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Introduction

This is the fourth assessment report developed by and for Rice Library since its Assessment Committee was formed in 2012. Each year, the committee plans assessments that touch on at least some – if not all – aspects of five broad areas of the university’s Library Services. These areas are: facilities, personnel, resources, services, and technology.

This year’s committee, under the leadership of Peter Whiting, was composed of five members, with representatives from nearly every major unit within the library, including public and technical services, and administration. Committee members for 2015-2016 were:

- Ashley Blinstrub – Reference/Instructional Services Librarian
- Debbie Clark – Checkout/Circulation Manager
- Mona Meyer – Secretary, Technical Services/Government Documents Librarian
- Philip Orr – Reference/Distance Learning Librarian
- Peter Whiting – Chair, Technical Services/Serials Technical Services Librarian

Once again the committee, through Library Director Marna Hostetler, sought possible assessment activities from librarians and senior staff. This report includes information on nine assessment projects, and each has been classified as an assessment of one or more of the five broad areas listed above. Eight of the projects represent a continuation or repetition of assessment efforts carried out in 2014-2015, while one is a new project.

Again the library contributed a series of questions to, and received data from, two annual surveys distributed by the university’s Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA). The first of these surveys collected feedback from USI faculty, staff, and administrators, and the second from freshmen and senior students. Other assessments that were continued from 2014-2015 involve the library’s efforts to collect and analyze feedback from students and faculty participating in its Instructional Services program. The Social Media Effectiveness project begun in 2012-2013 was also continued this year. Finally, the project to evaluate print resources shared by participating Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) members was completed.

Rice Library’s assessment activities for 2015-2016 remained few in number but manageable. Nevertheless, these efforts demonstrate a growing interest among the library’s staff members to experiment with formal assessment techniques as a way of improving the university’s Library Services and fulfilling the library’s mission.
Evaluation of Social Science Journal Holdings
Philip Orr

In an effort to determine how favorably Rice Library’s holdings of social science journals compared to a standard list, the library’s liaison to the university’s social science departments designed an assessment project to investigate this comparison. It was believed that information gathered through the project might be useful to the library in at least four ways. It would:

- give the library staff a sense of how well the library is providing the most highly cited journals in particular sub-disciplines within the social sciences,
- provide information to library administrators concerning its journal holdings which could be communicated to faculty and department chairs,
- show possible deficiencies in the holdings which could be addressed by collection development efforts, and
- provide a list of highly-cited journals available through Rice Library which could be added to research guides as recommended journals.

There are a number of recognized sources which rank academic journals, some available through subscription services, such as Thomson Reuters’ Journal Citation Reports, and some available through open access. There are also several journal-level metrics, but most base their calculations wholly, or in part, on the number of times the journal itself or articles published in the journals have been cited.

Google Scholar Metrics is an example of an open access tool which ranks scholarly journals based on the number of times the articles published in a journal are cited in the Google Scholar database. According to the Google Scholar Metrics Overview page, “Google Scholar Metrics provide an easy way for authors to quickly gauge the visibility and influence of recent articles in scholarly publications. Scholar Metrics summarize recent citations to many publications, to help authors as they consider where to publish their new research” (“Google Scholar Metrics: Overview,” 2016). This assessment was based on the Google Scholar Metrics’ ranking of journals published in June 2015.

The project began by recording the titles of the top 20 journals in thirty social sciences, four humanities, and three health & medical sciences sub-disciplines. Additionally, the top 100 publications (overall) and the top 20 journals in the broad social science discipline were also recorded. Together these thirty-nine discipline/sub-discipline categories were:

**TOP 100 PUBLICATIONS**
**TOP 20 SOCIAL SCIENCE PUBLICATIONS**
Academic & Psychological Testing
African Studies & History
Anthropology
Archaeology
Asian Studies & History
Bioethics
Canadian Studies & History
Chinese Studies & History
Cognitive Science
Criminology, Criminal Law & Policing
Diplomacy & International Relations
Economic History
Educational Psychology & Counseling
Environmental Law & Policy
Epistemology & Scientific History
Ethics
Ethnic & Cultural Studies
European Law
Family Studies
Feminism & Women’s Studies
Forensic Science
French Studies
Gender Studies
Geography & Cartography
History
These sub-disciplines were selected because it was believed that they aligned or overlapped with the focus of the courses being offered by the social science departments in the university’s College of Liberal Arts during the 2015-2016 academic year (History; Philosophy; Political Science and Public Administration; Psychology; and Sociology; Anthropology; and Criminal Justice Studies).

In addition to the Google Scholar Metric ranks, a number of other pieces of information were included in the spreadsheet, including each journal’s:

- International Standard Serial Number (ISSN)
- Google Scholar h-Index
- Google Scholar h5-index
- Google Scholar h5-median
- Availability in Rice Library
- 2014/2015 Impact Factor, if available
- Journal Citation Report Rank, if known
- SCImago Rank
- Number of Requests via Interlibrary Loan (2010-2015)

Most of the data for the project were collected and recorded in the spreadsheet by three Reference Student Assistants (RSA) working in the library’s Reference Services unit and by two student workers working in the library’s Distance Learning Services unit. Kirsten Williams, Library Associate in Interlibrary Loan at Rice Library, provided the detailed interlibrary loan statistics for each of the over 800 journals listed.

