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**Introduction**

Beginning in early 2013, Rice Library’s Assessment Committee began to work on its second Assessment Plan, which was finalized by the beginning of the spring 2014 semester. The committee was composed of Ashley Clark (Instructional Services), Debbie Clark (Circulation Services), Marna Hostetler (Administration), and Peter Whiting (Serials) and was chaired by Philip Orr (Distance Learning Services).

The plan itself included eight separate assessments designed to evaluate the library’s facilities, personnel, resources, services, and technology during the 2013-2014 fiscal year. All eight activities were completed.

Each of the completed assessments is summarized below. Among the details provided for each assessment activity are its purpose, the method of assessment employed, the key findings and their implications for the library, and the assessment’s alignment with the university’s and/or the library’s strategic plan.
End of Semester Extended Hours

In the fall of 2011 USI changed its final exam schedule, separating finals into two separate weeks and adding a study day at the start. Classes officially ended on Tuesday, December 6, 2011, and the study day was held on Wednesday, December 7, 2011. The library extended its typical midnight closing to 2 a.m. on Wednesday/Thursday December 7 and Thursday/Friday December 8 during the first week and again on Sunday/Monday December 11 and Monday/Tuesday December 12, during the second week. The library closed at midnight on Tuesday, December 13 and 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 14. Attendance counts were conducted at 12:00 a.m., 12:30 a.m., 1:00 am and 1:30 a.m. (see Appendix C).

This same process continued from the spring 2012 through the spring 2013 semester. It should be noted that the counts for spring 2013 semester were much lower than previous semesters because staff forgot to conduct them. The counts used for spring 2013 were from the door counter and only reflect people entering the building. Circulation Manager Debbie Clark was out of town for a conference and the Circulation unit staff members forgot about the manual counting procedure in her absence.

During the fall 2013 semester, a change was made. Library Director Marna Hostetler was approached by Dr. Marcia Kiessling, Associate Provost for Student Affairs, who asked that more days of 2:00 a.m. closings be added to the library’s final exam schedule. Funding was to be provided by the Provost’s Office to cover the extra cost for student assistants to work the additional hours as well as money for off-duty Vanderburgh County Sheriff Department deputies to provide security.

Additional days were added starting on Monday, December 2 and continuing daily through Tuesday, December 17. The library increased the number of its 2:00 a.m. closings from 5 nights to 16. After discussion with staff about student needs on the last day of finals, the closing time on Wednesday, December 18 was extended from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in order to accommodate tests beginning that evening.

The experiment was successful. Dr. Kiessling again offered the funds to pay for the extra staffing so it was repeated in the spring 2014 semester, beginning Monday, April 21 and running through Tuesday, May 6. The hours were again staffed with student assistants and off-duty sheriff deputies.

Key Findings/Implications

- Building use for the extended hours was good, and the figures will be useful when considering library hours in future years.
Given that at no time during extended hours did the number of students in the building at closing exceed 50 – and was generally less than that – the library director believes that the building hours are adequate. Counts will continue to be monitored.

Faculty Assessment of Instruction

Throughout the 2013-14 academic year, the library collected feedback from faculty members who used its Instructional Services program by bringing their classes to the library for an instructional session or inviting a teaching librarian into their classrooms. One hundred and forty-eight classes were taught for sixty-one faculty members during the academic year. A total of 56 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 meet 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)
- Goal 2, Ensure the library’s support of the university’s mission with appropriate digital content, tools, and services (Objective 4)

The feedback was collected using an online form developed by Instructional Services Librarian Ashley Clark. 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 basic demographic information (date/time, name, class, and librarian’s name). Respondents were then asked two questions requiring set responses:

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

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

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

- Eighty percent of the faculty using the library’s Instructional Services during the 2013-14 academic year had used the service at least once before at the time they completed the feedback. Only 11 of the 56 responses came from faculty who had never used the service before at the time they completed the feedback form.

  *The library will consider ways to reach faculty who haven’t used its Instructional Services and encourage those that include research assignments in their courses to make use of the services.*

- One hundred per cent of the library instruction sessions were rated as Essential, Very Effective, or Effective by faculty.

  *Teaching librarians should analyze faculty feedback more closely to determine, if possible, what made the sessions Essential, Very Effective, or Effective.*

- In response to the question “What did you find most useful about the session,” faculty noted a wide range of topics, including:
  - Demonstrating how to find/use (specific) resources – 25
  - Librarian’s preparation / performance / efficiency / flexibility / enthusiasm / organization – 15
  - Tailoring the session to course goals/assignment – 8
  - Scope of the presentation – 8
  - Responding to students’ questions/needs / Individualized help / Follow-up help – 7
  - Search techniques – 7
  - Learning activities / Hands on / Interactivity – 5
  - EasyBib / Citation guides / Citation help – 4
  - Research Guides – 2
  - Handouts / Outlines – 1
  - Library website – 1
  - Interlibrary loan – 1
  - Primary sources – 1

- When asked, “Is there anything you would like to see covered that we missed,” most faculty offered no suggestions. Those who did, suggested the following:
  - Nothing to Suggest – 19
  - More practice /exercises – 5
  - Print Sources – 3
  - Demonstrating Databases – 1
  - Searching Techniques – 1

  *The teaching librarians may want to incorporate these topics when developing their lesson plans, but they will also want to consider the level of*
the class and the faculty’s stated learning outcomes. The teaching librarians should review former feedback from faculty to ensure that the needs of faculty members are being met when classes are brought to the library for instruction.

