

6-2008

LR&TS Assessment Report 2007-2008

Chris Inkster

St. Cloud State University, cinkster@stcloudstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/lrs_annualrpts



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Inkster, Chris, "LR&TS Assessment Report 2007-2008" (2008). *Library Annual Reports*. 20.
https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/lrs_annualrpts/20

This Research Study is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Services at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Annual Reports by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu.

LR&TS Assessment Report 2007-2008

Compiled by
LR&TS Assessment Coordinator
Chris Inkster

Fall 2008

LR&TS Assessment Report 2007-2008

Learning Resources & Technology Services

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Assessment Personnel	3
Process for Determining Assessment Focus	3
Revising and Planning	3
Assessment Instruments.....	4
Assessment Instrument Administration.....	5
Data Analysis	5
Results: Miller Center Survey	6
Results: Telephone Survey.....	10
Comparative Study.....	12
Long-Term Results of Miller Center Survey.....	14
SCSU Assessment Instruments.....	15
Other LR&TS Assessment Activities.....	16
Comments.....	18
Assessment Follow-Up	18
Acknowledgements	19
Appendices	20

LR&TS Assessment Report 2007-2008

Learning Resources & Technology Services

Introduction

In keeping with the campus-wide emphasis on assessment of student learning, assessment efforts at LR&TS have continued to focus on the awareness and satisfaction with services and resources provided by LR&TS. 2007-08 was the fifth year of focused assessment at LR&TS.

Assessment Personnel

Chris Inkster has served as LR&TS Assessment Coordinator since fall 2005. An LR&TS Assessment Committee was established in 2006 to assist with goal setting, revisions and formatting of surveys, and general implementation and analysis strategies. Volunteers on this committee for 2007-08 included Fred Hill (Reference), Steve Malikowski (InforMedia Services), Casey Wagner (Information Technology Services), Sandra Williams (Reference), and J. C. Turner (Dean's Office, ex officio). Work group leaders have also been active in relevant assessment activities.

Process for Determining Assessment Focus

Assessment planning began in fall 2007 by using the in-depth triangulation analysis (see [Appendix A](#)) of the 2006-07 results of the three assessment instruments: the fourth Miller Center survey, the first LibQUAL+ Survey (a nationally normed Web-based survey), and information from other SCSU sources.

After the Assessment Coordinator shared pertinent assessment results individually with each work group leader, the Dean's Advisory Council discussed the assessment results and planned for areas that the surveys showed needed attention. This in-depth analysis and further discussion revealed that the responses to many of the questions from the Miller Center

surveys were more reliable as a result of revisions to the wording and format of the 2006-07 survey.

Results of the LibQUAL+ Survey were shared with work group leaders, and each work group individually determined areas from these assessment results to focus on for the 2007-08 year. As a group, the DAC agreed to target student worker customer service skills, with the goal that the next time the LibQUAL+ Survey is administered (in 2010, after three years), faculty and student perceptions about this would be improved. A few areas of concern that were identified by the assessment results were addressed by LR&TS in general; for instance, student workers from the 2nd floor computer lab continue to monitor appropriate student behavior in direct response to student perceptions of occasional noisy environments in the Miller Center study areas, and signage concerning appropriate cell phone use was again updated.

In November 2007 the Assessment Coordinator proposed an assessment plan (see [Appendix B](#)). The plan focused on revising and repeating the Miller Center Survey and the Telephone Survey as well as analyzing in-depth the LibQUAL+ Survey data from late spring 2007, which we expected to provide significant data about our users' desired and perceived levels of service. The plan also continued assessment data collected from other sources as these became available (for example, NSSE and Graduating Senior Survey) as well as focused assessments planned by LR&TS work groups.

Revising and Planning

The Assessment Coordinator drafted revisions of the Miller Center and Telephone Survey instruments to diminish ambiguities that were noted in the in-depth triangulation analysis of the 2006-07 data. The Assessment Coordinator met with two faculty directors from the SCSU Survey to analyze ambiguity in several of the Telephone Survey questions and to discuss suggestions for

improving the questions, the formatting, and the ordering of the questions.

Several guidelines were followed in the revision process:

- Questions focusing on technology and library should be relatively evenly balanced on the two Miller Center Survey versions
- Similar questions on the Miller Center Survey and the Telephone Surveys should be asked in similar ways if possible in order to compare data
- Questions about new services should be added as appropriate (i.e., Course QuickStart)
- Consistent wording of “library and technology” rather than LR&TS should be used
- Precise wording and formatting to prevent ambiguous results should be considered when revising questions
- Valid questions should be retained as much as possible so that long-term assessment data can be gathered

Revised questions from the Miller Center Survey and Telephone Survey were then shared with work group leaders for feedback and suggestions. The LR&TS Assessment Committee made further suggestions for revision and keeping the surveys parallel. Each instrument was presented to DAC for one more round of suggested revisions.

The Assessment Coordinator worked with individual work groups as requested to develop focused assessment instruments. Work groups that collaborated in this way included:

- Reference – Library Instruction evaluation (fall, spring)
- Reference – Reference Desk evaluation (fall, spring)
- Access – Study Room Survey (spring 08)
- ITS – HelpDesk satisfaction survey draft
- ITIS – all-faculty assessment of e-classroom technologies and support

Assessment Instruments

Miller Center Survey

This survey (see **Appendix C**) again had two versions: [A](#) and [B](#). The survey had a total of 13 questions:

- Seven yes/no questions (with follow-up questions)
- Three open-ended questions
- One demographic question
- Two Likert-type items (one with 12 sub-questions ranging from 1 – *Strongly Disagree* to 4 –

Strongly Agree and an option for *no opinion* and one with 11 sub-questions)

- One forced choice item (with 12 sub-questions answered with *Used and satisfied*, *Used but not satisfied*, *Aware of but not used*, and *Not aware of*)
- Two ranking questions (with follow-up question)

The only differences between Version A and Version B were the categories of resources and services listed for question #7, a forced choice item.

