visits, and program attendance when compared to the peer group.

While the expansion of Edgewater has resulted in increases in actual square footage, public service hours, and staff, JCPL still ranks at or below the 25th percentile in these facility related benchmarking measures, when evaluated per capita. It needs to be noted that not all increases from the Edgewater expansion had an impact on 2018 benchmarking results. Changes in square footage and the collection size were immediate, but due to an opening date of November, changes in public service hours or Full Time Equivalent (FTE) will not be seen until 2019.

JCPL marked the median of the 2018 peer group in revenue per capita with corresponding operating expenditures just slightly above the median. JCPL continued to dedicate a portion of operating revenues towards capital spending, such as expanding the Edgewater Library at the Edgewater Civic Center, and planning for the Belmar Library redesign.

JCPL was again highest investor in library materials in 2018 compared to the peer group, and increased the overall collection size by 12 percent. JCPL invested heavily in physical and digital materials in equal shares, and also purchased a new opening day collection for the Edgewater Library. The use of these resources is measured by circulation of the materials. Compared to the peers, JCPL showed the highest use of library materials by its community, and recorded the highest circulation per capita. Circulation of digital materials surpassed projections, and for the first year reached the median value of the peers, finally reaching this milestone after three years of strategic investments in order to catch up this particular collection segment from pre-mill levy years.

In an effort to evaluate the use of library resources more comprehensively, JCPL is integrating two additional industry measures in this benchmarking study. **Total collection use** includes not only the circulation of physical and digital materials, but also the use of databases. JCPL was able to retain its lead in total collection use from the previous year, and once again sees the investments made for the
collection, and its relevance and value to the community confirmed. The measure of **Total visits** combines physical visits to our buildings with digital visits to our website. JCPL ranks 3rd in this use measure in 2018, which shows the high level of awareness of library resources and active use of the library by the community.

JCPL ranks above the median of the peer group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 BENCHMARKING PARAMETERS</th>
<th>JCPL 2018</th>
<th>JCPL Ranking 2018 (descending)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Collection use per capita</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation per capita (Physical and digital)</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database retrievals per capita</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total visits per capita</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website visits per capita</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program attendance per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical visits per capita</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures per capita</td>
<td>$55.37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JCPL marks the median of the peer group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 BENCHMARKING PARAMETERS</th>
<th>JCPL 2018</th>
<th>JCPL Ranking 2018 (descending)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per capita</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Cardholders</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JCPL ranks below the median of the peer group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 BENCHMARKING PARAMETERS</th>
<th>JCPL 2018</th>
<th>JCPL Ranking 2018 (descending)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection size per capita</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Legal service area (LSA)</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library square footage per capita</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service hours per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary data table 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of Legal service area (LSA)</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.244</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>577,514</td>
<td>602,875</td>
<td>648,226</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>578,101</td>
<td>571,459</td>
<td>565,535</td>
<td>548,557</td>
<td>537,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Cardholders</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>267,924</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>420,063</td>
<td>10,142</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>320,551</td>
<td>361,881</td>
<td>350,433</td>
<td>341,446</td>
<td>332,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per capita</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$68.49</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$65.44</td>
<td>$56.42</td>
<td>$44.16</td>
<td>$45.24</td>
<td>$47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures per capita</td>
<td>$55.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$49.15</td>
<td>$53.72</td>
<td>$63.48</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$55.37</td>
<td>$52.36</td>
<td>$46.03</td>
<td>$42.64</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
<td>$43.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service hours per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library square footage per capita</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection size per capita</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database retrievals per capita</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collection use per capita</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program attendance per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical visits per capita</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website visits per capita</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total visits per capita</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarking measures 2018

Operating revenue, expenditures and investments

Operating revenue per capita is one of the criteria used to identify JCPL’s benchmarking peer group. As in the past two years, JCPL expended a portion of operating revenue on capital projects which explains the lower operating expenditures compared to operating revenue. Capital projects for 2018 included the expanded location of the Edgewater Library at the new Edgewater Civic Center, as well as planning for the Belmar redesign.

- JCPL’s Revenue per capita marked the median of the 2018 peer group.
- JCPL’s Operating expenditures were close to the median (slightly above in 5th rank).

Investments

Investments were made in staff as well as library materials.

Staff expenditures (salaries and benefits) remained conservative in 2018 when compared to the peer group.

- JCPL had lowest Staff expenditures in percent of Operating expenditures (54 percent).