After the basic data were recorded, they were analyzed and summarized. The analysis included classifying and coding each of the journals listed into one of the following five categories, based on its availability in Rice Library:

- Complete (C) – Complete run of volumes available
- Incomplete (I) – Missing some volumes, including earliest volumes
- Incomplete/Embargoed (I/E) – Missing some volumes, including either earliest and/or most recent volumes or issues
- Embargoed (E) – Complete except for most recent volumes or issues
- Not Available (N) – Not available in Rice Library

Two summaries of the data were also performed. The first summary provided the number of
journal titles in each sub-discipline based on the five availability categories; the percentage of titles that were complete (C), available to any extent (C, I, I/E, E), and not available (N); and a listing of the complete (C) and not available (N) titles. A second summary (see below) listed the number of titles in each sub-discipline in each availability category (C, I, I/E, E, N), the percentage of titles based on availability, and the total number of interlibrary loan (ILL) requests for available (C, I, I/E, E) and not available (N) titles during the five previous fiscal years (FY 2011—FY 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Percentage of Titles</th>
<th>Number of ILL Requests FY 2011—FY2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete (C)</td>
<td>Incomplete (I)</td>
<td>Incomplete/Embargoed (I/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 TOP PUBLICATIONS – 100 Titles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Academic &amp; Psychological Testing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 African Studies &amp; History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Asian Studies &amp; History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bioethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Canadian Studies &amp; History</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Chinese Studies &amp; History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cognitive Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Criminology, Criminal Law, &amp; Policing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Diplomacy &amp; International Relations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Economic History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Educational Psychology &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Environmental Law &amp; Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Epistemology &amp; Scientific History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ethnic &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 European Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, two lists of journal sub-discipline categories were created. The first listed the journal sub-discipline categories with the highest percentage of complete (C) titles, and the second listed the journal sub-discipline categories with the highest percentage of titles available to any extent (C, I, I/E, E). These are presented below:

**Journal Sub-Discipline Categories with the Highest % Complete (C) Titles:**

1. Psychology – 60%
2. International Law – 50%
3. Diplomacy & International Relations – 45%
4. Education Psychology & Counseling – 45%
5. Social Psychology – 45%
6. Sociology – 40%
7. Criminology, Criminal Law & Policing – 35%
8. Academic & Psychological Testing – 30%
9. Canadian Studies & History – 30%
10. Family Studies – 30%
11. Feminism & Women’s Studies – 30%
12. History – 30%
Journal Discipline Categories with the Highest % Available (C, I, I/E, E) Titles:

1. Diplomacy & International Relations – 100%
2. Law – 100%
3. Chinese Studies & History – 95%
4. Ethics – 95%
5. Family Studies – 95%
6. Gender Studies – 95%
7. History – 95%
8. Sociology – 95%
9. Criminology, Criminal Law & Policing – 90%
10. Educational Psychology & Counseling – 90%
11. Ethnic and Cultural Studies – 90%
12. Psychology – 90%
13. Academic & Psychological Testing – 85%
14. Canadian Studies & History – 85%
15. Feminism & Women’s Studies – 85%
16. Middle Eastern & Islamic Studies – 85%

Much can be gained from a comparative analysis such as this one, and the implications for the library’s Collection Development and Serials units may seem endless. For instance, it is interesting to note that Rice Library had some access to all of the top twenty journals listed in the sub-disciplines of Diplomacy and International Relations as well as Law. Rice Library also provides complete access to twelve (60%) of the top twenty journal titles in the Psychology sub-discipline and ten (50%) of the top twenty journals in International Law. On the other hand, the lack of access to some of the most frequently cited journals in Criminology, Criminal Law & Policing, as well as Psychiatry and Psychology, have prompted numerous interlibrary loan requests in the past five years.

In some instances, the findings may give the library’s Collection Development and Serials units reasons to celebrate, and in other instances a clearer picture of where to strengthen its support of specific academic programs. In any event, it would be wise to remember that the findings are a snapshot in time, and although the project included data other than the Google Scholar journal rankings, most of the metrics included were based largely on the Google Scholar database. Data from other sources, not excluding recommendations from faculty, history of interlibrary loan requests, and the projected growth of academic departments within the university, must also be considered with any future collection development decisions.
Throughout the 2015-2016 academic year, the library collected feedback from faculty members who used Library Instructional Services by bringing in their classes for an instructional session or by inviting a teaching librarian into their classrooms. There were 196 classes taught for 115 faculty members during the academic year. 83 of these faculty members provided feedback on their courses. A total of 90 responses were received, with some faculty providing feedback on multiple sessions in a semester, providing feedback for the same course in both semesters, or providing multiple feedback responses when different librarians provided library instruction for different sections of the same course during a single semester.

As a means of improving instruction, the two-fold purpose of this assessment was: a.) To assess how well the library instruction sessions met the goals of the classroom instructors, and b.) To determine the classroom instructors’ satisfaction with the library instruction sessions. The assessment itself was aligned with the following goal statements from the library’s strategic plan:

- **Goal 1.** Improve the Library User’s Experience.
  - **Objective 1:** Members of the USI community, whether onsite or distant, will have high-quality services of intellectual as well as practical value, both proactive and responsive to their varied needs.

- **Goal 2.** Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services.
  - **Objective 4:** Ensure that USI students will be able to make maximum use of technology and information from multiple sources to meet current and lifelong learning objectives.

The feedback was collected using an online form developed by Instructional Services librarians. A link to the form was e-mailed to faculty members following the instructional sessions, and responses were voluntary. The feedback form began by asking for, or automatically recording, basic demographic information (date/time of response, name, class, and librarian’s name). Respondents were then asked two questions requiring set responses:

1. Have you previously brought your students to library instruction? (Yes/No)
2. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of this session? (Essential, Very Effective, Effective, Somewhat Ineffective, Ineffective)

These were followed by a series of three questions which allowed for open-ended responses:

1. What did you find most useful about the session?
2. Is there anything you would like to see covered that we missed?
3. Anything else you would like to share?
Key Findings/Implications

- 69% of the faculty members using the library’s Instructional Services during the 2015-2016 academic year had used the service at least once before by the time they completed the feedback.

*Instruction librarians should increase efforts to reach out to new faculty.*

- 100% of the library instruction sessions were rated as Essential, Very Effective, or Effective by faculty.