The format of the survey was similar to the format used in 2005-06, as those changes had significantly improved the reliability of the data received. The 2005-06 format for the question with forced choices was continued this year with directed answers:

Used and satisfied
Used but not satisfied
Aware of but not used
Not aware of

Two questions from 2006-07 were continued, based on interest from work group leaders and DAC members. These questions asked students to rate on a 0-10 scale (10 high) how likely it is that they would recommend library and technology services to a friend or colleague.

An additional question with 11 sub-questions was added to collect student perceptions of using Desire2 Learn (D2L) in classes.

Students were invited to write additional comments in a box at the end of the survey.

Telephone Survey

This survey (see [Appendix D](#) for script) consisted of 22 questions, including two yes/no questions, 13 multiple response items, five 5-point Likert-type scale questions, and two open-ended questions. Questions were revised to better match the questions on the Miller Center Survey. The introductory text for the question sets was also revised to improve the reliability of student responses.

The SCSU Survey team planned to conduct this survey in spring 2007. However, because of other large-scale survey obligations, the SCSU Survey was unable to perform the calling during either spring 2007 or fall 2007. The survey was postponed and conducted in January 2008.

Because the participants in the Telephone Survey are not necessarily library users (as is primarily true in the Miller Center Survey, with the exception of students waiting in the lobby for a bus) and thus gives us a broader perspective of student awareness and satisfaction, we agreed to the postponement of the survey. Thus no data from the Telephone Survey was available for 2006-07 in the latest revision of the Assessment Report 2007.

Focus Group

A focus group was planned as a follow-up especially to areas of concern raised in the main survey instruments. However, because results of these two surveys were not available until after the end of the academic year, there was no time to analyze the results and gather a focus group. Responses from the Student Advisory Committee, which meets annually in the spring with the LR&TS Dean, will be used to provide another student viewpoint on LR&TS services and resources.

Assessment Instrument Administration

Miller Center Survey

The Miller Center Survey (Versions A and B) was administered to individuals who entered or exited the Miller Center during the second and third week of April, 2008. Eight two-hour blocks were scheduled so that students present in the Miller Center at various times and days of the weeks would be able to participate. Several members of the library faculty volunteered to assist with distributing the surveys as students entered the library wing. No incentive was provided to participants, but most students who were asked participated willingly and returned completed surveys. A box to deposit surveys and a poster display about the survey project was available in the Miller Center lobby for students to self-administer the survey.

Of the 500 copies distributed, 300 usable surveys were returned, for a return rate of about 60% (down from 70% in 06-07). Because of the continued improved formatting of the survey, this year almost all returned surveys were usable and only a few had to be deleted because of too much missing information.

Telephone Survey

The Telephone Survey was conducted by the SCSU Survey Center during the last two weeks of January, 2008. At the Survey Center's request, the LR&TS questions were folded into a larger campus-wide survey, though LR&TS and Tech Fee questions comprised the bulk of the survey. The survey was originally planned for Spring 07 but was postponed by the Survey Center until fall 07, and then postponed again until January. A random sample of all SCSU students were called, and 508 completed the survey.

Focus Group

The purpose of the proposed student focus group is to gather additional information raised by the results of the other assessment instruments. Data from the Miller Center Survey was not available before the end of spring semester and thus the focus group assessment project was not implemented in 2007-08.

Data Analysis

The Assessment Coordinator developed coding categories for the open-ended questions for the Miller Center Survey based on natural language coding principles. The coding scheme is in [Appendix E](#). It was interesting to note that for 2008, student responses to open-ended questions tended to emphasize the *academic* nature of LR&TS services more than in previous years. For instance, many students commented that LR&TS was helpful in providing resources "for research for my class assignments" or "for academic research."

Miller Center Survey

Open coding was used for the open-ended questions in order to find common themes and summarize the information. The coding scheme was constructed from previous survey results and from a detailed sampling of 100 of the 07-08 surveys.

After the Assessment Coordinator coded the survey, all data were entered into *Excel* with the help of student workers in the Center for Information Media office. The Assessment Coordinator used a spot-checking technique to

verify the accuracy of the data input. The Assessment Coordinator then used *SPSS* software to analyze the data. Questions for cross-tabulation were determined by several LR&TS work group leaders and results were also generated using *SPSS*.

Results: Miller Center Survey

In fall 2008, the Assessment Coordinator will meet individually with work group leaders to highlight responses and results from the Miller Center Survey that were directly connected to their work group. The Assessment Coordinator will also meet with the Associate Dean for Library Services to begin planning for library assessment 08-09.

Demographics. The majority of the 300 students responding were juniors (26%) and seniors (24%), followed by sophomores (20%) and freshmen (19%). Seven percent were graduate students and 2% identified themselves as community members. Most of the students (86%) were enrolled at SCSU during fall semester 2006. These demographics are quite close to those of 2006-07, with juniors and seniors comprising about half of the participants.

Visits to Miller Center. Eighty-two percent of participants visited the Miller Center at least several times per week. The top responses for number of times visiting were:

- Several times a week (31%)
- Daily (29%)
- More than once daily (22%)

Use of LR&TS Website. The LR&TS Website was used by 65% of participants at least weekly. The top responses for frequency of LR&TS Website use were:

- Less than 10x during semester (27%)
- Daily (18%)
- Several times per week (17%)
- More than once daily (14%)

Use of HuskyNet email and file space. Almost all of respondents (98%) accessed their HuskyNet email account regularly.

- More than once daily (63%)
- Daily (25%)
- Several times per week (10%)

Students were asked about their use of HuskyNet file space. Top responses were:

- Used HuskyNet file space to store documents (69%)
- Did not know how to use it (9%)
- Did not have a need to use it (3%)

Personal computer access. This question was asked for the first time this year. Results were:

- Have easy access to a computer at their residence (85%)
- Can easily access library databases from their residence (79%)
- Own a laptop computer (69%)

Computer utilization. Many students (81%, same percentage as 06-07) had used a computer in the Miller Center on the day they completed the survey.

The most frequent reasons (all with at least 20% responding) for using a Miller Center computer were to:

- Read email (50%)
- Use D2L (41%)
- Do a class assignment other than a paper (35%)
- Use a printer (32%)
- Write assigned paper (31%)
- Use Facebook, MySpace, etc. (29%)

Other reasons with 15-20% responding were to:

- Check news (19%)
- General convenience (19%)
- Do group work (16%)
- Use software not owned (15%)
- No time to go home (15%)

Library utilization. This question was added to the 08 survey to parallel the Miller Center computer utilization question. More than half (52%) of the students used the library resources or services on the day they completed the survey.