**Fines and Fees Assessment**

In July 2014 the library was approached by the USI internal auditors, Bradley Will and Bob Howell, about reviewing all of our fine and fees procedures. This was to be a fact-finding discussion to help them understand the process. A meeting was arranged with the following people asked to attend: Marna Hostetler, Director of the library; Debbie Clark, Circulation Manager; Janet Ruddell, Administration Accounting Assistant; and Kirsten Williams, Interlibrary Loan Senior Library Assistant. Note: Brad Reel, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, was on vacation.

We were asked to explain anything we do that involves money, billing, payments, and/or deposits. After the discussion they accompanied us to our work areas to see the actual computer processes, Illiad system, Voyager screens, payment methods, and any paper documents they had questions about. After this initial meeting and discussion, the internal auditors created a document with their interpretation of our procedures for us to review, revise, and complete some areas that were left blank. They made additional contacts via email or phone to ask a few more questions as they were developing the document.

From this document and discussion came a request for Debbie Clark to supply reports on the following for Fiscal Year 2013/2014:

- all fines that Voyager created with a description of what type of fine it was, who the fine belonged to with name and id number, item, date created, and amount
- all fines posted including payment method, who posted the payment, who had the fine with name and id number, and date posted
- all fines forgiven, fine type, who had the fine with name and id number, who forgave the fine, amount, and date forgiven
- all fines posted with the category “error”. This category is used for an item that wasn’t discharged correctly. This file listed who posted the error, amount posted, date, and who received the deduction with name and id number.

Debbie was also asked to supply screen shots that show how the fines were initially set up in the Administration module of Voyager. The following are what was printed and sent: individual overdue fees, processing fees, lost replacement fees, and damaged item fees for all the different item types we have. Another set of screen shots were made for them of the financial screens on the Checkout Libguide.

Another meeting was held on August 11, 2014 to review the draft document that the library received and to answer any final questions anyone had. The document included some graphs that the internal auditors had created from the payment, forgive, and payment reports data.

At this meeting, the topic of the drop in fine/fee revenue over the past several years was also discussed. We informed them of the national trend reflecting an overall drop in circulation figures and offered to give them a report on our circulation statistics. We talked about the addition of the laptops, Macbooks, and iPads. We
also informed them of the addition of automated email notices starting in the fall of 2007 as another reason for the drop in revenue. These include a “soon to be due” notice, day 1 overdue notice, day 7 and 14 overdue notices, which often result in an item being returned before a bill is even created.

1. A report was forwarded to the internal auditors showing the library circulation statistics from fiscal year 2007/2008 through 2013/2014 to show that usage of items has progressively decreased.
2. Dates for when the laptops, Macbooks, and iPads were added to the collection correspond with when the increase of the forgive postings began to grow.

Present for this meeting: Marna Hostetler, Debbie Clark, Brad Reel, Janet Ruddell, Bob Howell, and Bradley Will.

In the final draft of the report, the internal auditors made several recommendations. For each recommendation that was presented to the library - all of which were designed to decrease the library’s risk of fraud and errors - a version of the following statement was included:

“The absence of routine formal reviews and controls over the assessment, collection and waiver of library fines increases the risk that waivers are not applied in accordance with library policy and inconsistencies occur among library staff in the granting of waivers, and misappropriation of library fines could go undetected.”

Following are the recommendations that were given to the library from this assessment:

1. Revise the income report for the cash deposits. Implemented September 1, 2014.
2. Balance the cash drawer daily even if there is no income and to submit the income report to the Bursar’s office. Implemented September 1, 2014.
3. Run a report on forgiven fines and fees monthly to monitor usage of this category. Review the dollar amounts, which staff member is posting the forgiven amount, and reason posted. To be implemented by January 1, 2015.
4. Formalize the library fine/fee forgiveness policy and create a written document for staff and establish consistent usage procedures. To be implemented by January 1, 2015.
5. Implement a daily reconciliation of payments posted to Voyager compared to cash/check payment receipts, Eagle card receipts, and Bursar office payments. Implemented September 1, 2014.

In early September 2014, Marna Hostetler reviewed and approved the final report, which was then forwarded to Dr. Linda L. M. Bennett, President; Dr. Ronald Rochon, Provost; and Mark Rozewski, Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Key Findings/Implications

Because there were no routine, formal reviews of the assessment, collection, and waiver of library fines, there was opportunity for inconsistency in the application of waivers as well as misappropriation of library fines.

The Checkout unit has implemented several new procedures as a result of this assessment, including running regular reports on forgiven fines and fees; formalizing the library fine/fee forgiveness policy; and implementing a daily reconciliation of payments.
**General Collection Assessment**

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, the 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, the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) is an organization representing all 72 academic libraries in accredited, non-profit institutions of higher education in the state.