*Librarians should continue to collaborate with faculty in order to further customize library instruction sessions.*

In response to the question “What did you find most useful about the session?” faculty noted a wide range of items. With regard to the teaching librarian they pointed out such things as:

- Tailored instruction / Willingness to teach to faculty’s instructional goals
- Ability to interact with students / Individualized instruction / Approachable
- Organized presentation
- Knowledge of topic / Preparation
- Willingness to help students beyond session
- Ability to explain
- Thoroughness
- Professionalism

With regard to the instructional sessions, they commented on such things as:

- Demonstration of search and research strategies
- Introduction of a wide variety of relevant sources and resources
- Providing hands-on experiences for finding resources
- Introduction of database usage
Introduction to citation styles

Explanation of popular and scholarly sources

From the responses provided, it is clear that faculty members at USI focus on their students, since “students” is the most commonly-used word in faculty responses. Librarians should continue to make the instructional sessions student-centered and tailored to the assignment and the instructor’s learning goals.

When asked “Is there anything you would like to see covered that we missed?”, some faculty members (39) did not respond to the question, and most of those who did (54) offered no suggestions. Seven faculty members did offer suggestions for improvement, and among these were the following:

- There really wasn’t any time left to do more.
- Maybe something basic, like how to check out a book. Some of my students had no idea that they needed their Eagle Access card to check out a book. A few didn't even know where to go to check out a book.
- I would have like to have a tour of the library - all the floors.
- Most students don’t understand how cool archives are until they start digging around, so give them one specific and mind-boggling example to capture their imagination.

The teaching librarians may want to incorporate the relevant topics suggested by faculty responses whenever appropriate in developing their lesson plans. However, they should also consider the level of the class and the faculty’s stated learning objectives. The teaching librarians may want to look at prior feedback from faculty to ensure that they are meeting their instructional goals.

Faculty members were also asked “Is there anything else you would like to share?” Most faculty members used this space to praise the librarians who led their sessions and to thank them for helping their students. Following is a selection of the 59 responses received:

- I would definitely incorporate this in my future classes.
- I can tell that she did her homework, and tailored the presentation to my students so they could get exactly the information that they needed in order to complete their research.
- I will definitely be scheduling more sessions next semester.
- I think that in a couple of weeks, I will take my students to the library so that I can show them where the REAL books are. We do some much virtual research now that I fear they don't even consider the possibility of browsing.
- The tools are amazing, the facilities are amazing, and the policies are more generous to undergraduates than any I've ever seen (Interlibrary Loan without fees?!?! Awesome). I'm so impressed.

The teaching librarians should continue to build positive relationships with teaching faculty in order to encourage them to keep bringing students to the library for library instruction sessions.
In October 2013, the Indianapolis-based Lilly Endowment Inc. awarded $225,000 to the Private Academic Library Network of Indiana (PALNI) for the Shared Print Collection Project, an initiative of PALNI and its partner organization, Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI). The grant enabled PALNI and ALI to hire Sustainable Collection Services (SCS), a firm with expertise in reviewing and evaluating library collections.

The Private Academic Library Network of Indiana (PALNI) was founded in 1992 and includes 23 private colleges, universities, and seminaries in Indiana. Established in 2003, Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) is an organization representing all 72 academic libraries in accredited non-profit institutions of higher education in the state.

USI joined the project in late October 2013, and details on the first year of the project are contained in the 2013-2014 Report of the Assessment Committee. This project contributed to accomplishing the following goals from the David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016:

- **Goal 1**: Improve the Library User’s Experience
  - Objective 2: Given available funding and curricular focus, members of the USI community will have the most appropriate and extensive library resources possible, emphasizing undergraduate curricula.

- **Goal 6**: Enhance library spaces to meet changing needs.

After the collection data analysis was complete, SCS loaded items designated as “available for withdrawal” into its proprietary software, GreenGlass. Within GreenGlass, Collection Development Librarian Martha Niemeier created lists of withdrawal candidates for each subject liaison librarian. Liaisons received their lists near the end of summer 2014 and were given until the last day of classes in the spring 2015 semester to review them. Items marked for withdrawal by the subject liaisons were reviewed by Niemeier during the summer of 2015.

During the fall 2015 semester, faculty members in each academic department had an opportunity to review withdrawal decisions. Several faculty members reviewed the lists, and any titles in dispute will of course be retained.

Weeding of the general collection began on a small scale in January 2016. Weeding was on-going through the spring 2016 semester and is expected to continue throughout the summer of 2016. As of the end of June 2016, 3,774 volumes had been withdrawn from Voyager, the library’s catalog, and WorldCat, a set of databases that together comprise the most comprehensive global network of data about library collections and services. Approximately 4,250 additional volumes had been pulled from the shelves and were queued for withdrawal. In total, approximately 8,024 volumes will be withdrawn by the end of the project, which is estimated to be complete by May 2017, if not before. This weed and a subsequent shift will free approximately 401 linear feet of shelving, or approximately one quarter floor of stacks space.

Once the weeding is complete, subject liaisons will focus on updating their collection areas, and
many of these purchases will likely be electronic books. The space that was used to house print titles will be available for new group study space, individual study space, open collaboration areas, or to house an on-campus partner.

**General Library Survey: Faculty, Administrators, Staff**
Philip Orr

Since 2012, Rice Library has contributed questions to the annual survey of the university’s faculty, administrators, and staff which is distributed just prior to the beginning of the fall semester by the Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA). In 2015, the survey included seven questions related to Library Services. The purpose of the first four questions was to determine interest in, use of, or satisfaction with the library’s most significant resources and services. A fifth question sought to determine which sources survey respondents most frequently use to meet their professional information needs. Questions six and seven were open-ended prompts. The first asked, “How can Rice Library better serve you?” and the second asked, “How can Rice Library better serve your students?”. The latter of these two questions was asked only of faculty members.