The most frequent reasons for use were:

- Do research for an assignment (19%)

- Use Google, Yahoo, etc. to research a class assignment (17%)
- Use library database such as *Academic Search Premier* to find articles (11%)

Student satisfaction. Students were asked about their use and satisfaction for 24 items (each version of the survey had 12 unique items listed). For another 12 items (included on both versions of the survey), students were asked to respond on a scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. At least 90% of students *who had used the services or resources* rated 11 of these 36 items (31%) as *Used and Satisfied* or *Strongly Agree / Agree*. [Ninety percent of the 300 survey participants is 270.]

Library resources and services satisfaction. This year no library-related items on the survey received at least 90% satisfaction or agreement. Library items from the 07 survey decreased from 3-9 % in the 08 survey:

- B 7I. Full text articles available online (88%, down from 91%)
- B 7A. Help at Reference Desk (88%, down from 94%)
- B 7H. Subject guides (87%, down from 96%)
- B 7B. Email reference help (85%, down from 93%)

Technology resources and services satisfaction. Items focusing on technology with 90% or higher responses included:

- A 7K. Off-campus access to resources (library catalog, indexes, e-mail) (98%)
- A 7C. Received help with using D2L (95%)
- 8B. Software programs to meet academic needs (93%)
- 8C. Computer hardware adequate for academic needs (93%)
- 8D. Computer equipment updated often enough (92%)

Miller Center Facilities. Items focusing on the Miller Center facility with 90% or higher responses included:

- B 7F. Study rooms available for check out (90%)

General LR&TS Items. Items focusing on the general LR&TS with 90% or higher responses included:

- 8L. Library and technology resources and services support my academic learning (95%)
- A-B 7L. Library Website (92% - 95%)
- A 7H. Promotional materials (handouts, posters, news on Web sites) (92%)
- 8K. Library and technology services have helped with assignments (92%)
- 8J. Employees (not including student workers) generally informed and helpful (91%)

Student awareness of services they have not used. Students were highly aware of some services and resources, even though they had not used them. It is possible that students have not used these services because they have not needed to. For instance, 50% of students had not checked out laptops even though they were aware of this service, perhaps because they have not needed a laptop (67% own laptops). Similarly, 50% of students had not used help in computer labs even though they were aware of the service, perhaps because they didn't need assistance with their tasks. In that sense, some of the responses can be seen as not totally negative comments.

The 19 areas out of 36 (53%) that were ranked at least 25% awareness by non-users are grouped below. [Twenty-five percent of the 300 participants is 75 students.]

Library services awareness. Library-related items with at least 25% awareness from non-users included:

- B 7B. Email help from Reference (53%)
- B 7E. Interlibrary loan options (50%)
- B 7D. Equipment for checkout (44%)
- A 7I. Library instruction for classes (41%)
- A 7G. Online renewal of books (39%)
- B 7A. Help at Reference Desk (38%)
- B 7H. Subject guides (36%)
- A 7B. Book collection to support courses and research (34%)
- B 7I. Full text articles available online (28%)

Technology services awareness.

Technology-related items with at least 25% awareness from non-users included:

- B 7J. Purchase from Computer Store (58%)
- A 7J. Laptop checkout for students (50%)
- B 7C. Help in computer labs (50%)
- A 7A. Computer software workshops (39%)
- A 7F. Help Desk assistance (34%)
- A 7C. Help with D2L (33%)
- B 7G. Campus wireless (31%)

Miller Center facility awareness. Items focusing on the Miller Center facility with at least 25% awareness from non-users included:

- A 7E. LabSeats display monitor (33%)

General LR&TS awareness. General LR&TS items with at least 25% awareness from non-users included:

- A 7H. Promotional materials (42%)
- A-B 7L. Library and technology website (24% - 31%)

Student lack of awareness of some services and resources. Students were, however, unaware of a number of LR&TS services and resources that perhaps could have been beneficial to them. Five items out of 36 (14%) which were marked by at least 20% as *Not aware of* or *No opinion* are noted here.

Unaware Library by at least 20%

- A 7G. Online renewal of books (38%)
- B 7B. Email help from Reference (21%)

Unaware Technology by at least 20%

- A 7A. Walk-in workshops (26%)
- A 7J. Laptop checkout for students (23%)

Unaware General LR&TS by at least 20%

- A 7H. Promotional materials (22%)

Student dissatisfaction with services and resources used by at least 20%. Only two items were identified with ratings of "used but not satisfied" by more than 20% of the participants:

- 8A. Enough computers in the Miller Center (51% disagreed)
- 8H. Study areas are generally free from distractions (26% disagreed)

Student dissatisfaction with services and resources used by at least 5%. The following 19 areas of dissatisfaction out of 36 areas (53%) were identified by at least 5% of students who responded to the survey. [Five percent of the 300 survey participants is 15 students.]

Library dissatisfaction by at least 5%

- A 7D. Online databases (14%)
- B 7I. Full text article available online (8%)
- A 7I. Library instruction for classes (7%)
- B 7A. Help from Reference Desk (7%)
- A 7B. Library book collection to support courses and research (6%)
- B 7D. Checkout equipment available (6%)
- B 7H. Subject guides (6%)
- B 7E. Interlibrary loan (5%)

Technology dissatisfaction by at least 5%

- A 7E. LabSeats display monitor (10%)
- B 7C. Lab help (9%)
- B 7G. Wireless on campus (9%)
- 8C. Computers adequate for academic needs (8%)
- A 7F. Assistance from Help Desk (7%)
- A 7A. Walk-in workshops (6%)
- A 7J. Laptop checkout (6%)

Facilities dissatisfaction by at least 5%

- 8G. Adequate variety of study areas (10%)
- B 7F. Study rooms to check out (8%)

General LR&TS dissatisfaction by at least 5%

- 8I. Student workers informed and helpful (8% disagreed)
- A 7L. Website with information about library and technology (6% disagreed)

Student dissatisfaction from 06-07 not reflected in 07-08 survey. Three items identified with dissatisfaction to at least 5% in 07 were missing from this category in the 08 survey. All were in the area of technology.