Soon after USI joined the project in late October 2013, a small team within Rice Library, consisting of Debbie Clark, Circulation; Dianne Grayson, Monographs Technical Services Librarian; Martha Niemeier, Collection Development Librarian; Rose Scruggs, Electronic Services Coordinator; and Marna Hostetler, Library Director, began meeting. The group participated in several webinars/conference calls focused on gathering data from individual library catalogs and submitting the information to SCS. For the purposes of this project, only circulating monographs were evaluated. Collected data points included circulation counts, publication year, date added to the collection, and number of electronic surrogates available in HathiTrust. USI’s data was submitted at the end of January 2014.

In February 2014, SCS began the holdings inventory of the 30 participating libraries to identify overlapping and unique resources. All 23 PALNI libraries and 7 ALI libraries participated in this study. The collection data were submitted electronically and the analysis was completed by SCS using their proprietary software, GreenGlass. The collections of participating libraries were compared against WorldCat, HathiTrust Digital Library, and the *Choice* Outstanding Academic Titles lists.

In the spring of 2014, the ALI Shared Print Policy Group met with SCS several times to review the compiled group data and to discuss various ways of defining “scarcely-held” materials. The group was chaired by Tina Baich, an Associate Librarian at IUPUI. Per Tina Baich’s email on March 17, “The Policy Group decided against formal retention commitments in light of the time and staff this would require. Instead, the Policy Group established an informal agreement that participating libraries will not weed any items classified as ‘scarcely-held’ at this time.”

For this project, the definition of a “scarcely-held” title-holding was:

- held by fewer than 4 libraries within the state of Indiana (exact edition) OR
- held by fewer than 20 libraries in the US (exact edition) OR
- NOT held by at least one of IU Bloomington, Purdue, or Notre Dame (exact edition)

This definition, when compared to the data, resulted in 1,702,592 title-holdings to be protected – or 33% of the shared collection - and 3,481,900 title-holdings available for withdrawal.

In other words, anything designated as “available for withdrawal” was:

- Held by 4 or more libraries in the state of Indiana OR
- Held by 20 or more libraries in the US OR
- Held by at least one of IU Bloomington, Purdue, or Notre Dame

To be absolutely clear, this definition was not designed to protect a copy of everything owned by the project participants at the time of the data pull. That idea was discussed by the Shared Print Policy Group and rejected early in the process.

Library-specific breakdowns for this definition of “scarcely-held” are given in Table A. These tallies represent title-holdings; tallies and lists of corresponding items will be larger:

**Table A**

**Number and Percentage of Titles to Be Protected/Available for Withdrawal, by Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Number of titles to be protected</th>
<th>Number of titles available for withdrawal</th>
<th>% of titles to be protected</th>
<th>All titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBS</td>
<td>40,216</td>
<td>43,810</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>84,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancilla</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>11,701</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>58,673</td>
<td>102,477</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>161,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>54,701</td>
<td>130,460</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>185,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>71,930</td>
<td>64,330</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>136,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>64,395</td>
<td>60,319</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>124,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw</td>
<td>87,626</td>
<td>195,168</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>282,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>51,767</td>
<td>146,819</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>198,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>24,217</td>
<td>61,042</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>85,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>24,399</td>
<td>74,873</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>99,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>46,685</td>
<td>60,662</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>107,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>36,605</td>
<td>123,586</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>160,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>31,386</td>
<td>54,966</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>86,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State</td>
<td>179,807</td>
<td>348,043</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>527,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Kokomo</td>
<td>22,149</td>
<td>84,113</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>106,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Northwest</td>
<td>40,455</td>
<td>109,160</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>149,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Southeast</td>
<td>30,631</td>
<td>87,734</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>118,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Dentistry</td>
<td>11,238</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Medical</td>
<td>41,112</td>
<td>13,977</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU Fort Wayne</td>
<td>48,058</td>
<td>140,039</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>188,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPUI</td>
<td>208,532</td>
<td>337,251</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>545,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>84,002</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>116,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland City</td>
<td>24,928</td>
<td>34,614</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Calumet</td>
<td>36,459</td>
<td>90,903</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>127,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Joseph's</td>
<td>17,939</td>
<td>60,985</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>78,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary's</td>
<td>41,512</td>
<td>108,231</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>149,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary-of-the-Woods</td>
<td>30,416</td>
<td>50,853</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>81,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Meinrad</td>
<td>59,250</td>
<td>79,458</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>138,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>45,651</td>
<td>80,568</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>126,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trine</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>15,099</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Indy</td>
<td>32,174</td>
<td>101,385</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>133,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Saint Francis</td>
<td>19,462</td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Indiana</td>
<td>55,610</td>
<td>134,247</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>189,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>58,616</td>
<td>151,890</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>210,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>42,888</td>
<td>149,624</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>192,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,702,592</td>
<td>3,481,900</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5,184,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that the collections of some institutions which are highlighted above show a significant percentage of their collections as “To Be Protected”. These are special libraries or seminaries, and the Policy Group is considering devising a different definition of “scarcely-held” for this group.