This particular assessment project aligned with the following goal statements from the *David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016*:

- **Goal 1**: Improve the Library User’s Experience, Objectives 1 and 2
- **Goal 2**: Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services, Objectives 2, 3, and 4
- **Goal 3**: Develop and expand the library’s collaboration across campus and beyond
- **Goal 4**: Encourage and support a culture of evaluation and assessment

Data were gathered and analyzed as a whole, as well as filtered for each of the respondent groups (faculty, support staff, and administrators). Although most of the findings summarized below are based on overall responses from all of the groups surveyed, in some instances the responses from the faculty group are also included.

**Key Findings/Implications**

Respondents were asked to identify the three most frequently used Rice Library resources (Question #74). Overall, the three most frequently used resources or responses were:

- Databases (46.8%)
- Electronic Journals (35.5%)
- Do not use any Rice Library resources (34.3%)
When the data were filtered for just faculty, the three most frequently used resources or responses were:

- Databases (83.1%)
- Electronic Journals (70.5%)
- Print Books (31.7%)

Overall, the three least frequently used resources or responses were:

- Online Tutorials (3.1%)
- EasyBib (3.7%)
- Print Journals (4.9%)

When the data were filtered for just faculty, the three least frequently used resources or responses were:

- Popular/Leisure Materials (3.3%)
- Online Tutorials (6.0%)
- University Archives and Special Collections (6.0%)

Since 2013, the percentage of respondents reporting that they do not use any Rice Library resources has remained virtually unchanged.

Since 2013, the percentage of respondents identifying any of the following resources among their three most frequently used has increased significantly:

- Databases (37.3% → 71.2%)
- Electronic Journals (20.5% → 54.0%)
- Print Books (17.0% → 38.0%)
- University Archives and Special Collections (7.5% → 11.0%)
- Popular/Leisure Materials (11.6% → 16.0%)

On the other hand, the percentage of respondents identifying Print Journals among their three most frequently used resources has decreased (17.0% → 7.4%).

Respondents were also asked to identify the three most frequently used Rice Library services (Question #76).

Overall, the three most frequently used services or responses were:

- Do not use any Rice Library services (41.3%)
- Checking out items (35.7%)
- Interlibrary Loan (31.5%)

When the data were filtered for just faculty responses, the three most frequently used services or responses were:
Interlibrary Loan (63.4%)
Checking out items (48.6%)
Course Reserves (32.2%)

Overall, the three least frequently used services or responses were:

Other Service (3.0%)
Recommendation materials for purchase (5.8%)
Distance Learning Support (8.5%)

When the data were filtered for just faculty, the three least frequently used services or responses were:

Other Service (2.7%)
Recommendation materials for purchase (9.8%)
Do not use any Rice Library services (12.5%)

The library must continue to investigate ways of promoting and advertising its “least used” resources and services, especially to faculty members, as a way of increasing awareness and use. The library should continue to consider ways to market its resources and services to non-faculty patron groups (Administrators and Staff) as a way of fulfilling its mission to the university.

Following Questions 74 and 76, respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the resources (Question #75) and services (Question #77) using one of six choices: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied, Have Not Used, or Not Aware Of. Tables A, B, and C below summarize those responses.

Table A. Levels of Satisfaction with RL Resources: Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q75. How satisfied are you with the following Rice Library resources?</th>
<th>Very Satisfied / Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied / Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total Users</th>
<th>Satisfied / Users</th>
<th>Not Used / Not Aware Of</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Materials</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, users of all of these resources were significantly more satisfied than dissatisfied.

Overall in 2015, satisfaction ranged from a high of 85.4% (Databases) to a low of 38.9% (EasyBib).

The percentage of electronic book users among total respondents has continued to rise significantly from 2012 to 2015 (42.0% \(\rightarrow\) 64.1%).

**Table B. Levels of Satisfaction with RL Services: Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q76. How satisfied are you with the following Rice Library services?</th>
<th>Very Satisfied / Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total Users</th>
<th>Satisfied / Users</th>
<th>Not Used / Not Aware Of</th>
<th>Total Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Reserves</strong></td>
<td>N 169</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Learning Support</strong></td>
<td>N 121</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Class Research Instruction</strong></td>
<td>N 138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlibrary Loan</strong></td>
<td>N 205</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Archives and Special Collections</strong></td>
<td>N 112</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on overall survey data for 2015, users of all of these services were significantly more satisfied than dissatisfied. Satisfaction among all respondents ranged from a high of 96.4% (Rice Library Building) to a low of 45.9% (Material Purchase Recommendations). However, when responses were filtered for users alone, satisfaction ranged from a high of 100% (Reference Services) to a low of 90.3% (Material Purchase Recommendations).

The level of satisfaction among users of Rice Library’s Course Reserves Service has remained very high for the past four years (>98%), and after three years of steady growth (2012-2014), the percentage of total users took only a slight dip in 2015 to 64.2%, down from 67.7% the previous year.

The percentage of survey respondents who reported using Rice Library’s Distance Learning Services remained virtually unchanged from the previous year (47.8%, 2014 | 47.9%, 2015), and the level of satisfaction among these users increased only slightly (98.4%, 2014 | 98.8%, 2015).

When filtered for faculty responses only, the level of satisfaction among users of Rice Library’s In-Class Research Instruction services was 95.7%.

Although the percentage of respondents identifying themselves as users of Rice Library’s Interlibrary Loan Services in 2015 took a slight dip from the previous year, it still hovers around 80%. The level of satisfaction with these services among users also continues to remain very high (98.6%).

For the past two years only about 50% of total survey respondents expressed some degree of satisfaction with the library’s Materials Purchase Recommendation service. Like In-Class Research Instruction above, this service is most likely to be used by faculty exclusively. When the 2015 data is filtered for only faculty responses, the satisfaction among users increases to almost 88%.

