The Cleveland Heights-University Heights Public Library: Patron and Public Perceptions

Baldwin Wallace University Community Research Institute | June 13, 2025

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary[WM1][LC2]

1.1 Overview

The Cleveland Heights–University Heights Public Library (Heights Libraries) partnered with the Baldwin Wallace University Community Research Institute to assess the usage, perceptions, and needs of community members. The goal of the research is to inform strategic planning, programming, and potential ballot initiatives by presenting a clear understanding of public engagement with the library system.

This report presents findings from a comprehensive survey of 820 respondents using a combined sampling approach. The survey was administered from February 18 to March 28, 2025. The dual sampling methodology included a mixed-mode sample (n = 351) collected through phone and web panels, as well as a convenience or non-random sample of library users (n = 469) collected through self-administered online responses.

The mixed-mode sample (n = 351) included library users recruited through phone and web panels, encompassing residents from the five ZIP codes served by the Heights Libraries (44106, 44112, 44118, 44121, and 44122), as well as neighboring communities such as Beachwood, Cleveland, East Cleveland, Highland Hills, Shaker Heights, and South Euclid.

The convenience sample (n = 469) consisted of self-selected respondents who completed the survey online after encountering recruitment materials, such as flyers, emails, and social media posts, distributed by Heights Libraries. These two datasets were merged to form a combined sample (n = 820), which serves as the basis for the findings in this report.

The final combined sample comprises three data sources: a convenience sample (57.2%), a non-probability online panel (35.6%) administered through Cint/Lucid Holdings LLC, and a probability-based telephone recruitment sample (7.2%) of registered voters acquired through Aristotle. All respondents identified as library users and resided in or regularly accessed services within the Heights Library system.

All data are weighted to the 2023 American Community Survey (ACS) benchmarks for gender, age, and ethnicity. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The margin of error (MoE) is ±7%, and it applies to the overall results only (i.e., not the cross-tabulations). For some questions, MoE for the mixed-mode sample is higher because only a subset of respondents answered the question.

These findings provide actionable insights that support key priorities outlined in Heights Libraries' FY2023–2025 Strategic Plan and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan. The survey results align strongly with the system's commitments to fostering diversity and inclusion, enhancing community safety, security, and well-being, supporting equitable and inclusive program and service development, and promoting access to trusted, unbiased information for all community members.

In the executive summary, we focus on the results from the combined sample.

1.2 Library Card Ownership and Access (Q3-Q6)

Library access is strong across the community. In the combined sample, 87.3% of respondents reported having a Heights Libraries card. The Lee Road branch is the most frequently used (55.8%), followed by University Heights (17.9%), Noble (13.6%), and Coventry (12.7%). A majority (44.4%) visit their primary branch at least once per month, with 14.9% visiting more than once per week. Most respondents (67.7%) typically drive to their branch, while others walk (24.0%) or use public transportation (5.3%).

1.3. Branch Choice and Reason for Use (Q7-Q13)

Branch selection is driven primarily by location/proximity (77.6%) and availability of resources (50.9%). Other key factors include facility/environment (46.5%), staff/service quality (42.3%), and hours of operation (33.9%). The importance of these factors varies somewhat by branch. For example, resource availability is important among Lee Road users (60.3%) compared to Coventry users (34.8%). These findings reinforce the Heights Libraries' commitment to delivering accessible, responsive, and community-centered services across all branches.

1.4. Perceived Branch Advantages (Q14-Q23)

Respondents rate the Heights Libraries branches very positively. The most frequently cited advantages include convenient location (80.9%), variety of resources (60.6%), helpful and knowledgeable staff (58.8%), safe environment (54.1%), and comfortable seating/work areas (50.7%). About half of respondents (48.6%) cite the availability of technology as an advantage, and about one-third of respondents (31.4%) cite events and programming as advantages. These findings reflect the Heights Libraries' ongoing commitment to providing safe, welcoming, inclusive, and well-equipped spaces that serve the diverse needs of the community.

1.5. Perceived Branch Disadvantages (Q24-Q33)

Most users report few disadvantages. About 51.8% cite no disadvantages at their primary branch. The most common concerns are limited parking (16.4%), limited hours of operation (16.9%), overcrowding (10.4%), and noise levels (8.9%). Only a small percentage of users reported issues, such as safety concerns, technological limitations, or seating shortages.

Addressing concerns related to parking, hours, and space constraints will support the Heights Libraries' priorities of ensuring equitable access and maintaining welcoming, inclusive, and accessible facilities for all community members.

1.6. Program and Service Utilization (Q35-Q61)

Library programming and services are heavily used. More than half of respondents (52.8%) attended library programs three or more times in the past six months. High usage rates were also reported for computers (67.6%), Wi-Fi (68.6%), online databases (71.5%), and eBooks, audiobooks, and eMagazines (60.8%). Among parents with children under 18, usage was especially strong for children's services (74.9%), homework help (33.6%), and parent/guardian resources (59.3%).

Strong engagement with technology and workforce-related services aligns directly with the Heights Libraries' goal of championing community workforce and tech skill development.

Additionally, high participation in children's programming supports ongoing efforts to offer inclusive, community-responsive services across life stages.

1.7 Equity and Inclusion (Q62-Q67)

The library is broadly perceived as a welcoming and inclusive space. Most respondents rated Heights Libraries "Good" or "Excellent" on:

- Making users feel accepted (85.4%)
- Making users feel included (82.0%)
- Promoting equity (78.2%)
- Making users feel respected (84.5%)
- Representing their identity (75.5%)
- Representing their community's needs/interests (79.6%)

Importantly, no major demographic differences were observed. These results strongly align with the Heights Libraries' goal of fostering an inclusive environment and delivering equitable services to diverse community members.

1.8 Website Use and Purpose (Q68-Q76)

A supermajority of respondents (81.0%) say they have visited the Heights Libraries website. Among users, 65.5% visit the site at least monthly. The primary reasons for visiting include searching the catalog (66.4%), reserving or renewing materials (60.0%), and checking library hours and locations (50.2%). Registration for events and programs (34.4%) and accessing online resources (29.9%) were also common motivations. A positive user experience online aligns with the Heights Libraries' commitment to providing safe, welcoming, and accessible digital environments.

1.9. Website User Experience (Q77-Q81)

Website usability ratings are strong. Most users rated the website "Good" or "Excellent" on:

- Ease of navigation (71.2%)
- Visual design (68.5%)
- Layout (67.4%)
- Search function effectiveness (70.1%)
- Dependability (80.5%)

These high ratings suggest the site supports users' information needs effectively. Continued investment in the website as a trusted, user-friendly platform will advance the Heights Libraries' goals related to digital accessibility, as well as promote unbiased, high-quality information for the community.