After the collection data analysis was complete, SCS loaded items designated as “available for withdrawal” into GreenGlass. Within GreenGlass, each library can create weeding scenarios using only titles that meet the requirements for possible withdrawal. Final lists can be exported from the GreenGlass system and libraries can weed at will.

Outside of GreenGlass, SCS generated lists of “scarcely-held” items for each library. No specific requirements have been set by ALI or PALNI with regard to what should be done with these titles. Certain “scarcely-held” items may be outdated directories, computer or nursing manuals, or Readers Digest condensed books, for example. For this project, if an item is deemed by the holding library to be inappropriate for the collection, ALI and PALNI do NOT require retention.

USI’s data from SCS was received in late June/early July 2014. Future plans entail sending the titles available for withdrawal – according to the parameters of the ALI/PALNI project – to each subject area liaison for review. Faculty members in each academic department will be given a chance to review withdrawal decisions, as well. Weeding may take place in summer 2016.

Key Findings/Implications:

**Total Record Counts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Records</td>
<td>191,266</td>
<td>205,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Records - Filtered</td>
<td>134,247</td>
<td>140,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Metrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Filtered Items</th>
<th>Percent of Filtered Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Records - Filtered</td>
<td>140,286</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero recorded uses</td>
<td>50,936</td>
<td>36.31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication prior to 2003</td>
<td>115,817</td>
<td>82.56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100 US holdings</td>
<td>136,242</td>
<td>97.12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than five US holdings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique in Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In HathiTrust</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>53.11 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134,247</td>
<td>140,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-General Works</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject | Titles | Items
-------|--------|--------
B-Philosophy, Psychology, Religion | 9,004 | 9,477
C-Auxiliary Sciences of History | 868 | 955
D-World History | 8,118 | 8,594
E-History of the Americas | 6,644 | 7,402
F-History of the Americas | 2,939 | 3,085
G-Geography, Anthropology, Recreation | 4,671 | 4,774
H-Social Sciences | 25,003 | 25,644
J-Political Science | 4,191 | 4,364
K-Law | 2,693 | 2,884
L-Education | 9,101 | 9,303
M-Music | 1,922 | 1,985
N-Fine Arts | 3,864 | 4,054
P-Language and Literature | 25,875 | 27,119
Q-Science | 14,248 | 14,895
R-Medicine | 5,490 | 5,612
S-Agriculture | 1,029 | 1,054
T-Technology | 5,100 | 5,311
U-Military Science | 1,062 | 1,145
V-Naval Science | 142 | 144
Z-Bibliography, Library Science | 2,031 | 2,090

*The analysis provided by Sustainable Collection Services (SCS) shows that over a third of Rice Library’s circulating collection has never been checked out and its general collection is aging. Collection strengths are in Social Sciences, Languages and Literature, and Science.*

*The general collection has never undergone a coordinated weeding. A review of the SCS figures make it clear that there are subject areas that will benefit from a cull and subsequent updating with more current titles.*

This project advances the library’s strategic plan in several areas:

**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.
  - Continue to evaluate the library’s material resources to provide quality collections in a variety of formats to meet the changing needs of academic programs.
  - Continue the well-established trend of moving from print to electronic resources.

Once deselection is complete, subject liaisons will focus on updating their collection areas, and many of these purchases will likely be electronic books.

**Goal #6: Enhance library spaces to meet changing needs.**
- Maintain and adapt facilities to meet the changing needs of users and staff.

Again, once the weed and subsequent shift is complete, the library will most likely find that space that is currently used to house collections will be available for new group study space, individual study space, open collaboration areas, or space to house an on-campus partner.

**General Comments on Rice Library**

Once a month for the period February-May 2014, Library Director Marna Hostetler responded, via the library’s blog, to ideas/questions left in the library’s suggestion box. Although the suggestion box was first placed at the library’s Checkout Counter in January 2014, and was checked frequently, suggestions were only offered February through May.

In two instances, the ideas/requests dealt with areas over which the library has no control – better toilet paper and flying cars. Other suggestions or comments and the ways in which they were addressed were as follows:

- Two dealt with requests for longer hours (one of these came in through LibWeb). In both instances, Hostetler cited her concerns about safety, since use of the library during extended hours did not seem to support this request.
- Responding to a suggestion about non-European cartography, Collection Development Librarian Martha Niemeier created an extensive pathfinder on this topic.
- A request for more children’s books was addressed with a list of the awards for which the library purchases the winners and an acknowledgement of how the lack of funds limits its ability to purchase more.
- Other requests:
  - More study rooms
  - Video cameras for students to borrow. This issue is perhaps best addressed not by the library but by other campus service points, and Hostetler passed this suggestion on. She did suggest that the student could use the video feature on the library’s iPads.
  - Coat hooks for the desks in the library, for people to hang coats and hats. This suggestion was investigated by Hostetler, but an appropriate model was not found that was both sturdy and worked with existing furniture.
  - A report by the mother of a dyslexic son not getting adequate assistance. There were inadequate details for Hostetler to address this issue, other than to say that the library prides itself on good service and hope to have the opportunity to prove this in the future.
  - A request for background music. Hostetler reminded the student that we have headphones that can be checked out, and that not everyone can work or concentrate with background music.
  - A suggestion about stand-up desks. The suggestion was investigated by Hostetler, but it was decided to be cost-prohibitive at this time.