- A 7C. Received help with D2L (3%, down from 5%)
- 8D. Computers updated often enough (4%, down from 7%)
- 8B. Software available for academic needs (4%, down from 5%)

Top two ways library and technology resources and services support your academic learning.

This question was added in 2006-07 to parallel the university's institution-wide emphasis on assessing student learning. This year students' comments were more focused on the academic nature of these resources and services, with comments like "great resources for my classes," "has the journal articles I need," and "academic materials for my assignments."

The following ways of academic support, listed in rank order, were mentioned by students for this year's survey:

- Resources (47%, up from 39% for academic and general research in 07)
- Computer access (36%, down from 46% in 07)
- Environment (23%, up from 21% in 07)
- Can get help / instruction (16%, down from 27% in 07)

The small group of students (n = 20) who disagreed that library and technology resources and services supported their academic learning mentioned noise (73%) and/or lack of computer access (68%) as the reasons.

Main reason for visit to Miller Center on day of survey. About 74% (up from 65% in 07) of the students answered this question:

- Academic work (study, do assignments, read, etc.) (41%, down from 46% in 07)
- Group work (16%, not mentioned often in 07)
- Computer access (13%, down from 39% in 07)
- Email (7%, same as 07)
- Printer (5%, not mentioned often in 07)

Satisfaction with day's visit to Miller Center.

Almost all of the participants (93%, down from 95% in 07) were satisfied with their visit to the Miller Center on the day of the survey, for these reasons:

- Accomplishing what they came to do (76%, up from 46% in 07)
- Environment (12%, down from 26% in 07)
- Computer access (9%, down from 16% in 07)

The few students (n = 8) who were dissatisfied mentioned these reasons:

- Lack of computer access (63%)
- Too noisy to work (25%)
- Couldn't use printer (13%)

Top reasons for using the Miller Center.

Comments related to academics were the most frequently mentioned responses for the top reasons for using the Miller Center.

- Academic work (study, read, do assignments, etc.) (55%, up from 46% in 07)
- Computer access (41%, up from 39% in 07)
- Environment (31%, down from 41% in 07)
- Academic research (29%, up from 20% for general research in 07)
- Group work (8%, not mentioned often in 07)
- Use email (5%, not mentioned often in 07)

Recommend Services and Resources.

Students ranked on a 0-10 scale (10 high) their likelihood of recommending library resources and services to a friend. Just over 84% (07 was 85%) ranked this question at 8 or higher (10 = 44%, 9 = 19%, 8 = 21%). The reasons given were:

- Resources for academic research (30%, up from 16% for resources and 16% for general research in 07)
- A version of "like the library" (27% down from 34% in 07)
- Environment (27%, up from 24% in 07)
- Help / instruction (9%, not mentioned much in 07)

More than 76% (07 was 75%) ranked recommending technology resources and services to a friend at 8 or higher (10 = 35%, 9 = 22%, 8 = 20%). Reasons given were:

- Computer access (58%, up from 8% in 07 -- many more students specifically mentioned *computers* than did last year)
- Environment (27%)
- A version of "like the technology" (11%, down from 44% in 07)
- Instruction / help (10%, up from 9% in 07)

It was notable that in these comments, many students blurred the *library* and *technology* boundaries -- for instance, some students mentioned library databases as a reason to recommend Miller Center technology.

Comments in box. More than 50 students (17% of participants) took time to add a comment this year. Categories of comments included:

- **Computers** (15 comments) -- need more; faster; too many people using Facebook when others need a computer; use of videogames in study rooms
- **Noise** (14 comments) -- gets louder every year; no respect for others; need to monitor noise more; need study carrels; more group study rooms; at least one group study room with campus e-classroom setup to practice presentations
- **Happy faces, hearts, thanks, cheers** (12 comments) -- I [heart] my library; keep it up; thanks for being here for us; :-); this is the best place on campus)
- **Webpages** (3 comments) -- change and update webpages; library link needs to be larger
- **Facility** (4 comments) -- drinking fountains don't always work
- **Survey** (3 comments) -- survey confusing; I hope this survey will be helpful; thank you for *finally* doing a survey about the problems so they can be resolved
- **D2L** (2 comments) -- profs need to learn to use D2L better; professors should update D2L more often
- **Book collection** (2 comments) -- I'd like to see updated books to check out; it

would be nice to have newer editions of older books -- some old classic novels are falling apart

See [Appendix F](#) and [G](#) for more details and analysis. ([Appendix F](#) – Survey format with statistics; [Appendix G](#)– survey statistics in *Excel* format with percent agreeing and satisfied)

Results: Telephone Survey

Demographics. The SCSU Survey completed interviews from 508 students. Seniors (28%) were the largest group, followed by juniors (21%), sophomores (20%), freshmen (18%), and graduate students (10%). In addition, 3% identified themselves in other categories. Most of the students lived off-campus (81%), with 19% living in residence halls. Slightly more than half (51%) were female, with 49% males. All of the students had attended SCSU in fall semester 2007.

Visits to Miller Center. A high percentage of the students (90%) said they had visited the Miller Center facility during fall semester 2007. More than three-fourths (78%) visited at least once a week. Responses to this question were:

- Several times a week (36%)
- Less than 10 times / semester (20%)
- Once a week (17%)
- Daily (15%)
- More than once per day (10%)
- Not at all (2%)

Access via computer. Many of the students also accessed LR&TS resources via computer, with 89% doing this at least once a week. The top responses were:

- Several times a week (35%)
- Once a week (35%)
- Daily (11%)

Use of technology services. Almost all (98%) accessed technology services (including D2L, e-mail, and file space) at least several times a week. Other responses were:

- Daily (45%)
- More than once a day (38%)

- Several times a week (12%)

Telephoning Miller Center services. Almost half (48%) of students never called the Miller Center. Less than ten times per semester was answered by 35%.

Student satisfaction. Students were asked about their awareness and use of 14 LR&TS resources and services. Thirteen items grouped below were identified with satisfaction by at least 90% of respondents who had *used* the services are grouped below. [Ninety percent of the participants is 457 students.] Technology training (7.) was identified with satisfaction by 87% satisfied users.