1.10 Awareness of Renovations (Q82-Q83)

Awareness of recent capital improvements is high. Among all respondents, 71.5% knew about renovations to PEACE Park, and 68.4% were aware of renovations at the Noble Library location. High levels of awareness about capital improvements support the Heights Libraries' commitment to responsible stewardship and community transparency.

1.11 Support for Tax Levy Renewal (Q84-Q85)

Among registered voters in Cleveland Heights and University Heights, 82.1% would vote to renew the Heights Libraries tax levy if the election were held today. Only 5.2% said they would vote "No," and 12.7% were undecided. While these results suggest broad-based support, it's important to interpret them with caution. Survey respondents often overstate support for ballot measures, particularly when asked in the abstract and well in advance of Election Day. Still, the library has a strong track record with voters: its first five-year operating levy passed in 1973 with 67.8% of the vote, and continuing levies were approved in 1992, 2000, 2008, and 2014.

1.12 Recommendations

Program and Service Development

- The Heights Libraries should expand the promotion of digital resources and services. The high usage of online databases (71.5%), eBooks/eMagazines (60.8%), and streaming (50.6%) indicates strong demand. Continued investment in these areas will support evolving community needs and advance the Strategic Plan's focus on digital engagement and equitable access to information.

- The Heights Libraries should broaden their outreach for specialized services. Increasing awareness and promotion of lesser-used services, such as tech training (28.4%), STEAM Lab (24.1%), home delivery (15.6%), and tablet lending (15.0%), will support the library's ongoing efforts to strengthen community access to workforce and technology resources.

- The Heights Libraries should strengthen programming for families and educators. Given the very high usage of children's services (74.9%) and parent/guardian resources (59.3%) among parents, expanding family-oriented and educator support offerings will serve important community needs. Ensuring that these programs are inclusive and reflective of the community's diversity will further the Library's DEI Plan goals.

Branch Operations

- The Heights Libraries should address parking and hours concerns. Limited parking (16.4%) and limited hours (16.9%) are the most cited disadvantages. Where feasible, targeted improvements in these areas will enhance user satisfaction and further the library's goal of ensuring equitable access to library spaces.

- The Heights Libraries should maintain its focus on safe, welcoming, and high-quality environments. Strong perceptions of safety (54.1%) and staff quality (58.8%) should continue to be prioritized, as this is consistent with the library's commitment to fostering safe and inclusive community spaces.

Equity and Inclusion

- The Heights Libraries should continue to implement inclusive practices and ensure that the representation of identity and community – which are currently rated as "Good" or "Excellent" by 75.5% and 79.6% of respondents, respectively – remains a priority. Strengthening alignment with goals around inclusive service delivery, organizational culture, and representation will be essential.

- The Heights Libraries should monitor perceptions of equity among demographic groups to ensure that positive trends persist across all segments. Tracking these perceptions will ensure that positive trends persist across all segments and will inform ongoing implementation of the Heights Libraries' DEI Plan.

Website and Communications Strategy
- The Heights Libraries should leverage its high-performance website as an outreach tool. Positive ratings on navigation (71.2%), dependability (80.5%), and search function (70.1%) suggest the site is a valuable engagement point. Promoting underused resources, such as online tutorials, through targeted website updates and campaigns will support the Strategic Plan's goal of ensuring a welcoming and effective digital environment.

- The Heights Libraries should enhance the marketing of library renovations and improvements. While awareness of PEACE Park (71.5%) and Noble Library renovations (68.4%) is good, consistent communication across all channels will further support the Strategic Plan's emphasis on responsible stewardship and transparency.

Campaign Strategy for Levy Renewal
- The Heights Libraries should highlight broad-based community support for the levy. With 82.1% of registered voters supporting renewal, campaign messaging should emphasize strengths that align with voter priorities.

- Campaign messaging should emphasize the library's commitment to providing safe and inclusive spaces, strong digital offerings, and engaging programs for children and families—key priorities that support the Heights Libraries' Strategic Plan and DEI goals.

2. Methodology

The Heights Library Survey employed a dual sampling methodology: a mixed-mode sample (n=351) collected through phone and web panels and a convenience sample (n = 469) collected through self-administered online responses.

The mixed-mode sample (n = 351) included library users recruited through phone and web panels, encompassing residents from the five ZIP codes served by the Heights Libraries (44106, 44112, 44118, 44121, and 44122), as well as neighboring communities such as Beachwood, Cleveland, East Cleveland, Highland Hills, Shaker Heights, and South Euclid.

The convenience sample (n = 469) consisted of self-selected respondents who completed the survey online after encountering recruitment materials, such as flyers, emails, and social media posts, distributed by Heights Libraries. These two datasets were merged to form a combined sample (n = 820), which serves as the basis for the findings in this report.

The final combined sample comprises three data sources: a convenience sample (57.2%), a non-probability online panel (35.6%) administered through Cint/Lucid Holdings LLC, and a probability-based telephone recruitment sample (7.2%) of registered voters acquired through Aristotle. All respondents identified as library users and resided in or regularly accessed services within the Heights Library system.

All Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks for gender, age, and ethnicity. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The margin of error (MoE) for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%, and it applies to the overall results only (i.e., not the cross-tabulations). For some questions, the MoE for the mixed-mode sample is higher because the sample size is smaller.

Table 1. Survey Demographics weighted to 2023 ACS Data by Mode of Data Collection

Gender

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Male	43.8%	55.1%	34.70%
Female	53.5%	43.7%	61.4%
Nonbinary/Other	2.7%	1.2%	3.9%

Age

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
18–49	53.3%	72.0%	38%
50+	46.7%	28.0%	62%

Education

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Less Than High School	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%
High School	11.3%	19.3%	4.9%

Some College	20.2%	29.5%	12.7%
Associate's Degree	8.5%	10.2%	7.1%
Bachelor's Degree	26.5%	21.1%	30.9%˘
Graduate Degree	32.7%	19.2%	43.7%

Race/Ethnicity

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
White	44.3%	30.8%	53.5%
Black	44.9%	59.4%	33.1%
Other/Mixed	11.7%	9.8%	13.3%

Income

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
< $25K	13.9%	17.7%	10.9%
$25 - $50K	22.2%	22.0%	22.3%
$50 - $75K	20.2%	19.9%	20.5%
$75- $100K	19.3%	20.9%	18.1%
$100 - $150K	13.8%	11.1%	16.0%
> $ 150K	10.5%	8.5%	12.1%

Home Ownership

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Own	56.8%	46.6%	65.1%
Rent	43.2%	53.4%	34.9%

Children Under Age 18

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	28.2%	37.4%	20.8%
No	71.8%	62.6%	79.2%

Children Under Age 6

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	14.6%	18.9%	11.2%
No	85.4%	81.1%	88.8%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

As shown in Table 1, the mixed-mode and convenience samples differed substantially in key demographic characteristics. The mixed-mode sample skewed younger, with 72.0% of respondents under age 50, compared to 38.0% in the convenience sample. The mixed-mode sample also included a higher proportion of male respondents (55.1%) and Black respondents (59.4%), while the convenience sample included more female respondents (61.4%) and white respondents (53.5%).