**Key Findings/Implications**

- Although few suggestions were submitted, the ones the library received were varied, ranging from obviously playful to a serious complaint, with actual requests for new services and furniture in between.
The low number of suggestions is a concern, but the suggestion box is a way for library patrons to submit ideas anonymously, an important feature. More time with this method of assessment is needed, and it might be possible to highlight periodically the suggestion box’s presence through the library’s social media accounts to boost awareness.

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

Once again in 2013 the university’s Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA) issued its annual survey to USI faculty, administrators, and support staff during the first two weeks of the fall semester. The survey was comprised of questions submitted by a number of units and offices across campus, including some contributed by Rice Library.

As in the past, the purpose of the library’s questions in the OPRA survey was to determine interest in, use of, or satisfaction with the university’s Library Services. The library’s questions focused on two areas, including the use of and satisfaction with selected resources and services and users’ preferred methods of communication. Additionally, respondents were given an opportunity to provide suggestions for improving Rice Library’s services and/or programming.

This survey 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). The findings presented below, however, are based on all respondents.

**Key Findings/Implications**

Respondents were asked to identify the three most frequently used Rice Library resources or services.

- Overall, those responding selected:
  - Databases (37.3%)
  - Interlibrary Loan (23.2%)
  - Electronic Books and Journals (20.5%)
- The three least frequently used resources or services overall were:
  - Purchase Recommendation Service (4.1%)
  - Distance Learning Services (6.1%)
  - University Archives & Special Collections (7.5%)
- The top resource/service identified by each respondent group was:
  - Faculty – Databases (60.6%)
  - Administrators – Databases (22.8%)
  - Support Staff – Print Books and Journals (20.8%)
- The percentage of those who self-identified as non-users of library resources and services varied widely by respondent group.
Overall (34.3%)
Faculty (12.0%)
Administrators (48.1%)
Support Staff (50.9%)

Based on the findings above, faculty, administrators, and staff seem to view the library as a “content” resource more than a service provider.

The library should investigate ways of advertising and promoting the resources and services identified as “least used” to these patron groups as a way of increasing awareness and use.

Respondents were then asked to rate their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with selected library resources, services, facilities, and personnel. Responses were gathered on the use of and satisfaction with eight resources and services. Data for four of those resources and services (Electronic books, Interlibrary Loan, Course Reserves, and Materials Supporting Student Research) had also been collected in 2012 and were compared with the 2013 results (see Table B below).

Table B: How Satisfied Are You with the Following Rice Library Resources and Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied / Dissatisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Users</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Research Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Supporting Faculty Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Supporting Student Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Library Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Library Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Users</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall, users of all of these resources and services were significantly more satisfied than dissatisfied.
- Overall, satisfaction ranged from a high of 95.4% (Rice Library Staff) to a low of 45.9% (Materials Supporting Faculty Research).
• Although the percentage of electronic book users among total respondents has gone up significantly from 2012 to 2013 (42.0% → 58.1%), the level of satisfaction among these users has gone down slightly (92.3% → 88.3%).
• The level of satisfaction with the library’s interlibrary loan services among users continues to remain very high (99.5%, 2013). Perhaps what is even more revealing is that the percentage of respondents using this service has grown from 50.9% in 2012 to 71.1% in 2013, and that the percentage of those users being “Satisfied or Very satisfied” with the service grew from 49.5% to 70.7% in the same time period.
• Of the total number of respondents to the survey, 174 (62.6%) identified themselves as users of Rice Library’s Instructional Services, and 166 (95.4%) of those users reported being either satisfied or very satisfied with the service.
• Awareness of, use of, and satisfaction with the library’s course reserves service has increased significantly from 2012 to 2013.
• The level of satisfaction among the respondents who identified themselves as users of materials supporting faculty research is nearly 79%.
• The level of satisfaction with the library’s materials supporting student research among respondents who identified themselves as users of these materials has stayed about the same from 2012 (89.8%) to 2013 (88.1%).
• Very few respondents reported “not using” or “not aware of” Rice Library’s facilities (5%) or staff (3.9%). Among users, there was a very high level of satisfaction with both: Rice Library Facility (99.6%), Rice Library Staff (99.3%).

Declining percentages between 2012 and 2013 of “not used” and “not aware of” responses overall in four areas (Electronic Books, Interlibrary Loan, Course Reserves, and Materials Supporting Student Research) may indicate that efforts to promote these resources and services are being met with some degree of success.

Respondents were asked to choose their preferred methods of communication for getting information about Rice Library.

• Overall, the three most preferred methods of communication were:
  Direct communication (e-mail, telephone, face-to-face) - 57.1%
  Rice Library Web pages - 41.7%
  USI Today Newsletter - 24.9%
• Overall, the three least preferred methods of communication were:
  The University’s closed circuit television system (Symon) - 2.5%
  Rice Library Information Wall - 2.5%
  Kiosk in Rice Library lobby - 3.9%
• The most preferred method of communication identified by each respondent group was:
  Faculty: Direct communication (e-mail, telephone, face-to-face) - 73.1%
  Administrators: Direct communication - 47.8%
  Support Staff: Direct communication - 44.7%
Rice Library’s future efforts to advertise and promote its resources and services to faculty, administrators, and staff should take into account their preferred methods of communication.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide any additional suggestions for improving Rice Library’s services or programming.