Material expenditures (for library materials; physical, digital, databases) on the other hand showed substantial investments made by JCPL in the collection, both physical and digital. They resulted in greater collection offerings, and generated high collection use.

- JCPL had the highest library materials budget in percent of Operating expenditures (25 percent).
- Collection size increased by 12 percent, half was digital, half was physical items’ increases.
Measures of operations - Public service hours, Library square footage, FTE, Collection size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public service hours per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library square footage per capita</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection size per capita</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group of key performance indicators directly relates to our facilities. In 2018 JCPL follows the trend of previous years by ranking below the median compared to the peers in these parameters. With the expansion of the Edgewater Library JCPL was able to increase some parameters immediately, like square footage, and collection size, while the impacts of the additional staffing and public service hours will not be visible until later.

The ability of JCPL to keep up with future population growth and our benchmarking partners is tied closely to accessibility of library services in terms of public service hours, space in terms of square footage, customer service in terms of FTE available, and the core service of providing library materials in terms of collection size.

- **Public service hours**

The expanded Edgewater hours did not have a large impact on 2018 Benchmarking results because of the timing of the grand opening of the Edgewater Library in November of 2018. For 2018,

- JCPL’s per capita public service hours increased slightly (by 0.17) to 53 Public service hours per 1,000 capita.
- JCPL ranked 2nd lowest in Public service hours offered per 1,000 capita.
- JCPL remained below the 25th percentile.

However, when relating public service hours to the number of branches, JCPL recorded 2nd highest public service hours per branch (3,063 hours actually open per branch in 2018). This perspective shows that JCPL is essentially offering significantly more open hours to the public in each of its library branches than most of its benchmarking peers.

- **Square footage**

Square footage is an important parameter when comparing with other libraries as many key indicators are linked to it, such as all physical use parameters including the number of physical items that fit the
available shelf capacity, circulation of physical items, program attendance, and physical visits to the library.

With the expanded 10,000 square feet Edgewater Library facility, the system square footage for JCPL increased by 8,500.

- **Edgewater increased JCPL’s Square footage per capita by 4 percent.**
- **JCPL has moved up one rank to mark the 25th percentile, 3rd lowest of the peers.**

- **Full Time Equivalent (FTE)**

PLDS calculates FTE based on actual worked hours, calculated for a 40 hour work week, and annualized over the 52 weeks of the year. Because of the way FTE are measured and the late timing of the Edgewater Library grand opening, there is a smaller impact on the 2018 FTE benchmark measure.

- **JCPL’s per capita FTE increased by 8 percent to 0.48 FTE per 1,000 capita.**
- **JCPL remained under the median.**
- **JCPL stayed in 3rd lowest rank of the peer group, as in the previous year.**

- **Collection size**

JCPL invested heavily in library materials in 2018, and increased its collection size to 1,264,982 items. Physical items purchased accounted for about half of the added items to the collection. The increase included the 25,000 physical items acquired specifically for the opening day collection for the new expanded Edgewater Library. Digital items purchased made up the other half of collection purchases. The digital collection size grew by 49 percent, while the physical collection grew by 7 percent.

- **Collection size (physical and digital) increased by 12 percent.**
- **The increase was split about 1:1 between physical and digital items.**
- **JCPL has moved up 2 ranks to 7th rank of the peer group, now only slightly below the median.**
Measures of library use and community value - Circulation, Program attendance, Visits

This group of key performance indicators has been consistently high for JCPL, and remains well above the median for most parameters in 2018. The investments in the collection since the passing of the mill levy have been substantial, and JCPL has seen increases in the use of these resources.

- **Circulation and Total collection use**

Circulation shows use of physical and digital library materials by the community. While borrowing physical materials always requires a visit to the library, digital materials are accessible through the library from various vendors by digital download and do not require a physical library visit. Circulation is not only a measure of return of investment for the collection, but also functions as a success measure in terms of the quality of its product offerings. JCPL’s high circulation ranking among the peers confirms the selections made for the collection as meeting customer needs.

The library industry has started a discussion about measuring use of library materials, illustrated by the addition of Total collection use. Total collection use is adding the number of database retrievals to the circulation numbers of physical and digital materials, offering a comprehensive evaluation of the library collection. Database retrievals capture full text retrievals or downloads, record views, full records accessed, videos watched, lessons viewed, and include learning databases like Mango Languages. JCPL was again able to establish its lead in 2018 in both Circulation per capita, as well as Total collection use per capita, ranking

- 1st in Circulation per capita, and
- 1st in Total collection use per capita.