Library resources and services satisfaction. At least 90% of the respondents were satisfied with the following library-related items they had used:

- 6. Research assistance (96%)
- 14. Equipment to check out (94%)

Technology resources and services satisfaction. At least 90% of the respondents were satisfied with the following technology-related items:

- 8. Help in computer labs (97%)
- 12. Computer labs in MC (94%)
- 14. Equipment to check out (94%)
- 9. Help Desk visit (93%)
- 10. HelpDesk phone call (92%)
- 11. Computer Store (92%)

Miller Center facility satisfaction. At least 90% of the respondents were satisfied with the following facility-related items:

- 13. Study rooms (98%)
- 14. General study areas (97%)
- 20. Building facilities (94%)

Student awareness of services they have not used. Eight of 14 items identified with at least 25% awareness are grouped below. [Twenty-five percent of the participants is 127 students.]

Library services awareness with at least 25% awareness included:

- 14. Check out equipment (44%)
- 6. Research assistance (35%)

Technology services awareness with at least 25% awareness included:

- 9. Help Desk visit (45%)
- 11. Computer Store (44%)
- 8. Help in computer labs (44%)
- 7. Technology training (38%)
- 10. Help Desk call (34%)

Miller Center facility awareness with at least 25% awareness included:

- 13. Study rooms (26%)

Student lack of awareness of some services and resources. Seven of 14 items identified by at least 25% as *Not aware* or *Don't Know* are grouped below.

Library services awareness with at least 25% lack of awareness included:

- 6. Research assistance (35%)
- 14. Check out equipment (24%)

Technology services awareness with at least 25% lack of awareness included:

- 11. Technology training (43%)
- 10. Help Desk call (40%)
- 11. Computer Store (28%)
- 9. Help Desk visit (22%)
- 8. Help in computer labs (21%)

Student dissatisfaction of services and resources. Seven of 14 items identified by at least 5% with dissatisfaction are grouped below. [Five percent of the participants is 25 students.]

Technology services dissatisfaction with at least 5% included:

- 12. Computer labs (5%)
- 17. Adequate book collection to support research for classes (5%)

Why student doesn't visit Miller Center more frequently. Five of the 10 reasons provided were identified by more than 10% of the respondents. [Ten percent of the participants is 51 students.] These items are ranked as follows:

- #1 Use resources via computer (23%)
- #2 Parking (21%)
- #3 Not enough computers (12%)
- #3 Use Miller Center often and do not need to use it more (12%)

- #4 No class assignments that require going to the Miller Center (11%)

How student learned about Miller Center services and resources. Six of the seven reasons provided were identified by at least almost 10%. These are ranked as follows:

- #1 From a professor (25%)
- #2 From another student (16%)
- #2 From LR&TS, library, or HuskyNet Webpages (16%)
- #3 From a library instruction session (14%)
- #4 From a technology instruction session (9%)
- #4 From a worker in the Miller Center (9%)

General satisfaction with library and technology resources used. Almost all (94%) *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that they were generally satisfied with Miller Center services and resources. Only a few (n = 25) disagreed, citing not enough computers and too much noise as the reasons for their dissatisfaction.

See [Appendix H](#) for more details and analysis.

Comparative Study

The Assessment Coordinator completed a comparative study of the two major assessment projects for 2007-08. A matrix was developed to compare the results of similar questions from the Miller Center Survey and the Telephone Survey.

The audiences of these two surveys are quite different. Miller Center Survey participants received and completed the survey in the Miller Center and could thus be considered Miller Center users. The Telephone Survey participants, on the other hand, were selected from a statistically representative sample of all SCSU students and completed the survey via telephone; these students may or may not have been familiar with the Miller Center facility.

Demographics. Both surveys were dominated by juniors and seniors (MC 50%, Phone 49%) and were the same or about the same for all other class standings.

Visits to Miller Center. The results from the two surveys fall along the different audience lines. Almost all (99%) of the Miller Center Survey participants visited the Miller Center, while only 90% of Telephone Survey participants did so. In the Miller Center Survey, 95% of participants visited at least once a week, with *several times a week* (31%) and *daily* (30%) the most frequent answers. Not as many from the Telephone Survey visited as frequently: 78% came at least once a week, with *several times a week* (36%) and *less than 10 times a semester* (20%) the next highest categories. But only 2% said they had not visited at all.

Accessing the Miller Center via computer.

Telephone Survey students were more likely to access services and resources via computer (97% did this *at least once a week*, with *once and week* and *several times a week* at 35% each as the most common response), whereas only 65% of Miller Center Survey students accessed the LR&TS webpage *at least once a week*, with the most frequent answer being *less than ten times per semester* (27%).

Accessing technology services. More than 81% of the Miller Center Survey students used a computer the day they took the survey, with the most common uses email (50% and which 63% say they do *more than once daily*) and D2L (41%). These students might not have considered the HuskyNet webpage as a "library website with information about library and technology resources and services" when answering the A-B 7L question. With the recent launching of the separate "library" website, next year's questions will try to distinguish between the Library and HuskyNet websites.

Large numbers of students in both surveys accessed technology services *at least once a week* (97% of MC with *more than once daily* the mode at 62%; 95% of Telephone Survey with *daily* the mode at 45%).

LR&TS Resources and Services. Because at least 10% of the Telephone Survey students never visited the Miller Center and the students in general visited the building less frequently, it could be expected that these students would be less familiar with some of the LR&TS services

and resources. This assumption is corroborated in the survey results.