- The largest number of respondents to this question (37) offered no suggestions for improvement. Additional suggestions were:

  Add new, updated journals and materials (28)
  Provide easier access for databases and journals (18)
  Provide extended Hours, 24-7 access (7)

The suggestions offered by faculty, administrators, and staff for improvement of the university’s Library Services are welcomed and must be seriously considered by library personnel as it faces the future.

**General Library Survey: Students (Senior)**

Once again this year the university’s Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA) surveyed senior students during the fall Assessment Day which was scheduled for September 17, 2013. 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 2013 survey included three questions related to Library Services. These questions focused on: a.) user satisfaction with selected library resources and services, and b.) preferred methods of communication for getting Rice Library information. There was also an open-ended prompt, allowing respondents to provide additional suggestions for the library. The purpose of the questions was to determine the students’ use of, satisfaction with, preference for, and suggestions to the university’s Library Services.

The questions aligned with selected goal statements from the *David L. Rice Library Strategic Plan, 2011-2016* including:

- 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 students were first asked to report their use of and level of satisfaction with eight selected library resources and services. The data collected are summarized in the table below. Data for three of those resources and services (Electronic Books, Interlibrary Loan, and Materials Supporting Student Research) were also collected in 2012 and compared with the 2013 results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Dissatisfied</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Supporting Student Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>604</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library iPads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>528</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkout Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Very Satisfied / Satisfied</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Used / Not Aware Of</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>582</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall students using each of the eight library resources and services were significantly more satisfied than dissatisfied.

- The two-year comparison for three resources and services (Electronic Books, Interlibrary Loan, and Materials Supporting Student Research) indicated only a slight drop in satisfaction among users.

- The satisfaction rate among users for Library Printing (85.0%) was the only service with less than a 95.0% satisfaction rate.

- All but two of the resources and services (Interlibrary Loan and Library iPads) were used by over 60% of those responding to the survey.

In spite of the encouraging survey results, the library needs to continue the promotion of all of its key resources and services to students as a way of maintaining the high level of satisfaction. Such promotion may take many forms, including library instruction, reference interactions, website announcements, etc. Foremost among such promotions could be the availability of iPads to all student users and interlibrary loan services, particularly to upper class students.
Along with the university’s Instructional Technology Services, the library needs to investigate possibilities for upgrading or improving its printers and printing service.

Secondly, the senior students were asked to choose their preferred methods of communication for getting information about Rice Library.

- The three most preferred methods of communication were:
  - Rice Library Web pages (49.8%)
  - Direct communication (e-mail, telephone, face-to-face) (37.2%)
  - Rice Library announcement on MyUSI (23.9%)

- The three least preferred methods of communication were:
  - Rice Library workshops/presentations (2.9%)
  - Communication via University’s closed circuit television (Symon) (5.3%)
  - Kiosk in Rice Library lobby (9.0%)

Rice Library’s future efforts to promote and advertise its 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 sixty students provided some kind of response, and occasionally individual responses included suggestions related to multiple topics or categories.

- Nineteen students, or 11.9% of those responding to this prompt, expressed general satisfaction with the university’s Library Services. Forty-one, or 25.6% those responding, stated that they had no suggestions to offer. Taken together, these two categories of responses represent favorable responses from more than a third (37.5%) of those responding to the prompt.

- Other major categories of suggestions included:
  - Extended Hours (27)
  - Printing (18) – Mostly related to cost
  - Group Study Rooms (13) – Availability, Enforcement of group policy, Noise level, etc.
  - Equipment (11) – Age, performance, circulation policies for iPads, etc.

Rice Library will want to continue to consider the possibility and investigate ways of meeting the unmet needs expressed by the students’ most frequent suggestions.

Social Media Effectiveness

From June 2013 through July 2014, Rice Library kept track of usage statistics through its social media presence, including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and a Wordpress blog. Starting in the spring semester, Rice Library hired a Social Media Student Intern to increase posts and engagement based on the results of the previous year’s assessment of social media.

The library relies on the social media sites to promote its posts; this past year Facebook changed its
algorithm of who sees posts to a ‘company page’. Facebook decreased the number of people who see a post from a page to at most 3% of total page likes. The statistics are provided by the social media websites and the statistics that each website provides vary in depth.

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 interactions through these media and how many people the library reaches through these channels.

This analysis aligned with Goal 1 Objective 1 from the library’s strategic plan. Goal 1 is to “Improve the Library User’s Experience,” and Objective 1 states, “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.”