- **Programs and Program attendance**

The number of JCPL programs offered remained the same per capita compared to the previous year, but the programs were attended more in 2018.
• JCPL offered the same number of Programs per capita in 2018 as in 2017.
• JCPL increased Program attendance per 1,000 capita by 11 percent in 2018.
• JCPL improved to 4th rank (by 2 ranks), well above the median, in Program attendance per 1,000 capita.

These results show the continued success of JCPL programming and are testimony to JCPL following its path of offering higher attended quality programs rather than simply more programming to increase attendance. Library programs and events allow JCPL to support, educate and reach out to its community. Program attendance is a success measure for these library services, and JCPL’s results speak to a vibrant relationship of JCPL with its patrons.

• Visits

Physical visits are one of the measures of community value, as the library is genuinely designed as a place for the community to connect and to tap into the various library resources available. JCPL saw a 4 percent increase per capita for Physical visits in 2018 compared to the previous year. This number shows the importance of the library as a place to the community.

Website visits measure the number of virtual visits to the library website, www.jeffcolibrary.org. These visits include the activity of catalog browsing in 2018 for the first time, when this user activity had been excluded previously. The revised state definition for website visits explains a great portion of the 40 percent increase JCPL records in 2018 compared to 2017. However, JCPL also made some improvements to its website, impacting the 2018 benchmarking results. The new website with its “Digital Experience Platform” by Bibliocommons led to more accessible information for the customer by integrating website, catalog, and events calendar for a better browsing experience. The new platform also enabled JCPL to market the digital collection more directly by displaying all available item formats when customers browse the catalog, thereby raising awareness for digital items.

The measure of Total visits combines physical visits to our buildings with digital visits to our website. It is therefore also affected by the definition change for website visits in 2018.

JCPL improved all measures in 2018, compared to the previous year, and ranked

• 5th in Physical visits per capita,
• 2nd busiest library with most Physical visits per public service hour.
• 3rd in Website visits per capita,
• 3rd in Total visits, Physical visits, and Website visits.
Appendix

Methodology

This report utilizes benchmarking data from the 2018 fiscal year, based on a selected sample of eleven US public libraries (including JCPL), which are frequently referred to as “peer group” or “benchmarking group” in this document. The data is presented in two tables, a short Summary data table displaying mainly per capita values, and a more Comprehensive data table in the appendix, showing annual counts along with per capita values. Per capita ratios measure a library’s capability of serving its population or community, and help put annual counts into perspective to population size. Per capita ratios also measure whether the annual accumulated values for any given parameter can sustain population growth over time.

The following table section illustrates the general layout of the tables and their data columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of Legal service area (LSA)</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23,244</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>577,514</td>
<td>602,875</td>
<td>648,226</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>578,101</td>
<td>571,459</td>
<td>565,535</td>
<td>548,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per capita</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$68.49</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$65.44</td>
<td>$56.42</td>
<td>$44.16</td>
<td>$45.24</td>
<td>$47.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From left to right, the tables reference the 2018 JCPL values for all listed benchmarking parameters, followed by the ranking of JCPL within the peer group. This ranking serves as a quick benchmarking point. As JCPL strives to meet or surpass the median (50th percentile) of the peer group, the table below references the relation to the median for all possible ranks. The median is referred to as the 50th percentile interchangeably in this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JCPL Ranking against peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50th percentile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the peer group of eleven, when ranked 1-5, JCPL would mark above the 50th percentile, when ranked 7-11, JCPL would mark below the 50th percentile. The 6th rank represents the median and marks the midpoint in the data where 50 percent of the data fall below this point, and 50 percent fall above it.

Following the JCPL Ranking column, the tables show the difference of JCPL’s 2018 values to the median, both in numbers as well as in percentage difference. All percentiles, 25th, 50th, and 75th, are listed subsequently. While the median serves as JCPL’s main benchmarking measure, the 75th percentile is used as a secondary measure of “best library performance”. The 75th percentile is a
data point JCPL aspires to reach over time with continuous strategic investments and the realization of long term capital projects.

The percentiles are followed by two columns displaying the year-over-year change for JCPL from 2017 to 2018, as difference and percentage difference. They precede a listing of JCPL’s current (2018) values and historic values dating back to the year 2013. The historic data is to document progress over time.