Educational attainment was higher in the convenience sample, where 74.6% of respondents held at least a bachelor's degree, compared to 40.3% in the mixed-mode sample. The convenience sample also included respondents who were somewhat more affluent and more likely to be homeowners: 28.1% reported household incomes above $100,000, and 65.1% owned their homes, compared to 19.6% and 46.6%, respectively, in the mixed-mode sample.

Finally, family composition varied across samples. Mixed-mode respondents were more likely to have children under age 18 (37.4%) and children under age 6 (18.9%), compared to 20.8% and 11.2%, respectively, in the convenience sample. These demographic differences should be considered when interpreting findings across the two sample modes.

3. Overall Results by Mode of Data Collection

3.1 Library Card Ownership and Access

Most respondents have a library card with Heights Libraries. As shown in Table 2, 87.3% reported having a library card, with slightly higher rates among convenience sample respondents. Branch use varies across the system. Table 3 shows that Lee Road is the most frequently used branch (55.8%), followed by University Heights (17.9%), Noble (13.6%), and Coventry (12.7%).

As shown in Table 4, library visitation is frequent. Nearly half of respondents (44.4%) visit their primary branch at least once per week, including 14.9% who visit more than once per week. Table 5 indicates that most users (67.7%) drive to their branch, though walking (24.0%) and public transportation (5.3%) are also used.

Table 2. Library Card Ownership by Mode of Data Collection (Q3)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	87.3%	77.8%	94.4%
No	12.7%	22.2%	5.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 3. Most Frequently Used Library Branch by Mode of Data Collection (Q4)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Lee Road	55.8%	45.1%	63.8%
Coventry	12.7%	18.0%	8.8%
Noble	13.6%	12.6%	14.3%
University Heights	17.9%	24.3%	13.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 4. Frequency of Library Visits by Mode of Data Collection (Q5)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Once a Year or Less	4.0%	7.4%	1.5%
Few Times per Year	23.4%	30.4%	18.2%
About Once per Month	28.2%	29.7%	27.1%
About Once per Week	29.5%	23.7%	33.9%
More Than Once per Week	14.9%	8.9%	19.4%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 5. Primary Mode of Transportation to Library by Mode of Data Collection (Q6)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Drive	67.7%	65.2%	69.5%
Walk	24.0%	24.4%	23.6%
Public transportation	5.3%	7.0%	3.9%
Bike/electric Scooter	3.1%	3.4%	2.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.2 Reasons for Library Branch Choice

Branch choice is driven largely by location and resources. As Table 6a shows, about 77.6% of respondents cite location/proximity as a key reason for using their branch. Other frequently cited factors include the availability of resources (50.9%), facility or environment (46.5%), staff or service quality (42.3%), and hours of operation (33.9%). Table 6b breaks out the reasons by branch. Notable differences include higher emphasis on the availability of resources at Lee Road (60.3%) and staff/service quality at Noble (49.2%). Location and proximity are consistently strong drivers across all branches.

Table 6a. Reasons for Branch Choice – Percent Selected "Yes" by Mode of Data Collection

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Location/proximity (Q7)	77.6%	74.7%	79.7%
Hours of Operation (Q8)	33.9%	31.3%	35.8%
Facility/ environment (Q9)	46.5%	46.5%	46.5%
Availability of Resources (Q10)	50.9%	50.5%	51.1%
Programs and Events (Q11)	25.0%	23.3%	26.3%
Staff and Service Quality (Q12)	42.3%	35.7%	47.2%
Other (Q13)	7.6%	2.4%	11.4%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one option. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 6b. Reasons for Primary Branch Use by Lee Road, Coventry, Noble, and University Heights Locations (Combined Sample Only, n=820)

	Lee Road	Coventry	Noble	University Heights
Location/proximity (Q7)	74.6%	76.6%	84.9%	82.1%
Hours of Operation (Q8)	37.3%	29.4%	33.1%	27.0%
Facility/environment (Q9)	48.6%	43.5%	39.3%	47.7%
Availability of Resources (Q10)	60.3%	34.8%	44.4%	37.7%
Programs/events (Q11)	29.5%	20.6%	16.3%	20.6%
Staff/service Quality (Q12)	42.9%	34.6%	49.2%	40.7%
Other reason not listed (Q13)	8.9%	3.4%	10.3%	4.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one option. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Open-Ended Responses to Q13: "Why do you use this branch most often?" (Other)

In the open-ended questions, respondents cited a variety of reasons for using a particular library branch, which can be grouped into several key themes. Many mentioned access to technology and services such as computers, printers, and fax machines. Comments included "50 pages free printing a day black/white" and "Internet access…". Others highlighted participation in library programs or events, including classes and volunteer opportunities, such as one respondent who wrote, "English class" and another who noted "volunteer opportunities."

Location and convenience also played a significant role in branch choice. Several respondents mentioned living nearby or working close to the branch, with comments like, "I work at the Whole Foods so it's very close for me to visit before or after work…" and "I bought my house on Ormond rd 30 years ago because it was near the library." Some appreciated the atmosphere and physical environment, citing qualities like "the natural light environment & atmosphere" or describing the space as "peaceful and communal." Many respondents praised the staff, referencing "the kindness of the staff" and describing them as "Truly wonderful staff."

Personal history and emotional connection to the branch also emerged as a theme, with responses such as "As a kid I always went to the main library…" and "I LOVE OUR LOCAL LIBRARY!!!" Finally, a few mentioned practical factors such as extended hours, voting location, or changes in branch availability, like the person who shared, "noble had been closed and this was the best alternative. Better study space at Lee."

3.3 Perceived Branch Advantages

Perceptions of branch advantages are overwhelmingly positive. As shown in Table 7a, the most frequently cited advantages include convenient location (80.9%), variety of resources (60.6%), helpful and knowledgeable staff (58.8%), safe environment (54.1%), and comfortable seating/work areas (50.7%).