The statistics analyze how many fans each social media website has, how many shares/retweets/repins the library’s posts receive, how many favorites/likes the posts receive and the virality of each post. At the end of July 2013, the library’s social media followers were:

- Twitter - 441, up 113% from 2012
- Facebook - 934, up 8% from 2012
- Pinterest - 787, up 45% from 2012
- Instagram - 350, up 178% from 2012
- The blog had a total of 2,408 views for the 2013-2014 year, which is significantly less than the data recorded from the previous year

Key Findings/Implications

The average number of Retweets on Twitter per week was 4.
The average number of Mentions on Twitter per week was 5.
2,240 of the library’s photos were ‘favorited’ on Instagram from June 2013 through July 2014.
The average daily number of people talking about the library on Facebook was 22.
The average daily total reach on Facebook was 310.
The blog had a total of 9 comments in the year.
Some Social Media Websites have fewer interactions, such as Pinterest and the Let’s Talk Library Blog.

- The library should post more often to achieve engagement, especially in the summer months.
- The library should continue efforts to market through Twitter and Instagram.
- The library should continue to focus growth on Twitter and Instagram, as these social media sites are the most popular with students. The
number of retweets has increased while mentions have decreased. This exchange is beneficial: retweets further spread the brand while mentions stay dormant since they are only seen by those within the conversation.

- The library should look into ways to more effectively market the Let’s Talk Library Blog to increase the total number of views and also increase the number of comments on the blog.
- The library should analyze its most impactful posts on each social media forum.

**Student Assessment of Instruction**

Throughout the fall and spring semesters of the 2013-14 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 1,211 times by four instructional librarians (Ashley Clark, Jennifer Greene, Philip Orr, and Brad Reel). As a means of improving instruction, the threefold purpose of this assessment was: a.) To assess what was learned, b.) To determine further needs, and 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 online feedback form was revised by Reference and Instruction Librarian, Ashley Clark. The form was typically presented at the end of the instructional session, and students were allowed time to complete the form before being dismissed.

The feedback 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 required students to record their comfort level for doing 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 three 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
Key Findings/Implications

- Feedback was collected from 53% of students that came in for library instruction.

One drawback to this form of assessment is that not every class receives the survey, especially if a class is working successfully on their own research at the end of the class, librarians are hesitant to interrupt them or they run out of time. Librarians should be encouraged to have students fill out the assessment form as well as incorporate additional assessment activities into their classes.

- Of the 1,211 responses received from the feedback, 57% were from freshmen, 22% from sophomores, 12% from juniors, and 9% from seniors.

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

- 61.7% of the students completing the feedback form reported that the library instruction session was the first in which they had participated; 24.5% second, 7.6% third, 5.1% fourth, and 1.1% reported participating in five or more sessions.
- Approximately 80.67% of all students completing the feedback form reported moving at least one positive level in their comfort following the library instruction session (e.g. I am Lost to Somewhat Comfortable, Comfortable to Very Comfortable, etc.).
- Nineteen percent of students completing the feedback form reported no change from their initial comfort level following the instructional session.
- It should be noted that 2 students (0.3%) reported a regression in their comfort level following the instruction.
- In response to the question “I know where to go to get started on my research”, 94.47% of students agreed with this statement, 0.67% disagreed with this statement, 0.02% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 4.61% were unsure.
- In response to the question “The activities (if used) helped me understand the concept being taught,” 88.1% of students agreed with this statement, 1.1% disagreed with this statement, 2% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 8.8% were unsure.
- In response to the question “My instructor was knowledgeable and engaging,” 94.2% of students agreed with this statement, 0.84% disagreed with this statement, 0.03% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 4.61% were unsure.
- In response to the question “Overall, I learned many things from this session,” 88.68% of students agreed with this statement, 1.68% disagreed with this statement, 1% said that this statement does not apply to them, and 8.63% were unsure.
- In response to the open-ended prompt, “Name one thing you learned or found interesting what will help you with your research,” 932 students provided comments.

The library's Instructional Services unit should consider what students found helpful about the session and incorporate the information in future sessions.

- In response to the open-ended prompt, “Name one thing you are still confused about after today’s session,” 485 students provided comments.
The library’s Instructional Services unit should investigate what students are confused about after the session and incorporate the information in future sessions and look into ways to explain the information in a clearer way. 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 needs to market its services more widely since students generally have a positive reaction to their library instruction sessions.

**Conclusion**

The second 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 they received from their colleagues within the library and across campus. Armed with the knowledge gained this year, the team will continue its efforts to improve the university’s Library Services for the entire USI community.
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Library assessment is a tool which assists an institution in defining its goals using evaluative and quantitative methods for analysis of their services, resources, facilities, staff, and technology. These analyses not only help define goals but also identify areas for improvement.

Because library assessment is a dynamic process which incorporates the gathering of information about how a library works and what can be done to continue a certain level of service, it is a necessary tool for an institution to remain relevant in the academic environment.

Library Assessment Committee

History of the Committee:

Under the leadership of Library Director Ruth Miller, the staff of the David L. Rice Library began to work on the library's first strategic plan during the fall 2009 semester. The plan was implemented in mid-2011 and covered the period from 2011 to 2016. Assessment, evaluation, and measurement were major themes running throughout the entire document. However, Goal #4 --Encourage and support a culture of evaluation and assessment-- was specifically related to these important activities. One of the activities detailed to fulfill this goal was to “Create a standing library committee devoted to assessment and charged with the development of an on-going assessment plan for Rice Library.”