One hundred percent of those responding to the 2015 survey who identified themselves as users of Rice Library’s Reference Services were either satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

More than 95% of those responding to the 2015 survey identified themselves as users of Rice Library’s building and staff, and 99.6% of those users were either satisfied or very satisfied.
The high level of satisfaction with Rice Library’s staff recorded in response to this question is mirrored in the responses provided to the open-ended prompts, Questions #79 and #80 (see below).

The overall decline of percentages for “not used” and “not aware of” responses in most service areas may indicate that efforts to promote these resources and services have been successful. Slight decreases in some key services (Course Reserves, Interlibrary Loan, and Rice Library Staff) may also indicate a need for renewed efforts.

Should this type of question be included in future campus-wide surveys, having the data to track use and satisfaction with Rice Library’s resources and services will be important for evaluating their usefulness.

Respondents were then asked (Question #78) to identify the main sources they use to meet their professional information needs. They were allowed to select up to 3 sources. A similar question was asked in 2012 and 2014, but not in 2013, allowing for some points of comparison.

The top three choices each received over 100 responses: Internet search engines (173), Rice Library Staff, Resources, Services, etc. (130), and Rice Library Interlibrary Loan (103).

When compared with data collected from the same or similar questions in 2012 and 2014, a decreasing reliance on Internet search engines and preferred websites, and an increasing reliance on Rice Library’s staff, resources, and services are both noteworthy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet search engines</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred websites</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Library Staff, Resources, Services, etc.</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other academic/special libraries</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bottom three choices and the number of respondents selecting these sources were Other academic/special libraries (22), Other sources (12), and None of the above (11).

The top three choices among faculty members were the same as those for all respondents overall, but in a slightly different order: Internet search engines (99), Rice Library Interlibrary Loan (82), and Rice Library Staff, Resources, Services, etc. (73).

Although 12 respondents (4.1%) chose “Other sources,” only one identified an alternate source: Professional organization publications.

At least three of the choices presented to survey respondents were in some way connected to Rice Library: Rice Library Staff, Resources, Services, etc. (43.9%), Rice Library Interlibrary Loan (34.8%), and Open access websites (PubMed Central, PLoS, Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), etc.) (20.6%).
Although Internet search engines continue to rank as a primary choice among survey respondents in meeting their professional information needs, it is noteworthy that the percentage of those selecting this option has decreased over the past four years and that there is a corresponding increase in the percentage of respondents selecting Rice Library as a primary information provider. This may indicate that the library’s efforts to market its resources and services and to demonstrate its ability to support study and research are effective.

The library’s section of the survey concluded with two open-ended prompts. Question #79, which was presented to all respondents, asked, “How can Rice Library better serve you?” Of those surveyed, one hundred provided a response to this question, and some responses included multiple thoughts or comments.

The responses were classified into seven broad categories: Neutral/No Comment/No Suggestions (19), General Praise/Satisfaction (16), and comments related to Equipment (1), Facilities (5), Resources (42), Services (25), and Staff (18).

Additionally, each thought or comment was further classified as providing a suggestion or recommendation; a criticism or complaint; or praise or satisfaction. The following table summarizes the breakdown of these classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suggestions / Recommendations</th>
<th>Complaints / Criticisms</th>
<th>Praise / Satisfaction</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those responding to the survey who identified themselves as “Faculty” were presented with a final question (Question #80): How can Rice Library better serve your students? Fifty-two provided a response to this question, and some responses included multiple thoughts or comments.
The responses were classified into seven broad categories: Neutral/No Comment/No Suggestions (6), General Praise/Satisfaction (6), and comments related to Equipment (0), Facilities (6), Resources (19), Services (21), and Staff (9).

Additionally, each thought or comment was further classified as providing a suggestion or recommendation, a criticism or complaint, or praise or satisfaction. The following table summarizes the breakdown of these classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Suggestions / Recommendations</th>
<th>Complaints / Criticisms</th>
<th>Praise / Satisfaction</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to open-ended prompts such as these often reveal at least three things to library staff:

- A significant percentage of respondents have no suggestions for improving services or express a favorable impression overall of the services currently offered.
- They are a source of possible ideas for future expansion of resources or services.
- They include misinformation about the library among faculty members, administrators, and staff that should be addressed through better communication and/or programming.

Open-ended responses must be studied carefully by the library’s staff, units, and committees as a source of ideas for improving and expanding the university’s Library Services.
**General Library Survey: Senior Students**

Peter Whiting

USI’s Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA) surveyed senior students during the fall semester’s Assessment Day on Tuesday, September 22, 2015. This annual survey is comprised of questions contributed by several units and offices across campus, allowing the collection of data related to a student’s life and academic experience in a single assessment instrument.

The 2015 survey required three responses from students about the university’s Library Services. The survey prompts focused on:

- a) user satisfaction with selected library resources and services
- b) preferred methods of communication for receiving information about Rice Library

The purpose of the questions was to determine the students’ use of, satisfaction with, preference, and suggestions for the university’s Library Services. The three prompts were:

1. How satisfied are you with the following Rice Library resources and services?
2. Please choose your preferred communication method for receiving information about Rice Library.
3. How can Rice Library better serve you?