Table 7b provides details by branch. For example, the variety of available resources is cited more often at Lee Road (72.0%) than at Coventry (41.2%), while a safe environment is cited most often by Noble users (63.5%). Helpful staff is a notable strength at both Lee Road (62.5%) and Noble (58.4%).

Table 7a. Perceived Branch Advantages – Percent Selected "Yes" by Mode of Data Collection

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Convenient Location (Q14)	80.9%	74.8%	85.5%
Accessibility (Q15)	41.7%	42.8%	40.9%
Variety of Resources Available (Q16)	60.6%	54.8%	65%
Helpful and Knowledgeable Staff (Q17)	58.8%	48.8%	66.3%
Comfortable Seating and Work Areas (Q18)	50.7%	46.6%	53.7%
Safe Environment (Q19)	54.1%	52.5%	55.4%
Availability of Technology (Q20)	48.6%	43.4%	52.5%
Events and Programming (Q21)	31.4%	24.4%	36.6%
Quiet Atmosphere for Studying or Reading (Q22)	42.3%	42.7%	42.1%
None of These (Q23)	0.8%	1.1%	0.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one response. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 7b. Perceived Branch Advantages by Lee Road, Coventry, Noble, and University Heights Locations (Combined Sample Only, n=820)

	Lee Road	Coventry	Noble	U. Heights
Convenient Location (Q14)	79.2%	74.8%	89.3%	84.3%
Accessibility (Q15)	47.6%	24.4%	53.0%	45.9%
Variety of Available Resources (Q16)	72.0%	41.2%	47.5%	48.9%
Helpful and Knowledgeable Staff (Q17)	62.5%	43.8%	58.4%	58.3%
Safe Environment (Q19)	52.4%	44.2%	63.5%	59.6%
Availability of Technology (Q20)	51.2%	30.3%	55.0%	48.4%
Quiet Atmosphere (22)	42.3%	33.4%	43.3%	48.0%
Comfortable Seating and Work Areas (Q18)	52.8%	35.3%	49.4%	56.1%
Events and Programming (Q21)	31.8%	27.0%	34.0%	31.1%
None of These (Q23)	0.6%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one option.

3.4 Perceived Branch Disadvantages

Most users report few disadvantages. As Table 8a shows, 51.8% of respondents cited no disadvantages at their primary branch. The most common concerns in the aggregate-level data were limited parking (16.4%), limited hours of operation (16.9%), overcrowding (10.4%), and noise levels (8.9%).

Table 8b shows perceived branch disadvantages by the Lee Road, Coventry, Noble, and University Heights locations.

- Satisfaction is highest at the Lee Road branch, followed by University Heights, Noble, and Coventry. Whereas 60.1% of respondents reported no disadvantages at the Lee Road location, only 36.1% of respondents reported no disadvantages at the Coventry location.
- Limited parking is reported most frequently at Coventry (31.1%) and Noble (19.5%) and least often at Lee Road (11.5%).
- Limited hours are a top issue at Coventry (28.6%) and University Heights (26.5%).
- Concerns about unsafe environments and limited seating were low overall (<10%) across all branches.

Table 8a. Branch Disadvantages – Percent Selected "Yes" by Mode of Data Collection

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Limited Parking (Q24)	16.4%	23.7%	11.0%
Limited Accessibility (Q25)	5.0%	8.7%	2.5%
Overcrowded or Busy Environment (Q26)	10.4%	13.6%	7.9%
Limited Hours of Operation (Q27)	16.9%	20.1%	14.6%
Lack of Resources or Materials (Q28)	8.0%	7.8%	8.0%
Disruptive Noise Levels (Q29)	8.9%	7.7%	9.9%
Unsafe Environment (Q30)	3.7%	4.8%	2.8%
Insufficient Technology or Outdated Facilities (Q31)	3.9%	7.1%	1.5%
Limited Seating or Work Areas (Q32)	6.4%	7.4%	5.6%
None of the Above (Q33)	51.8%	44.1%	57.5%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one response. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 8b. Perceived Branch Disadvantages by Lee Road, Coventry, Noble, and University Heights Locations (Combined Sample Only, n=820)

	Lee Road	Coventry	Noble	U. Heights
Limited Parking (Q24)	11.5%	31.1%	19.5%	19.1%
Limited Accessibility (Q25)	2.1%	9.6%	9.1%	7.8%
Overcrowded or Busy Environments (Q26)	11.1%	7.4%	9.9%	10.5%
Limited Hours of Operation (Q27)	10.1%	28.6%	21.6%	26.5%
Lack of Specific Resources or Materials (Q28)	5.6%	10.9%	9.3%	12.3%
Disruptive Noise Levels (Q29)	11.2%	3.3%	4.2%	9.6%
Unsafe Environment (Q30)	3.6%	2.4%	1.3%	6.6%
Insufficient Technology or Outdated Facilities (Q31)	2.1%	1.5%	8.9%	7.6%
Limited Seating or Work Areas (Q32)	6.0%	5.1%	7.3%	7.7%
None of These (Q33)	60.6%	36.1%	42.1%	42.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one response. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.5 Multiple Branch Use

Many respondents use more than one Heights Libraries location. As shown in Table 9, 57.5% of respondents reported using multiple branches. The use of multiple branches is higher among convenience sample respondents (65.5%) compared to mixed-mode respondents (46.8%), suggesting strong engagement with the library system across various locations.

Table 9. Multiple Branch Location Use by Mode of Data Collection (Q34)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	57.5%	46.8%	65.5%
No	42.5%	53.2%	34.5%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.6 Program and Service Utilization

Library programs and services are heavily used across the community. Table 10 shows the percentage of respondents who used each program or service at least three times in the past six months.

Respondents reported varying levels of frequent engagement with library programs and services over the past six months. Digital and technology-based services were among the most utilized offerings. More than two-thirds of respondents reported using the library's Wi-Fi network (68.6%) and public computers (67.6%) at least three times. Similarly, 71.5% accessed the library's online databases, indicating strong demand for digital research and learning tools.

Media access also drew considerable use, with 60.8% of respondents regularly using eBooks, audiobooks, or eMagazines, and just over half (50.6%) using movie and music streaming services. Nearly half (50.1%) also reported using research databases, underscoring continued interest in information retrieval across digital formats.

In-person programming also remained popular: 52.8% attended a library program, while 39.5% participated in community meetings, and 46.8% used study rooms frequently. Resources targeted toward families saw lower usage overall, but still reflected engagement: 36.3% used children's services, 28.5% accessed parent/guardian resources, and 20.2% sought out homework help.

Some specialized or niche services had more modest reach. For instance, job search and training resources were used regularly by 35.8%, and tech training drew 28.4%. Services such as Candid at Heights Library (21.3%), hotspot lending (22.8%), STEAM lab technology (24.1%), and the mobile food pantry (25.8%) indicate meaningful, if targeted, usage by community members.