Services Both higher awareness and higher use by Miller Center Survey students was evident for these five items, which differed by at least ten percentage points between the two surveys:

- **Study rooms use** (MC 75%, Phone 61%); more Phone students were unaware of the study rooms (10%) than MC students (2%) and more Phone students (26%) didn't use the rooms than MC students (16%); but Phone students were more highly satisfied (98%) than MC students (90%)
- **HelpDesk assistance use** (MC 53%, Phone 39%); 40% of Phone students were unaware that HelpDesk assistance was available via phone; both groups were equally aware but hadn't used the service (34%); MC users were highly satisfied (99%), with Phone users also satisfied (93%)
- **Reference assistance use** (MC 51%, Phone 25%); 35% of Phone students were not aware of this service; but 96% of Phone users were satisfied, compared to 88% for MC users
- **Checkout equipment use** (MC 39%, Phone 29%); both groups were equally aware but hadn't used this equipment (44%), but more Phone students (94%) were satisfied than MC students (87%); more frequent visitors to the building might be more aware of this service and attempt to use it more frequently
- **Technology training use** (MC 28%, Phone 13%); 43% of Phone students were unaware of these, compared to 26% of MC students; another factor that might contribute is that these sessions are publicized primarily in the Miller Center; Phone students showed 87% user satisfaction, compared to 82% for MC students

Several items had similar results in both surveys, with percentages the same or differing by only around 5%.

- **Computer Store use** (MC 24%, Phone 23%); Phone users were more satisfied (92%) than MC users (86%); more Phone students were unaware (28%) than MC students (13%)
- **Help in computer labs** (MC 37%, Phone 32%); Phone users were more satisfied (97%) than MC users (82%); surprisingly, more Phone students knew about the service (21% unaware) than MC students (26% unaware)
- **Computer labs in Miller Center use** 76% of Phone students used the Miller Center computer labs. These users were 94% satisfied; a comparable question was not asked of the MC students, but 81% used a computer the day of the survey; however, "not enough computers" was the most frequent negative comment of the MC Survey

Resources

- **Book collection adequate** MC users were basically *satisfied* (89%), compared to Phone users who *strongly agreed or agreed* (75%).
- **Periodicals collection adequate** MC users were more likely to be satisfied (83%) than Phone users (75% *strongly agreed or agreed*).
- **Online materials adequate** MC users were more satisfied (88%) than Phone users (82% *strongly agreed or agreed*).

Facility

- **Satisfaction with building facilities** 94% of Phone users *strongly agreed or agreed*, while only 73% of MC users *strongly agreed or agreed* that there was an adequate variety of study areas.
- **Noise** 73% of MC users *strongly agreed or agreed* that study areas were free of distraction most of the time, while 26% *disagreed or strongly disagreed*; 2% of Phone users mentioned noise when they disagreed with satisfaction with the facilities.

Overall satisfaction with library and technology services and resources Phone users expressed high overall satisfaction (94% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*) with library and technology services and resources. Miller Center students were more moderate, indicating that they would recommend library (84%) and technology (77%) resources and services at 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-high scale.

Miller Center students agreed that library and technology resources and services supported their academic learning. Top reasons were:

- Resources (47%)
- Computer access (36%)
- Environment (23%)
- Help / instruction (16%)

For the small number of students who *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed*, the main reasons were:

- Need more computers
- Miller Center too noisy to work

Tech Fee Questions The Tech Fee Committee also included questions in the same telephone survey. Several questions were almost parallel with Telephone Survey or Miller Center Survey questions and thus allow for comparison.

- **Need for more computers** Phone users ranked "increase the number of general access computers for students" as the #1 way to spend Tech Fee money (29%). Also, the #3 reason they did not use the Miller Center more frequently was *not enough computers* (12%). In the Miller Center Survey, those who answered 6 or lower (on a 10-high scale) on the recommendation question mentioned the need for more computers as the #1 reason.
- **Laptop ownership** About two-thirds of MC students (67%) who took the survey owned their own laptops. In the Phone Survey, 74% (almost three-fourths) currently owned laptops, tablets, or PDA.
- **Wireless reliability** Phone Survey students (73%) *strongly agreed* or *agreed* and 87% of MC users were *satisfied* with the wireless on campus.

- **Software available on Miller Center computers** Most of the MC students *strongly agreed* or *agreed* (93%) that the software met their academic needs. On the Phone Survey, 67% indicated they used campus software for courses at least monthly (67%), with most students using the software weekly (25%) or monthly (26%). Several Miller Center students mentioned the need for more Macintoshes for graphic arts and mass communication studies students.

For more details and analysis of the comparative study, see [Appendix I](#).

Long-Term Results of Miller Center Survey

Because two of the 2004-05 instruments were repeated in 2005-06, it was hoped that two years of assessment data would begin to build a data record which could be compared from year to year. However, the necessary revisions made to both questions and format in the Miller Center Survey and Telephone Survey since 2005-06 have made it impossible to compare all years of the data. The longitudinal analysis focuses on the Miller Center Surveys from spring of 2006, 2007, and 2008. Because the Telephone Survey was postponed by the SCSU Survey Center in 2007, this year's report will concentrate on the Miller Center Survey.

Same: Items identified as the same percentage for *agreeing* or *satisfaction* for at least 07 and 08 include:

- Demographics (juniors and seniors are largest groups of survey participants)
- MC computer equipment updated enough (93%)
- MC employees (not student workers) are informed / helpful (91%)
- Book collection (89%)
- Online renewal (88%)
- Campus wireless (87%)
- Purchasing at Computer Store (86%)
- Highly likely to recommend library resources and services 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-high scale (84%)
- Used Miller Center computer on day of survey (81%)

- Laptop checkout (78%)

Little or no change: Items with satisfaction or agreement holding fairly steady and changing 2% or less include (first percentage is 08 statistic, second is 07):

- LR&TS resources and services support academic learning (95%, down from 97%)
- Library website with tech and library information (95%, up from 94%)
- Received help with D2L (95%, up from 93%)
- Miller Center hardware adequate for academic needs (93%, down from 95%)
- Satisfied with visit to Miller Center on day of survey (93%, down from 95%)
- Software to meet academic needs (93%, down from 95%)
- Technology help from HelpDesk (88%, up from 86%)
- Interlibrary loan options (87%, down from 88%)
- Library instruction for classes (83%, up from 82%)
- LabSeats display (82% down from 83%)
- Highly likely to recommend technology services 8, 9, or 10 on a 10-high scale (77%, up from 75% in 07)

Growth and improvement in satisfaction and agreement: The following items have grown at least 5% in 2008, based on satisfaction or agreement of users:

Library

- Equipment for checkout (87%, up from 75%)
- Online indexes and databases (83%, up from 78%)
- Checkout equipment available when needed (74%, up from 68% in 07 and 56% in 06)

Technology

- Promotional materials (92%, up from 87%)
- Library website (92%, up from 87%)

Facilities

- Equipment in e-classrooms is reliable (87%, up from 80%)

Dissatisfaction and disagreement: The following items were identified by a ranking showing at least 5% negative change in satisfaction or agreement between 07 and 08. Percentages are for users *satisfied* or *agreeing*.