This assessment aligned with the following goal statements from the *David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016*:

- **Goal 1:** Improve the library user’s experience, Objectives 1 and 2
- **Goal 2:** Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services, Objectives 2, 3, and 4
- **Goal 3:** Develop and expand the library’s collaboration across campus and beyond
- **Goal 4:** Encourage and support a culture of evaluation and assessment

**Key Findings/Implications**

The following table summarizes the data collected in response to Question #75 from the survey. The question sought to measure the levels of student satisfaction with a variety of Rice Library resources and services.
## Student Satisfaction with Selected Library Resources and Services, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Users</th>
<th>Satisfied/Users</th>
<th>Not Used / Not Aware Of</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Supporting Student Research</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Computers</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Printing</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkout Experience</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Hubs</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Study Rooms</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recharging Stations</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop/Leisure Materials</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops for Checkout</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablets for Checkout (iPads, Galaxies)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Study Rooms</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall students using each category of the library’s resources and services were more satisfied than dissatisfied.
- Library Printing (89.69%) and Group Study Rooms (93.07%) were the only resources or services with less than a 95.0% satisfaction level.
Out of the fifteen library resources and services to choose from, the most popular choice was library iPads (729).

In spite of the encouraging survey results, library staff members must continue to promote the library’s key resources and services to students as a way of maintaining the high level of satisfaction and awareness. Such promotion may take many forms, including library instruction, reference interactions, website announcements, etc.

Because a “satisfaction” question, similar to this one, has been included in previous student surveys distributed by OPRA, the Assessment Committee has been able to track the overall changes in student responses for some of the library’s key resources and services. Following is a summary of student satisfaction trends among users for three of those resources and services.

Survey results during the past four years have indicated a slight increase of satisfaction with electronic books among students.

Students’ satisfaction with the library’s interlibrary loan services has been consistently high during the past four years.
Survey results indicate a gradual increase in satisfaction for the library’s research materials among student users during the past four years.

Secondly, senior students were asked to choose their preferred methods of communication for receiving information about Rice Library:

Future efforts to promote and advertise the library’s resources and services to students should take into account their preferred methods of communication.

Lastly, students were given the opportunity to respond to the open-ended prompt, “Please provide any additional suggestions for Rice Library services.” One hundred and twelve students provided some kind of response, and occasionally individual responses included suggestions related to multiple topics or categories.
By category:

- Praise for the library and library staff (96)
- Suggestions about group study rooms (93)
- Miscellaneous (53)
- Equipment (9)
- Research/Resources (21)
- Suggestions about printing (21)
- More marketing (14)
- Fines (1)

Suggestions from the senior students can be found in Appendix B.

*Rice Library staff members should continue to investigate ways of addressing the unmet needs expressed by the students’ most frequent suggestions.*

---

**Modules for Dental Hygiene Course Instruction**

Ashley Blinstrub

During the summer 2014 term, librarian Ashley Blinstrub met with Lorinda Coan, Assistant Professor of Dental Hygiene at USI, to plan online learning modules for a research-intensive Dental Hygiene course. These online learning modules were implemented in the fall 2014 semester to teach students about the library, the medical database PubMed, and basic searching principles. Students were quizzed after watching the modules to check for understanding of the concepts taught and to determine the effectiveness of the Dental Hygiene course modules. The initial assessment was reported on in the 2014-2015 *Report of the Assessment Committee*. The same process was repeated in the fall 2015 semester with a new set of students.

This assessment aligned with the following parts of the library’s strategic plan:

**Goal 1:** Improve the Library User’s Experience.
- **Objective 1:** Members of the USI community, whether onsite or distant, will have high-quality services of intellectual as well as practical value both proactive and responsive to their varied needs.
- **Objective 2:** Given available funding and curricular focus, members of the USI community will have the most appropriate and extensive library resources possible, emphasizing undergraduate curricula.

**Goal 2:** Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services
- **Objective 2:** Evaluate the usefulness and viability of current and future technology options.
Objective 4: Ensure that USI students will be able to make maximum use of technology and information from multiple sources to meet current and lifelong learning objectives

Goal 3: Develop and expand the library’s collaborations across campus and beyond.

Goal 4: Encourage and support a culture of evaluation and assessment.

Blinstrub modified the online learning modules from the previous year and uploaded them to the course’s Blackboard website. Again, three modules were used, and each module had its own quiz. Students were required to complete the quiz after finishing each module, and each ten-question quiz was in multiple choice or true/false format.

Some questions tested basic knowledge, such as, “Who sponsors the PubMed database?” and, “What is the name of the librarian who created these modules?” The purpose of these questions is to help students prepare for board exams, where, according to Professor Coan, they may be asked specific questions about the database. Other questions tested students’ understanding of concepts taught in the modules. Further questions asked students to use PubMed to find answers to the questions.

Distribution of Quiz Scores

Twenty-four students completed the three modules. In the above chart, seventeen students, or 71% of the total number of respondents, gave correct answers to all ten questions. Four students, or 17% of the total number of respondents, received nine points. One student, or 4% of the total number of respondents, answered eight questions correctly. And finally, two students, or 8% of the total number of respondents, received seven points on the quiz.

According to a Blackboard Analysis on Module 1, five of the questions were categorized as “Good Questions” and the remaining five questions couldn’t be calculated. Nine of the Module 1 questions were ranked as “Easy” by the Blackboard Analysis of level of difficulty, and one was ranked “Medium”.

Page | 26
In the above chart, sixteen students, or 67% of the total number of respondents, gave correct answers for all ten quiz questions. Five students, or 21% of the total number of respondents, gave nine correct responses. And finally, 3 students, or 13% of the total number of respondents, received eight points on the quiz.

According to a Blackboard Analysis on Module 2, four of the questions were categorized as “Good Questions”, one as a “Fair Question”, and the remaining five couldn’t be calculated. All ten questions were ranked as “Easy” based on their level of difficulty.
In the above chart, five students, or 21% of the total number of respondents, received a perfect score of ten on the quiz. Nine students, or 38% of the total number of respondents, supplied nine correct answers on the quiz. Five students, or 21% of the total number of respondents, received eight points on the quiz. Three students, or 13% of the total number of respondents, received seven points on the quiz. And finally, two students, or 8% of the total number of respondents, received only six points on the quiz.