At the lower end of the spectrum, more specialized services, such as microfilm (16.6%), tablet lending (15.0%), and resources for the deaf and hard of hearing (13.4%), were used by smaller portions of the population. Still, these resources are important for specific user groups.

Taken together, these findings suggest that Heights Libraries play a dual role: as a technology and information access point and as a hub for community gathering and practical support. While core digital services see the most use, programs serving children, job seekers, and specialized populations provide critical value to targeted segments of the community.

Digital Access and Technology Services
Digital and tech infrastructure remains a cornerstone of library engagement. High-frequency use was reported for:

- Online databases (71.5%)
- Wi-Fi network (68.6%)
- Public computers (67.6%)
- eBooks, audiobooks, or eMagazines (60.8%)
- Movie and music streaming services (50.6%)
- Wireless printing (40.2%)
- Online tutorials (33.0%)

These figures suggest that Heights Libraries are heavily used as a tech-access hub, especially for patrons who may lack reliable internet or digital subscriptions at home.

In-Person Library Use and Programming
In-person services also remain widely used:

- Attended a library program (52.8%)
- Used study rooms (46.8%)
- Attended a community meeting (39.5%)
-
This indicates strong demand for both individual and group use of physical library spaces.

Family and Youth-Oriented Services
Family-focused programming showed moderate engagement among the full sample:

- Children's services (36.3%)
- STEAM lab technology (24.1%)
- Homework help (20.2%)
- Tools for teachers (20.6%)
- Parent/guardian resources (28.5%)
- Educational kits like Memory or Micro:bit kits (19.3%)

Though these services naturally see higher use among households with children, their presence in the general sample still reflects broad community relevance.

Career and Adult Learning Resources
Libraries continue to serve as educational and workforce development centers:

- Job search and training resources (35.8%)
- Tech training (28.4%)
- Research databases (50.1%)
- Candid at Heights Library (21.3%)

These offerings appeal to patrons seeking job transitions, continuing education, or entrepreneurial support.

Specialized and Accessibility Services
Several services serve smaller, targeted user groups:

- Deaf and hard-of-hearing resources (13.4%)
- Microfilm (16.6%)
- Tablet lending (15.0%)
- Home delivery services (15.6%)

These niche services may have lower usage rates but are critical for equity and inclusion.

Civic Engagement and Basic Needs
Libraries are also civic and community access points:

- Voting information (42.8%)
- Mobile food pantry (25.8%)
- Hotspot lending (22.8%)

This reinforces the library's role in meeting essential information and resource needs beyond traditional programming.

Program and Service Utilization among Parents with Children Under Age 18
Parents of children under 18 reported consistently higher usage of nearly every library program and service than the general population, demonstrating the central role Heights Libraries play in supporting families (see Table 10). Across the board, parents were more likely to have used each service at least three times in the past six months, often by substantial margins.

Some of the most striking differences emerged in family- and youth-oriented services:

- Children's services: 74.9% of parents used them frequently, more than double the rate among all users (36.3%) — a +38.6-point difference
- Parent/guardian resources: 59.3% vs. 28.5% (+30.8 pts)
- Homework help: 33.6% vs. 20.2% (+13.4 pts)
- Educational kits: 29.8% vs. 19.3% (+10.5 pts)
- Tools for teachers: 32.4% vs. 20.6% (+11.8 pts)

Parents were also more digitally engaged, indicating a greater dependence on the library for tech and online resources:

- Wi-Fi access: 76.9% of parents vs. 68.6% (+8.3 pts)
- Online databases: 76.8% vs. 71.5% (+5.3 pts)
- Public computers: 75.5% vs. 67.6% (+7.9 pts)
- Online tutorials: 40.2% vs. 33.0% (+7.2 pts)

Frequent use of streaming media and e-resources was also slightly higher among parents:

- eBooks/audiobooks/eMagazines: 64.2% vs. 60.8% (+3.4 pts).
- Movie and music streaming: 54.2% vs. 50.6% (+3.6 pts).

In addition, parents showed higher rates of in-person and civic engagement:

- Attended a library program: 62.3% vs. 52.8% (+9.5 pts).
- Community meetings: 42.1% vs. 39.5% (+2.6 pts).
- Voting information: 49.8% vs. 42.8% (+7.0 pts).

When it comes to economic and practical supports, parents again stood out:

- Job search/training resources: 46.2% vs. 35.8% (+10.4 pts)
- Mobile food pantry: 33.0% vs. 25.8% (+7.2 pts)
- Hotspot lending: 29.0% vs. 22.8% (+6.2 pts)
- Home delivery services: 24.2% vs. 15.6% (+8.6 pts)

Even for more niche services like tablet lending (18.5% vs. 15.0%) and deaf/hard-of-hearing resources (17.5% vs. 13.4%), parents reported slightly greater engagement.

These differences suggest that parents are not only more frequent users of library services overall, but they also rely on the library to meet a diverse array of needs, from childcare and educational resources to digital access and necessities. As a result, parents represent a critical user segment whose experiences and preferences should be at the center of future planning, communications, and service design.

Table 10. Use of Library Programs or Services at Least 3 Times in the Past 6 Months by All Users vs. Parents with Kids Under Age 18 Years

	All Users (n=820)	Parents with Kids < 18 (n=231)	Difference
Attended a Library Program (Q35)	52.8%	62.3%	+9.5 pts.
Used the Computers (Q36)	67.6%	75.5%	+7.9 pts.
Used the Wi-Fi Network (Q37)	68.6%	76.9%	+8.3 pts.
Used the Online Databases (Q38)	71.5%	76.8%	+5.3 pts.
Used the Study Rooms (Q39)	46.8%	51.6%	+4.8 pts.
Attended a Community Meeting (Q40)	39.5%	42.1%	+2.6 pts.
Children's Services (Q41)	36.3%	74.9%	+38.6 pts.