Library

- Help at Ref Desk (88%, down from 94%)
- Reference via email (85%, down from 93%)
- Subject guides (87%, down from 96%)

Technology

- Technology help in computer labs (86%, down from 91%)
- Enough computers in Miller Center (49%, down from 62%)

General

- Library and technology services have helped with assignments in the past (92%, down from 97%)

The complete results of the 2007-08 Miller Center Survey longitudinal study are included in the comparative chart in [Appendix J](#). In the future, hopefully even more data will be gathered in a way to improve the collection and comparison of long-term results.

SCSU Assessment Instruments

Other campus data sets. Other campus data sets that have in the past been analyzed by the Assessment Coordinator in order to collect assessment and evaluation data related to library and technology services are unavailable from the Office of Institutional Research as of the writing of this report (July, 2008). The most recent Graduating Senior Survey (fall 07 and spring 08) is among the data sets that will be examined in fall 08.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2007

First year (FY) and senior (SY) students participated in the NSSE, with a total of 1,194 students responding. Several questions relate at least indirectly to resources and services provided by SCSU. Most frequent responses are listed below:

Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources

FY -- often (49%)

SY -- very often (48%)

Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment

FY -- sometimes (35%)

SY -- very often (34%)

Used email to communicate with an instructor

FY -- often (39%)

SY -- very often (50%)

Coursework emphasis: making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

FY -- quite a bit (45%)

SY -- quite a bit (45%)

Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic achievement

FY -- 1-4 (48%)

SY -- 1-4 (51%)

Number of written papers or reports

20 pages or more

FY -- none (83%)

SY -- 1-4 (48%)

5-19 pages

FY -- 1-4 (55%)

SY -- 1-4 (42%)

Fewer than 5 pages

FY -- 5-10 (30%)

SY -- 5-10 (27%)

Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically

FY -- quite a bit (49%)

SY -- quite a bit (45%)

Using computers in academic work

FY -- quite a bit (42%)

SY -- very much (58%)

Using computer and information technology

FY -- quite a bit (42%)

SY -- quite a bit (41%)

Thinking about this semester, as you taking all courses entirely online?

FY -- 1% (n = 5)

SY -- 5% (n = 418)

Graduate Student Survey. In spring 2007 a survey of graduate students was conducted by the School of Graduate Studies. Three of the survey questions were related to LR&TS services and resources. When asked if library hours and services met their needs as graduate

students, of 292 responders, 81.1% agreed or strongly agreed. When asked if the library holdings were adequate to meet their academic needs, 67.8% of 289 responders agreed or strongly agreed. Almost half (44.7%) were interested in being able to attend a workshop on computer skills.

Other LR&TS Assessment Activities

LR&TS Workgroup Collaborations. The Assessment Coordinator assisted the following workgroups with focused assessment projects.

ITIS – E-Classroom Survey This survey, distributed to all SCSU faculty, was a new assessment tool this year. The Assessment Coordinator collaborated with George Fiedler and others in the ITIS work group to design a web-based survey (using SurveyMonkey) that focused on faculty satisfaction with e-classroom technology and support (see [Appendix K](#)). The survey was distributed in an email link via SCSU-Announce in spring semester 08. A total of 75 surveys were received and analyzed.

E-classroom hardware and software worked effectively

- Touchpad -- 95% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*
- Computer -- 56% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*
- Document camera -- 81% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 17% didn't use
- Video or DVD player -- 44% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 39% didn't use
- Equipment relatively easy to operate -- 90% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*

Received operational support

- Technical support they needed for the e-classroom -- 64% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 9% *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed*; 27% either *didn't use* or *know about*
- Assistance from the HelpDesk via the in-class phone -- 42% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 19% *disagreed* or *strongly disagreed*; 38% either *didn't use* or *know about*

Faculty development

- Sufficient training for e-classroom -- 44% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 48% indicated they *didn't use* or *didn't know about*

Curriculum integration

- E-classroom environment enhanced their teaching -- 100% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*
- E-classroom environment enhanced student learning -- 95% *strongly agree* or *agreed*

Overall impression of e-classrooms

- Would teach in an e-classroom again -- 100% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*
- Preferred to teach in e-classrooms - 95% *strongly agreed* or *agreed*

Reference – Library Instruction Evaluation

In both fall and spring semesters, library instruction presenters asked students to fill out evaluation forms. The forms were tallied and comments were collected on a spreadsheet.

Evaluation forms were received from 1850 students in 115 sessions. Students were asked if they felt more confident about starting their research as a result of the session; 91.9% answered yes and 7% were not sure. When asked if the session was helpful, 93% answered yes, with 6% not sure.

First year students completed the most evaluations (42%), followed by juniors (17%), sophomores (14%), and then seniors and graduate students (13%).

Reference -- Reference Desk Evaluation In both fall and spring semesters, reference librarians selected one week during which all patrons were asked to fill out evaluation / satisfaction forms. The results were collected on a spreadsheet and analyzed.

Fall 2007 (n = 73)

Reference Librarian made me feel welcome
Yes -- 100%
Reference Librarian helped me with my question
Yes -- 90%

Overall, the Reference Librarian provided satisfactory assistance

Yes -- 100%

Would you recommend the Reference Desk to a friend?

Yes – 100%

Spring 2008 (n = 69)

Reference Librarian made me feel welcome
Yes -- 100%

Reference Librarian helped me with my question

Yes -- 100%

Overall, the Reference Librarian provided satisfactory assistance

Yes -- 99%

Would you recommend the Reference Desk to a friend?

Yes – 100%

Access – Study Room Survey A satisfaction survey of users of study rooms was administered in spring 2008 as a follow-up to a similar spring 2006 survey. Results are being analyzed by the Access work group.