According to a Blackboard Analysis of Module 3, six of the questions were categorized as “Good Questions”, one was categorized as a “Fair Question”, and the remaining three questions couldn’t be calculated. All ten questions in Module 3 were ranked as “Easy” based on their level of difficulty.

**Key Findings**

The average scores for all three quizzes were passing

- Module 1 had an average score of 9.5/10 compared with 9.6/10 the previous year
- Module 2 had an average score of 9.55/10 compared with 9.8/10 the previous year
- Module 3 had an average score of 8.5/10 compared with 8.9/10 the previous year

**Implications**

The faculty member should review Module 3, which has the most difficult concepts, to see if there are any ways to explain concepts more clearly. The faculty member should improve the distribution of easy, medium, and hard questions to better gauge student learning. The faculty member should improve questions to make all questions “Good Questions.” The teaching librarians should look for further opportunities to collaborate with faculty to include online learning modules in more classes.

**Research Guide Usability Study**

Debbie Clark and Phil Orr

The Research Guide Usability Study was originally proposed by Instruction and Undergraduate Experience Librarian Ashley Blinstrub and Distance Learning Librarian Phil Orr for possible inclusion in the FY 2014-2015 assessment plan. The project was delayed, however, until FY 2015-2016. By the end of the fiscal year, the project was near completion but not totally finished. The paragraphs that follow summarize the project thus far.
As designed by Blinstrub and Orr, this assessment project was intended to measure the usability by students of two selected research guides—one on psychology and one on bioethics. The project was patterned on a study by Luigina Vileno reported in an article entitled “Testing the Usability of Two Online Research Guides” and published in *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research* (Vileno, 2011). It was hoped that the findings of Rice Library’s study would assist librarians in revising current guides, as well as in creating any new ones based on best practices.

The project itself aligned with the following goals and objectives from the *David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016*:

**Goal 1:** Improve the Library User’s Experience  
**Objective 2.** Given available funding and curricular focus, members of the USI community will have the most appropriate and extensive library resources possible, emphasizing undergraduate curricula.

**Goal 2:** Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services  
**Objective 4.** Ensure that USI students will be able to make maximum use of technology and information from multiple sources to meet current and lifelong learning objectives.

**Goal 4:** Encourage and support a culture of evaluation and assessment

On August 27, 2015, Blinstrub and Orr received approval from Library Director Marna Hostetler to pursue the proposed project. Hostetler also agreed to fund up to ten $5.00 Campus Store gift cards to be given as honorariums to students volunteering to participate in the study. During the summer and early fall, Blinstrub and Orr underwent Institutional Review Board (IRB) training prior to submitting the project application to the IRB for approval. Approval of the application with “Exempt” status was granted on October 5, 2015.

Throughout the fall semester the researchers focused mainly on two aspects of the project. First, they finalized the study documents, including pre- and post-tests and usability tasks, and drafted guidelines for the study scheduler and study monitors. Second, they sought unsuccessfully to recruit ten psychology students to participate in the study. Near the end of the fall semester, Ashley Blinstrub announced her resignation from Rice Library and her plans to become Research & Assessment Librarian at Saginaw Valley State University’s Zahnow Library. In spite of this change, Blinstrub and Orr committed to continue the project.

Student recruitment efforts continued throughout the spring semester, and the project did not proceed until Kevin Valadares, a professor in the Health Administration program, along with Jennifer Buchanan, Rice Library’s senior administrative assistant in Library Administration, managed to get eleven Master of Health Administration (MHA) students to commit to volunteer.

During the last two weeks of the spring 2016 semester, nine of these students reported to the library one at a time to participate in the study, taking the pre- and post-tests and completing the usability tasks related to one of the two research guides. The students’ computer screens throughout the process were recorded using Camtasia software. Three Rice Library staff members—Joanne Artz, Debbie Clark, and Nancy Langley—served as study monitors.
By the end of June 2016, Blinstrub and Orr had viewed each of the nine recordings, summarized their impressions of how the students had used, or in some cases failed to use, the guides, and had met multiple times via Skype to discuss the findings. The implications of this study and recommendations for changes to the research guides based on the findings should be complete during the summer of 2016 and will be reported in the FY 2016-2017 assessment report.

**Social Media Effectiveness**
Katie Loehrlein

From June 2015 through July 2016, Rice Library kept track of usage statistics through its social media presence, including Facebook and Twitter. This analysis aligned with the following goals and objectives from the *David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016*:

**Goal 1:** Improve the Library User’s Experience
- **Objective 1:** Members of the USI community, whether onsite or distant, will have high-quality services of intellectual as well as practical value, both proactive and responsive to their varied needs.

During the 2015-2016 academic year, Rice Library continued to employ a student worker for ten hours a week as Social Media Student Intern to increase posts and engagement. Statistics are provided by the social media websites and they vary in depth; none of the data presented in this report was collected by Rice Library staff members. Facebook and Twitter both have analytics pages that can be used to analyze statistics. The WordPress blog is now administered by the library’s University Archives and Special Collections Unit. Instagram and Pinterest do not have analytics.

The purpose of this assessment was to determine the best ways to reach USI students, faculty, and staff through social media. Specifically, the statistics focused on the number of interactions through these media and how many people the library reaches through these channels. The statistics analyze how many fans each social media website has, how many shares/retweets/re-pins posts receive, how many favorites/likes posts receive, and the virality of each post. By the end of June 2016, the library’s social media picture looked like this:

- Twitter grew from 717 followers to 867 followers, 20.9% growth
- Facebook grew from 1,073 followers to 1,198 followers, 11% growth from the previous year
- Pinterest grew from 1,210 followers to 1,240 followers, 2% growth from the previous year
- Instagram grew from 507 followers to 609 followers in the past year, 20% growth from the previous year

**Overview of Twitter Social Media Performance**
The following analysis provides statistics on the demographics of the library’s audience. It details
the library’s current target audience as well as who sees and engages with the library on Twitter according to the type of posts the library currently submits. If the library changes its approach to Twitter post content, the audience may change accordingly.