Homework Help (Q42)	20.2%	33.6%	+13.4 pts.
Tools for Teachers (Q43)	20.6%	32.4%	+11.8 pts.
Parent/Guardian Resources (Q44)	28.5%	59.3%	+30.8 pts.
Kits (e.g., Memory or Micro:bit coding kits) (Q45)	19.3%	29.8%	+10.5 pts.
Microfilm (Q46)	16.6%	21.0%	+4.4 pts.
Home Delivery Services (Q47)	15.6%	24.2%	+8.6 pts.
Tech Training (Q48)	28.4%	26.7%	-1.7 pts.
Research Database (Q49)	50.1%	52.3%	+2.2 pts.
eBooks, Audiobooks, or eMagazines (Q50)	60.8%	64.2%	+3.4 pts.
Movie and Music Streaming Services (Q51)	50.6%	54.2%	+3.6 pts.
Job Search and Job Training Resources (Q52)	35.8%	46.2%	+10.4 pts.
Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Resources (Q53)	13.4%	17.5%	+4.1 pts.
Candid at Heights Library (Q54)	21.3%	28.0%	+6.7 pts.
Voting Information (Q55)	42.8%	49.8%	+7.0 pts.
Hotspot Lending (Q56)	22.8%	29.0%	+6.2 pts.
STEAM Lab Technology (Q57)	24.1%	27.6%	+3.5 pts.
Tablet Lending (Q58)	15.0%	18.5%	+3.5 pts.
Wireless Printing (Q59)	40.2%	40.5%	+0.3 pts.
Online Tutorials (Q60)	33.0%	40.2%	+7.2 pts.
Mobile Food Pantry (Q61)	25.8%	33.0%	+7.2 pts.

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one option. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ±7%.

Table 11. Frequency of Library Program Attendance (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection(Q35)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	47.2%	40.0%	52.6%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	36.2%	38.3%	34.7%
Often (6-10 times)	11.2%	15.2%	8.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	5.4%	6.4%	4.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 12. Frequency of Computer Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q36)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	32.4%	19.3%	42.2%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	26.5%	29.2%	24.5%
Often (6-10 times)	19.1%	27.0%	13.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	22.0%	24.6%	20.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 13. Frequency of Wi-Fi Network Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q37)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	31.5%	18.3%	41.3%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	24.5%	21.3%	26.9%
Often (6-10 times)	18.2%	24.9%	13.2%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	25.9%	35.5%	18.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 14. Frequency of Online Database Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q38)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	28.5%	22.2%	33.2%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	33.1%	28.6%	36.4%
Often (6-10 times)	20.5%	26.3%	16.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	17.9%	22.9%	14.3%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 15. Frequency of Study Room Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q39)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	53.2%	34.6%	67.2%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	26.2%	32.7%	21.4%
Often (6-10 times)	11.8%	17.5%	7.5%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	8.8%	15.3%	3.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 16. Frequency of Community Meeting Attendance (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q40)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	60.5%	50.6%	68.0%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	27.3%	29.9%	25.4%
Often (6-10 times)	8.1%	11.2%	5.7%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.1%	8.4%	0.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 17. Frequency of Children's Services Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q41)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	63.6%	50.2%	73.7%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	18.2%	24.1%	13.9%
Often (6-10 times)	10.1%	16.5%	5.3%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	8.1%	9.2%	7.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 18. Frequency of Homework Help Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q42)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	79.8%	60.4%	94.3%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	10.6%	19.3%	4.1%
Often (6-10 times)	5.3%	11.2%	0.8%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.3%	9.0%	0.8%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 19. Frequency of Tools for Teachers Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q43)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	79.5%	65.8%	89.7%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	10.8%	14.9%	7.7%
Often (6-10 times)	6.3%	12.5%	1.6%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.5%	6.7%	1.0%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 20. Frequency of Parent/Guardian Resources Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q44)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	71.5%	54.3%	84.4%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	18.9%	27.4%	12.6%
Often (6-10 times)	5.2%	8.9%	2.4%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.4%	9.4%	0.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 21. Frequency of Kits (Such as Memory or Micro.bit Coding) Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q45)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	80.7%	66.3%	91.4%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	11.7%	19.7%	5.7%
Often (6-10 times)	5.1%	9.1%	2.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	2.5%	4.8%	0.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 22. Frequency of Microfilm Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q46)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	83.4%	68.9%	94.3%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	9.2%	15.5%	4.5%
Often (6-10 times)	4.0%	8.0%	1.0%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.4%	7.7%	0.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 23. Frequency of Home Delivery Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q47)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	84.4%	68.1%	96.6%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	7.1%	14.8%	1.3%
Often (6-10 times)	4.3%	8.0%	1.5%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.2%	9.1%	0.5%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 24. Frequency of Tech Training Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q48)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	71.6%	62.2%	78.7%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	17.6%	21.1%	14.9%
Often (6-10 times)	7.3%	11.0%	4.5%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.5%	5.7%	1.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 25. Frequency of Research Database Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q49)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	49.8%	35.6%	60.5%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	32.1%	37.8%	27.9%
Often (6-10 times)	11.0%	17.1%	6.4%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	7.0%	9.4%	5.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 26. Frequency of eBook, Audiobook, or eMagazine Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q50)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	39.3%	38.2%	40.1%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	25.2%	27.3%	23.5%
Often (6-10 times)	16.5%	20.4%	13.5%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	19.1%	14.0%	22.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 27. Frequency of Movie and Music Streaming Services Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q51)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	49.5%	40.2%	56.4%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	25.3%	24.9%	25.6%
Often (6-10 times)	13.4%	20.3%	8.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	11.9%	14.6%	9.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 28. Frequency of Job Search and Job Training Resources Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q52)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	64.2%	40.5%	82.0%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	18.7%	26.2%	13.0%
Often (6-10 times)	10.4%	20.6%	2.7%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	6.7%	12.6%	2.3%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 29. Frequency of Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Resource Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q53)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	86.6%	74.8%	95.5%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	6.6%	12.0%	2.6%
Often (6-10 times)	3.6%	7.4%	0.7%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.2%	5.7%	1.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 30. Frequency of Candid at Heights Library Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q54)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	78.6%	62.7%	90.6%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	11.6%	18.9%	6.1%
Often (6-10 times)	6.1%	12.0%	1.7%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.6%	6.4%	1.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 31. Frequency of Voting Information Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q55)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	57.3%	46.0%	65.7%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	30.9%	35.8%	27.2%
Often (6-10 times)	8.1%	11.7%	5.4%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.8%	6.6%	1.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 32. Frequency of Hotspot Lending Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q56)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	77.2%	59.4%	90.6%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	9.8%	16.8%	4.5%
Often (6-10 times)	7.9%	15.2%	2.4%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	5.1%	8.7%	2.5%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 33. Frequency of STEAM Lab Technology Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q57)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	75.9%	65.3%	83.8%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	15.0%	18.6%	12.2%
Often (6-10 times)	4.9%	7.9%	2.7%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.2%	8.2%	1.2%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 34. Frequency of Tablet Lending Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q58)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	85.0%	72.3%	94.5%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	7.2%	13.8%	2.3%
Often (6-10 times)	4.0%	6.4%	2.1%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	3.8%	7.5%	1.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 35. Frequency of Wireless Printing Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q38)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	59.8%	43.8%	71.8%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	21.5%	28.5%	16.2%
Often (6-10 times)	10.4%	15.2%	6.8%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	8.3%	12.6%	5.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 36. Frequency of Online Tutorial Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q60)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	67.0%	50.7%	79.2%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	20.6%	27.0%	15.8%
Often (6-10 times)	7.2%	13.0%	2.9%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	5.2%	9.4%	2.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 37. Frequency of Mobile Food Pantry Use (in past 6 months) by Mode of Data Collection (Q61)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Never/Rarely (0-2 times)	74.1%	57.3%	86.7%
Sometimes (3-5 times)	16.0%	24.8%	9.4%
Often (6-10 times)	5.2%	9.5%	2.0%
Very Often (More than 10 times)	4.6%	8.4%	1.8%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.7 Equity and Inclusion