During the April 2012 Librarians’ Council meeting, Interim Director Martha Niemeier created the committee. Those volunteering to serve were Debbie Clark, Martha Niemeier, Philip Orr, Rose Scruggs, Nicole Tekulve, and Peter Whiting. Orr was asked to serve as chair. Later that month, the committee began meeting one to two times a month throughout the following summer and into the fall. In October when Marna Hostetler became the library’s new director, she joined the committee. By the beginning of spring 2013 semester, the library’s first assessment plan was finalized. The committee’s first report was completed in June 2014.

Purpose of the Committee:

The objective of the David L. Rice Library Assessment Committee is to guide and report on the use of assessment as a means of supporting the library’s mission. To achieve this objective the committee will seek to fulfill the following charges:

- Encourage and promote a culture of assessment.
- Gather planned assessment activities and integrate into a single document.
- Serve as a resource for those conducting assessment activities.
- Record the results of assessment activities.
- Contribute to university-wide assessment efforts.

2013-2014 Committee Members: Philip Orr – Chair, Distance Learning Librarian; Ashley Clark – Reference and Instruction Librarian; Debbie Clark – Checkout/Circulation Manager; Marna Hostetler – Director of the Library; and Peter Whiting – Serials Technical Services Librarian.
Appendix B:

Library Assessment Plan 2013-2014

Introduction

Building upon the foundation laid in FY13, Rice Library is continuing its commitment to improve the university’s Library Services through formal assessment. Once again a committee made up of library personnel has developed a manageable plan to assess several aspects of the library, including facilities, personnel, resources, services, and technology. Although this year’s committee was slightly smaller than last year, it has worked hard in drafting this plan, never losing sight of its stated objective “to guide and report on the use of assessment as a means of supporting the library’s mission.” Committee members for FY14 are:

Debbie Clark – Secretary, Checkout/Circulation Manager
Ashley Clark – Reference/Instructional Services Librarian
Marna Hostetler – Administration/Director of the Library
Philip Orr – Chair, Reference/Distance Learning Librarian
Peter Whiting – Technical Services/Serials Technical Services Librarian

In developing the attached plan, the Assessment Committee sought input from the library’s professional librarians and senior staff. The plan itself includes eight projects. Five of these represent a continuation or repetition of assessment efforts begun in FY13, while three are new.

Again this year the library will contribute a series of questions to and receive data from two annual surveys distributed by the university’s Office of Planning, Research, and Assessment (OPRA). The first of these surveys will seek feedback from faculty, staff, and administrators, and the second from senior students. Two additional projects being continued from FY13 involve the library’s efforts to collect and analyze feedback from students and faculty participating in its Instructional Services program. While the Social Media Effectiveness project was begun last year, it has been revised slightly to include an analysis of data collected from the OPRA student surveys as well as use statistics available from the various social media websites.

New projects include a collaborative effort with other Indiana academic libraries to assess the strengths and weaknesses of circulating monograph collections and to compare the findings among the participating institutions. A second new project involves anonymously collecting feedback from library users through comment boxes. Finally, because the request from some students for longer library hours has been persistent in recent years, the library plans to examine head counts and/or gate counts during the extended hours provided during final exams.

Although Rice Library’s Assessment Plan for FY14 is modest in size, the committee believes it better to keep the plan scalable, completing the actual projects planned. Furthermore, we are committed to more than just gathering data but rather acting upon the assessment activities to actually improve library services.
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Goals

1. **Enhance Experiential Learning Opportunities**

   **Key Strategies**
   
   - Promote and more fully integrate community and global experience in the academic curriculum
   - Increase internships, coop, study abroad, and community engagement
   - Accurately track and measure the experiences of students

2. **Increase the Graduation Rate**

   **Key Strategies**
   
   - Provide consistent, effective advising across campus to increase accountability and ensure students are on track to graduate
   - Provide more flexible ways to gain a degree
   - Develop an effective framework for student recruitment and retention
   - Increase on-campus job opportunities for students who need financial assistance

3. **Preserve & Nurture the Campus Community**

   **Key Strategies**
   
   - Support the health, well-being, and quality of life of our campus community
   - Build connections across campus, the buildings, and disciplines
   - Provide ongoing development for faculty, staff, and students

4. **Provide Leadership to Indiana and the Region**

   **Key Strategies**
   
   - Supply collaborative expertise and applied research for issues impacting the region
   - Make it easier for people to engage with our resources and/or capabilities
   - Elevate our visibility to a level more appropriate to the University's accomplishments and impact in higher education and on the economy

5. **Increase Diversity of Faculty, Staff and Student Body**

   **Key Strategies**
   
   - Develop activities and experiences that promote diversity as a value
• Enhance support networks for faculty, staff, and students of diverse backgrounds, including first-generation status
• Provide international programming for faculty and students

6. **Become a 24/7 Campus**

**Key Strategies**

• Engage students in the process of developing a "full-time" campus
• Identify and facilitate activities, spaces, programs, and services to offer during nontraditional hours
• Encourage students to be deliberate in their co-curricular activities