The trend graphs in the appendix display the historic JCPL data plotted against the median values of the corresponding previous years’ benchmarking peers, to visualize JCPL’s long term trends compared to the median values of the peer libraries.
### Comprehensive data table 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of Legal service area (LSA)</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23,244</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>577,514</td>
<td>602,875</td>
<td>648,226</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>579,631</td>
<td>578,101</td>
<td>571,459</td>
<td>565,535</td>
<td>548,557</td>
<td>537,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Cardholders</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>267,924</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>420,083</td>
<td>10,142</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>310,409</td>
<td>320,551</td>
<td>361,881</td>
<td>350,433</td>
<td>341,446</td>
<td>332,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per capita</td>
<td>$66,244</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$54.60</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$68.49</td>
<td>$6.81</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$66.24</td>
<td>$66.45</td>
<td>$56.44</td>
<td>$44.16</td>
<td>$45.24</td>
<td>$47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per year</td>
<td>$38,397,173</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,249,513</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
<td>$32,448,007</td>
<td>$44,176,660</td>
<td>$41,723,437</td>
<td>$567,314</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>$38,397,173</td>
<td>$37,829,859</td>
<td>$32,244,512</td>
<td>$24,975,800</td>
<td>$24,815,991</td>
<td>$24,497,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures per capita</td>
<td>$55,375</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,66</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>$49.15</td>
<td>$53.72</td>
<td>$63.48</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$55.37</td>
<td>$52.38</td>
<td>$46.03</td>
<td>$42.64</td>
<td>$38.83</td>
<td>$43.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures per year</td>
<td>$32,096,434</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$600,483</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$30,678,623</td>
<td>$31,495,951</td>
<td>$35,402,323</td>
<td>$1,825,648</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$32,096,434</td>
<td>$30,270,786</td>
<td>$26,306,849</td>
<td>$21,112,944</td>
<td>$21,299,925</td>
<td>$23,516,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expenditures (salaries and benefits) per year</td>
<td>$17,353,918</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,221,150</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>$17,908,512</td>
<td>$20,575,068</td>
<td>$26,470,201</td>
<td>$1,282,148</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$17,353,918</td>
<td>$16,071,770</td>
<td>$15,371,707</td>
<td>$13,442,148</td>
<td>$13,104,625</td>
<td>$13,531,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material expenditures per year</td>
<td>$8,170,418</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,483,417</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>$3,579,927</td>
<td>$3,637,001</td>
<td>$4,581,792</td>
<td>$1,025,824</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>$8,170,418</td>
<td>$8,296,242</td>
<td>$5,816,450</td>
<td>$3,433,873</td>
<td>$3,337,282</td>
<td>$3,171,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Staff expenditures of total operating expenditures:
- 54% (2018)

% Materials expenditures of total operating expenditures:
- 29% (2018)

Library square footage per capita:
- 0.40 (2018)

Library square footage:
- 225,407,2018

FTE per 1,000 capita:
- 0.48 (2018)

FTE per year:
- 278,2018

Collection size per capita:
- 21.87, 2018

Collection size:
- 1,264,982, 2018

Circulation per capita (Physical and digital):
- 13.45, 2018

Circulation per year (physical and electronic):
- 7,798,419, 2018

Database retrievals per capita:
- 2,34, 2018

Database per year:
- 1,353,785, 2018

Total Collection use per capita:
- 15.79, 2018

Total collection use per year:
- 9,152,204, 2018

Programs per 1,000 capita:
- 19, 2018

Programs per year:
- 10,807, 2018

Program attendance per 1,000 capita:
- 471, 2018

Program attendance per year:
- 273,293, 2018

Physical visits per capita:
- 4.69, 2018

Physical visits per year:
- 2,718,796, 2018

Website visits per capita:
- 7.26, 2018

Website visits per year:
- 4,208,479, 2018

Total visits per capita:
- 11.95, 2018

Total visits per year:
- 6,927,275, 2018
Benchmarking graphs

Measures of operations

- Public service hours per 1,000 capita
- Library square footage per capita
- FTE per 1,000 capita
- Collection size per capita

Measures of library use and community value

- Circulation per capita
- Program attendance per 1,000 capita
- Physical visits per capita
Public service hours per 1,000 capita

* 2013 Peer comparison values N/A.
FTE per 1,000 capita

- 75th Percentile: 0.71
- Median: 0.52
- JCPL FTE per 1,000 capita: 0.48