Respondents broadly view Heights Libraries as inclusive and welcoming. As shown in Table 38, 85.4% of respondents rated the library as "Good" or "Excellent" in terms of making users feel accepted. High ratings were also reported for:

- Making users feel included (82.0%)
- Promoting equity (78.2%)
- Making users feel respected (84.5%)
- Representing users' identities (75.5%)
- Representing community needs/interests (79.6%)

Ratings were consistently high across both sample groups, and no major demographic differences were observed.

Table 38. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Making Users Feel Accepted by Mode of Data Collection (Q62)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	3.3%	5.4%	1.7%
Poor	1.2%	0.7%	1.6%
Average	6.9%	10.1%	4.5%
Good	24.1%	23.4%	24.6%
Excellent	61.3%	55.7%	65.5%
Unsure	3.2%	4.6%	2.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 39. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Making Users Feel Included by Mode of Data Collection (Q63)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	1.4%	1.9%	1.0%
Poor	1.4%	.9%	1.7%
Average	11.2%	16.8%	7.0%
Good	27.4%	26.6%	28.0%
Excellent	54.6%	51.3%	57.2%
Unsure	4.0%	2.5%	5.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 40. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Promoting Equity by Mode of Data Collection (Q64)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	1.2%	1.4%	1.1%
Poor	0.8%	1.2%	0.6%
Average	10.2%	16.9%	5.1%
Good	24.9%	25.5%	24.4%
Excellent	53.3%	49.5%	56.1%
Unsure	9.6%	5.5%	12.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 41. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Making Users Feel Respected by Mode of Data Collection (Q65)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	1.1%	0.6%	1.5%
Poor	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Average	9.6%	16.4%	4.5%
Good	25.1%	26.3%	24.1%
Excellent	59.4%	50.4%	66.2%
Unsure	3.6%	5.1%	2.4%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 42. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Representing My Identity by Mode of Data Collection (Q39)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	0.9%	0.0%	1.5%
Poor	1.4%	1.6%	1.2%
Average	10.4%	15.3%	6.7%
Good	26.5%	29.2%	24.5%
Excellent	49.0%	45.9%	51.2%
Unsure	12.0%	8.0%	14.9%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 43. Public Assessment of Library Environment: Representing My Community's Needs/Interests by Mode of Data Collection (Q67)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Very poor	1.2%	1.1%	1.3%
Poor	2.2%	2.4%	2.1%
Average	9.7%	14.9%	5.8%
Good	29.2%	32.8%	26.5%
Excellent	50.4%	43.5%	55.5%
Unsure	7.3%	5.3%	8.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.8 Website Use

Website usage is widespread. As shown in Table 44, 81.0% of respondents reported having visited the Heights Libraries website. Table 45 shows that among website users, 65.5% visit at least monthly, including 6.5% who visit daily and 31.0% who visit weekly.

Table 44. Heights Libraries' Website Use by Mode of Data Collection (Q68)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	81.0%	67.8	90.9%
No	19.0%	32.2	9.1%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 45. Frequency of Heights Libraries' Website Use by Mode of Data Collection (Q69)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Daily	6.5%	5.3%	7.2%
Weekly	31.0%	28.9%	32.2%
Monthly	34.5%	31.4%	36.1%
Rarely	28.0%	34.4%	24.5%

Note: This question was only asked of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

3.9 Primary Reason for Visiting the Library Website

Respondents visit the Heights Libraries website for a variety of purposes. As shown in Table 46, the top reasons include:

- Searching the catalog (66.4%)
- Reserving or renewing materials (60.0%)
- Checking hours and locations (50.2%)

Other commonly cited reasons include registering for events (34.4%), using research databases (29.9%), and accessing digital media (24.9%).

Table 46. Primary Reason for Visiting the Library Website by Mode of Data Collection (Q70-Q76)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Searching the Catalog	66.4%	49.6%	75.8%
Reserving or Renewing Materials	60.0%	51.5%	64.8%
Checking Library Hours and Locations	50.2%	51.6%	49.4%
Registering for Events and Programs	34.4%	31.9%	35.8%
Using Research Databases or Online Resources	29.9%	37.7%	25.5%
Accessing Digital Media	24.9%	30.1%	22.0%
Other	3.7%	2.4%	4.5%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because respondents could select more than one response. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Open-Ended Responses: "What is your primary reason for visiting the library website?" (Other)
Respondents offered a variety of reasons for visiting the library website, which fall into several thematic categories: 1) general browsing; 2) accessing library resources, such as books, media, the catalog, and digital resources (e.g., Project 1619); 2) looking for information about events; 3) searching for jobs at the library, 4) contacting staff; and 5) obtaining information about passport services (see Appendix A).

3.10 Library's Website: User Experience

Respondents rated their experience with the Heights Libraries website very positively. As summarized in Table 47:

- Dependability received the highest rating, with 80.5% of respondents rating it "Good" or "Excellent."
- Ease of navigation (71.2%), search function effectiveness (70.1%), visual design (68.5%), and layout (67.4%) were also rated favorably.

Detailed ratings for each dimension appear in Tables 48 through 52.