Twitter allows for only one month of retrospective graphs and statistics. The following is the graph of figures for September 2016, showing the main interests of the library’s Twitter audience, as well as the percentage of male versus female members of the library’s audience. Members of the library’s Twitter audience report that they are most interested in comedy in movies and television, music, and movie news and general information. This information is useful for library staff members who create tweets about the library and its services. It is also important to note that 34% more females are interested and engage with our Twitter platform than males.

The range of household income for the library’s most frequent followers is from $60,000 to $124,999, causing one to wonder if this group is made up of female professors and administrative professionals on campus. However, it is more likely that the library’s tweets reach beyond campus. Therefore, projecting a positive image of libraries is an aim for the upcoming year. These insights will continue to inform how the library’s social media administrators design and post content for Twitter.

**Overview of Facebook Social Media Performance**

Based on Facebook’s analytics, the library’s current Facebook followers are primarily women between the ages of 18 and 34 years old. The library reaches a higher percentage of females between the ages of 18 to 24 years old than any other group.
Social media must be continually evaluated to understand its impact on users and potential users.

Efforts to engage users must be more strategic by targeting specific audiences.

Expansion of social media platforms will be helpful as new technologies are used by current and potential audiences.

Connecting with other departments on campus and with community organizations will increase collaborative efforts.

Faculty, staff, graduate students, campus organizations, community organizations – along with undergraduate students – will be our audiences going forward.

**Student Assessment of Instruction**

Katie Loehrlein

Throughout the fall and spring semesters of the 2015-2016 academic year, students participating in the library’s formal instruction program were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the sessions. During this period, feedback was provided 1,281 times for the three main instructional librarians (Jennifer Greene, Ashley Blinstrub, and Katie Loehrlein).

As a means of improving instruction, the threefold purpose of this assessment was:

a) To assess what was learned
b) To determine further needs
c) To assess the effectiveness of the librarian-instructor

The assessment itself was aligned with the following goal statements from the library’s strategic plan:

- **Goal 1**: Improve the Library User’s Experience, Objective 1
- **Goal 2**: Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services, Objective 4

The feedback form was presented at the end of the instructional session, and students were given time to complete it before being dismissed. The form began by asking students, or automatically recording, basic demographic information (class, semester, date/time, instructor’s name, librarian’s name, student classification, and number of library instruction sessions attended).

The form then required students to record their comfort levels with library research before and
after the instructional session. The options provided for describing the student’s comfort level were: *I am Lost, Somewhat Comfortable, Comfortable,* and *Very Comfortable.* The students were then asked to respond (*Agree, Disagree, Unsure, Does Not Apply*) to a series of four statements:

1. I know where to go to get started on my research.
2. Overall, I learned many things from this session.
3. The activities (if used) helped me to understand the concept being taught.
4. My instructor was knowledgeable and engaging.

The feedback form concluded with two open-ended prompts:

1. Name one thing that you learned or found interesting that will help you with your research.
2. Name one thing that you are still confused about after today’s session.

**Key Findings/Implications**

Feedback was collected from 38% of the students that came in for library instruction.

*One drawback to this form of assessment is that not every class receives the survey, especially if students are working successfully on their own research at the end of the class. Librarians should be encouraged to have students fill out the assessment form as well as include additional assessment activities in their classes.*

Of the 1,281 responses received from the feedback, 70% were from freshmen, 15% from sophomores, 8% from juniors, and 7% from seniors.

*The library’s Instructional Services unit should increase its efforts to offer instruction to all upper-level research classes.*

- Approximately 69% of all students completing the feedback form reported moving up at least one positive comfort level following their library instruction sessions.
- Only 25% of students completing the feedback form reported no change from their initial comfort level following the instructional session.
- It should be noted that 7 students (0.5%) reported a regression in their comfort level following the instruction.
- In response to the question “The activities (if used) helped me understand the concept being taught”, 87% of students agreed with this statement, 2% disagreed with this statement, 1% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 10% were unsure.
- In response to the question “My instructor was knowledgeable and engaging”, 91% of students agreed with this statement, 2% disagreed with this statement, 1% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 6% were unsure.
- In response to the question “I know where to go to get started on my research after the library instruction session,” 95% of students agreed with this statement, 1% disagreed with this statement, 1% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 3% were unsure.
The following word cloud represents what students learned or found interesting that will help with their research. Within the word cloud, larger words represent concepts that received the most usage in the responses:

![Word Cloud](image)

The library’s Instructional Services unit should review what students found helpful about each session and incorporate this information into future sessions.

The following word cloud represents the students’ responses to the prompt, “Name one thing you are still confused about after today’s session.” Within the word cloud, larger words represent concepts that received the most usage in the responses:

![Word Cloud](image)
The library’s Instructional Services unit should review what students are confused about after each session and incorporate that information into future sessions, and should also consider ways to explain the information more clearly. Several students said they were confused about a certain aspect of their research, but they now knew where to go for help.

Overall, the library’s Instructional Services unit should market its services more widely, since students generally have a positive reaction to their library instruction sessions.

While it is helpful to know that students feel that they are learning in library instruction sessions, librarians should move toward assessments that can demonstrate student learning to ensure that students are grasping concepts in library instruction sessions.

Librarians should also consider incorporating student feedback on library instruction into marketing materials for library instruction.

Conclusion

The fourth year for Rice Library’s Assessment Committee was productive and rewarding, but there is still much work to be done. The team members are thankful for the assistance and collaboration that they received from their colleagues within the library and across campus. Equipped with the abundant knowledge gained this year, the team will continue its efforts to improve Library Services for the entire USI community through assessment.
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