Use of laptops and library space Four LR&TS faculty conducted a "walk and count" research study, observing when and where in the Miller Center students worked independently or in groups, on computers or laptops, or without technology. A total of 3,996 students were observed and counted over several months of the study. Results of the analysis showed these ways that students were using the Miller Center spaces:

- Using a MC computer alone (43%)
- Studying alone (17%)
- Studying with a group (12%)
- Using a laptop alone (10%)
- Using a laptop with a group (9%)
- Using a MC computer with a group (8%)
- Looking for a book (1%)

Several of the faculty also surveyed their classes on library space usage and preferences.

Over a period of three years, both laptop usage and group work has increased.

Dean's Advisory Group The LR&TS Dean annually meets with a group of students to listen

to them talk about what they like about the library and what suggestions for improvement they can make. Students appreciated the facility and atmosphere, study areas, workers, library services, computer access, and hours.

Members of the group made suggestions regarding recycling, communication, check-out technology, safety issues, noise/etiquette, computer issues, Website, campus labs, and staff. The categorized comments, taken from the meeting transcript, are included in [Appendix L](#).

Comments

The results of assessment and evaluation from the wide variety of data sources in recent years have shown that LR&TS patrons generally hold a very positive view of LR&TS services and resources.

However, the assessment data does reveal a number of areas for improvement in particularly crucial areas such as student workers' customer service skills, computer availability, and noise level in the library. Additional suggestions for addressing these issues are expected to be forthcoming in the fall 2008 semester from LR&TS, the new Library Associate Dean, the Dean's Advisory Council, the work groups, and the administration.

Elements of the 2006-07 Assessment Plan that have not yet been implemented (see [Appendix M](#) for drafts) should be considered again for 2008-09 as these assessments may provide important data for LR&TS growth and improvement.

Assessment Follow-Up

The LR&TS Dean, Dean's Advisory Council, and workgroups continue to make use of data gathered by the various recent LR&TS assessment instruments to inform decisions and guide direction. Typically, each work group decides on the area(s) it would like to emphasize for further investigation, change, or improvement.

The DAC selected student worker skills and attitudes as a focus for improvement in 2007-08.

This choice was based on past Miller Center Surveys, Telephone Surveys, and on the comments entered by faculty and students into the LibQUAL+ Survey in spring 2007.

The Assessment Coordinator displayed a poster called "Your Opinion Matters -- We've Listened to You in the Past" to bring students' attention to changes made in LR&TS as a result of assessment surveys. Those changes include but are not limited to the following:

- Not enough printers (added a double-sided printer in Reference area)
- Student workers not always knowledgeable or helpful (added customer service training for all LR&TS student workers)
- Not aware of computer software workshops for students (added easel and poster on 2nd floor to advertise dates of free workshops)
- Liked early and late hours at the Miller Center (able to keep budget to have library open extended hours)
- Not enough e-classrooms on campus (now more than 120 e-classrooms)
- Shelves in basement do not always open (replaced all shelving mechanisms with improved model)
- Book collection not always adequate for research needs (added more than 10,000 books and more than 12,000 e-books)
- Some journal articles not available at SCSU (improved FindIt! link makes it easy to request a copy from another library)
- Laptops for check out don't always work (improved equipment check procedure after checkout)
- Writing a bibliography is hard (added RefWorks workshops to learn to create bibliographies)
- Some areas of Miller Center are noisy, especially cell phones (increased signs and efforts to encourage students to use cell phones only in lobby area; plans are underway for designating Quiet Areas and Group Areas)

There are many instances where the work groups have anticipated assessment results in advance and have already planned for and in some cases even implemented improvements before the assessment results for 2008 became available. In fact, continuous improvement is a vital part of the LR&TS culture and commitment.

Acknowledgements

The Assessment Coordinator would like to thank many who have assisted with assessment projects this year.

Those who volunteered for the LR&TS Assessment Committee provided their survey design expertise and were extremely helpful in revising and improving the 2007-08 survey instruments and in lending assistance for analyzing and displaying results.

Steven Wagner and David Robinson of the SCSU Survey provided excellent assistance and advice for revising questions for the Telephone Survey and with setting up the questions for effective statistical analysis. Steve Malikowski taught the Assessment Coordinator the details of manipulating *SPSS* to better analyze the resulting data sets for the Miller Center Survey. Missy Northenscold, Sheila Landucci, and Ann Chmielewski (all in the LR&TS Dean's Office), Brianna Inkster, and Whitney Inkster have all

provided supportive assistance with *Excel* software and details. Student workers in the Center for Information Media assisted with data input for the Miller Center Survey.

Colleagues across campus who also serve in assessment leadership positions provided encouraging and knowledgeable support and assistance, especially Elaine Ackerman (COE), Joe Melcher (COSS), Sandy Nelson (COSE), Wendy Bjorklund (COFAH), Jim Sherohman (University Assessment Director), and Holly Evers (University Assessment Office support staff).

The LR&TS work group leaders, faculty, staff, and students who volunteered to assist with assessment efforts in any way (helping with survey design and revision, designing new assessment tools, trying out survey formats, volunteering to help administer the surveys, and examining the assessment reports) are also all appreciated and gratefully acknowledged

Appendices

[Appendix A](#)

Triangulation Study –2006-07

[Appendix B](#)

Assessment Plan – 2007-08

Appendix C

Miller Center Survey 2008 ([Version A](#) and [B](#))

[Appendix D](#)

Telephone Survey Script 2007-08

[Appendix E](#)

Coding Scheme for Miller Center Survey 2008

[Appendix F](#)

Results of Miller Center Survey 2008 -- Survey with statistics

Appendix G

Results of Miller Center Survey 2008 -- Excel with percent agreeing and satisfied

[Appendix H](#)

Results of Telephone Survey 2008

[Appendix I](#)

Comparative Study 2008

[Appendix J](#)

Miller Center Survey – Longitudinal Comparison for 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008

[Appendix K](#)

E-Classroom Survey 2008

[Appendix L](#)

LR&TS Dean's Advisory Group Responses

[Appendix M](#)

Assessment Plans Not Implemented in 2008

Report and appendices available online at:
<http://lrts.stcloudstate.edu/about/reports/assessment/assessment07-08.pdf>