Table 47. Website Evaluation Across Five Indicators (Q77-Q81)

	% Good + Excellent (Combined)
Ease of Navigation (Q77)	71.2%
Visual Design (Q78)	68.5%
Layout (Q79)	67.4%
Search Function Effectiveness (Q80)	70.1%
Dependability (Q81)	80.5%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may exceed 100% because data are aggregated across five questions. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Table 48. Website Evaluation: Ease of Navigation by Mode of Data Collection (Q77)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Very Poor	1.0%	0%	1.5%
Poor	2.7%	0.9%	3.7%
Average	22.5%	20.7%	23.5%
Good	43.6%	39.3%	46.0%
Excellent	27.6%	36.0%	22.9%
Unsure	2.6%	3.1%	2.4%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Table 49. Website Evaluation: Visual Design by Mode of Data Collection (Q78)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Very Poor	1.2%	0%	1.8%
Poor	3.2%	1.5%	4.1%
Average	23.7%	21.5%	25.1%
Good	45.7%	43.4%	47.0%
Excellent	22.8%	31.1%	18.2%
Unsure	3.5%	2.9%	3.8%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Table 50. Website Evaluation: Layout by Mode of Data Collection (Q79)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Very Poor	0.5%	0%	0.7%
Poor	4.4%	1.1%	6.3%
Average	23.0%	21.3%	23.9%
Good	44.2%	39.8%	46.6%
Excellent	23.2%	33.7%	17.3%
Unsure	4.7%	4.1%	5.1%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Table 51. Website Evaluation: Search Function Effectiveness by Mode of Data Collection (Q80)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Very Poor	0.7%	0%	1.0%
Poor	2.7%	1.5%	3.4%
Average	21.5%	21.2%	21.7%
Good	42.6%	41.0%	43.5%
Excellent	27.5%	31.6%	25.1%
Unsure	5.1%	4.8%	5.2%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

Table 52. Website Evaluation: Dependability by Mode of Data Collection (Q81)

	Combined (n=664)	Mixed-Mode (n=238)	Convenience (n=426)
Very Poor	0.5%	0%	0.8%
Poor	1.1%	1.5%	1.7%
Average	15.0%	21.2%	13.9%
Good	41.7%	41.0%	43.7%
Excellent	38.8%	31.6%	36.5%
Unsure	2.9%	4.8%	3.3%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who indicated that they had visited the Heights Libraries' website. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 8.5%.

3.11 General Awareness of PEACE Park and Noble Library Renovations

Awareness of recent library renovations is strong. As shown in Table 53, 71.5% of respondents were aware of renovations to PEACE Park. Table 54 shows that 68.4% were aware of renovations at the Noble Library location.

Table 53. Awareness of PEACE Park Renovations in Coventry Village by Mode of Data Collection (Q82)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	71.5%	59.6%	80.3%
No	28.5%	40.4%	19.7%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

Table 54. Awareness of Noble Library Location by Mode of Data Collection (Q83)

	Combined (n=820)	Mixed-Mode (n=351)	Convenience (n=469)
Yes	68.4%	54.9%	78.4%
No	31.6%	45.1%	21.6%

Note: Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 7%.

3.12 Support for Heights Libraries Tax Levy Renewal

Support for the Heights Libraries tax levy renewal is high among registered voters. Table 55 shows that 94.1% of respondents from Cleveland Heights and University Heights reported being registered voters.

As Table 56 indicates, 82.1% of registered voters in the combined sample would support the tax levy if the election were held today. Only 5.2% would not support the levy, and 12.7% remain undecided.

Here, it is also important to consider the results from the mixed-mode sample, as it provides a more accurate representation of the Cleveland Heights-University Heights community. In this sample, support is almost as high. About 80.5% of registered voters support the levy. Support is highest among parents or guardians with children under the age of six (92.7%), African Americans (84.2%), women (83.5%), and people aged 50 and above (83.0%).

Table 55. Registered Voter by Mode of Data Collection (Q84)

	Combined (n=539)	Mixed-Mode (n=171)	Convenience (n=368)
Yes	94.1%	90.3%	95.8%
No	5.9%	9.7%	4.2%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who resided in Cleveland Heights or University Heights. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 9.5%.

Table 56. Intention to Vote for Heights Library Tax Levy Today by Mode of Data Collection (Q85)

	Combined (n=507)	Mixed-Mode (n= 155)	Convenience (n=353)
Yes	82.1%	80.5%	82.7%
No	5.2%	6.0%	4.8%
Undecided	12.7%	13.4%	12.4%

Note: This question was asked only of respondents who resided in Cleveland Heights or University Heights and were registered voters. Data are weighted to 2023 ACS benchmarks. Columns may not total 100% due to rounding error. The MoE for the mixed-mode sample is ± 10%.

Appendix A: Open-Ended Responses

Q1 Which town or city do you live in? Other (open-ended)

Table A1. Library Users who Live Outside of Beachwood, Cleveland, East Cleveland, Highland Hills, Shaker Heights, and South Euclid

City	Number of Mentions
Bedford	2
Bedford Heights	1
Bratenahl	1
Cleveland	1
Lakewood	1
Lyndhurst	4
Maple Heights	1
Mayfield	1
Mayfield Heights	3
North Olmsted	1
Pepper Pike	1
Richmond Heights	2
Solon	1
Woodmere	2

Q13: Why do you use this branch most often? Please select all that apply. – Other (open-ended)

Internet access
Printing and reading
English class
I lived about a block away and liked using that branch. I also use the Bertrum Branch of the Shaker Library.
It's my voting location
Internet computer access
Been using the branch on Lee for ever
Tutoring
volunteer
I bought my house on Ormond rd 30 years ago because it was near the library
often in that area
the natural light environment & atmosphere
Great Children area
As a kid I always went to the main library even with Noble being closer at that time. Its just peaceful and communal to go to the main library and read the paper.
volunteer opportunities
Longer hours.
I work there

cleanliness
50 pages free printing a day black/white
I used this library when I lived in Cleveland. Heights
I work at the Whole Foods so it's very close for me to visit before or after work with hours open vs Cleveland Libraries closing at 5. I place all my holds at the Uni Hts branch now.
Accessibility
FRIENDS book sales
the kindness of the staff
all above + like to walk on Coventry Road
convenience
ease of use
This library offers 50 pages you can print per day
ability to pint from the computer
like the desk with computers
best library I've been to
helpful
noble had been closed and this was the best alternative. Better study space at Lee
used to live very near by
friendly helpful staff
everything
printing documents
Truly wonderful staff!
Faxing and copier
come up for free time
Harvey's and Your Bug book sales
I just love this branch and other branches
More books
I LOVE OUR LOCAL LIBRARY!!!
the use of the printer. conveniently...
To pick up holds
I also often go to Coventry, but the roads & parking there are terrible.
Professional manner of staff
I actually use Noble more
great library
various reasons

Q76: What is your primary reason for visiting the library website? (Select all that apply) – Other (Open-Ended)
Checking out books
Not sure
Job search
learning about library improvements
Reserving meeting space
Looking for event info.
CLEVNET
services like fax, copy machine, etc
Passport Services
caveat: I use clevnet a lot
checking for jobs @ library
Project 1619 Resources and Interviews Excellent Job

photo class
audiobooks
Just to stay in the know
Just browsing.
printing information that I need for work.
contacting staff
trying to resolve issue