Agenda:

- Greg Youngen and Diane Schmidt
  Biology Library Planning Survey (Nov. & Dec. 2009)
  [http://www.library.illinois.edu/export/nsm/biology/Biology_Library_User_Survey.pdf](http://www.library.illinois.edu/export/nsm/biology/Biology_Library_User_Survey.pdf)

- JoAnn Jacoby
  Literatures and Languages Planning Survey (Nov. 2009)
  [http://www.library.illinois.edu/export/nsm/lit/planning_team/litsurvey.html](http://www.library.illinois.edu/export/nsm/lit/planning_team/litsurvey.html)

- Sue Searing
  Follow-up assessment one year after closure of the LIS Library

  For historical background, see the LIS Library Service Survey – Fall 2008

JoAnn Jacoby opened the meeting and gave an overview of other survey and focus groups conducted by NSM Teams:

- International and Area Studies - User Survey

- Health Information – Core and Emerging Areas of Study and Research
  [http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/health/Core_and_emerging_areas_11-7-09.pdf](http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/health/Core_and_emerging_areas_11-7-09.pdf)

- College of Media and Department of Communication- Focus Group
  [http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/comm_lis/Media_Faculty_Focus_Group.pdf](http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/comm_lis/Media_Faculty_Focus_Group.pdf)

- Government Information Services - Focus Group
  [http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/govinfo/GovInfoFocusGroupReport.pdf](http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/govinfo/GovInfoFocusGroupReport.pdf)

**Biological and life sciences planning survey (Diane Schmidt and Greg Youngen)**

1. **Greg Youngen discussed survey methodology:**

   - The survey ran from Nov-Dec 2009
   - Used WebTools for creating online surveys:
     [http://publicaffairs.illinois.edu/marketing/web/webtools.html](http://publicaffairs.illinois.edu/marketing/web/webtools.html)
   - Based questions on the LIS survey, tailored to Life Sciences concerns. Arranged a team subgroup to develop questions.
   - IRB process: all University surveys must comply –
IRB has exemption clause that applies to many surveys and other non-experimental studies, but requires an application process. Application includes sample survey and informed consent form.
- Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) modules – ethics training (4 modules, about an hour each). Covers research with human subjects & informed consent.
- Should have the principle investigator go through this process, and be the contact person for the whole team.

**IRB recommendations:**
- Statement that study involved research (potential for publishing results)
- Include name/affiliation as person conducting research
- State that findings could be included in publication
- Include note to print copy of consent for personal records.

### 2.) Diane Schmidt discussed survey findings

- First decided which groups to target (undergrad, grads, faculty) Two schools of biology (IB/MCB) are always identified target groups. Geographic dispersion of users is an issue.
- Used LIS Planning Survey as a starting point with some customization
- Asked for dept. affiliation, rank, what buildings on campus they use (important)
- Gave an overview of questions; relating to library services in physical and virtual libraries. Asked about desired additional services.
- Asked about other libraries used (included Biotech Info Center and Health Info Portal to answer questions for Health Team)
- Asked about data management/analysis – informatics in life sciences. Wanted to know the general subject area this applied to. Respondents do want training on statistics and informatics tools, this will require new skills for librarians.
- Finding in many responses that marketing of current services is an important issue.
- Good response rate from undergrads - 13%. Reaching out to them was difficult, only contacted them through a list – could not distribute flyers or link to library webpage.
- Services: print resources were among the most important. Also student space. Desired services: showed some confusion about what is currently offered (e.g. book/document delivery).
- Ebooks: high percentage said library should have them.
- Does not think they reached the full extent of their patrons, it was distributed by librarians, and have no way to be sure that other departments distributed it as widely. However, they did get good response from core Life Sciences groups.

### Questions:

Regarding interest in services related to statistics that are available elsewhere on campus:
Would it be worthwhile to integrate those into areas managed by the library?
- Yes, something we should look at more. Respondents are not currently thinking of library as capable of those non-traditional services.
JoAnn – a search is open for Life Sciences data services position. Wonders if candidate’s skills match these service areas, and if this is possible to develop.

The job description was not written with this in mind, though there may be ways to work with this person.

Question about e-books: ambiguity and perceptions of question of the issues changed within a year of developing the survey. Since then they’ve gone ahead with purchasing e-titles.

**JoAnn Jacoby – Overview of Literatures Planning Survey.**

- Used LIS Planning survey as a starting point in developing the survey, but modified to focus to look at bringing together interrelated services and collections in the Main Library
- Team was charged to investigate existing and emerging information needs in literatures and linguistics. Needed to check existing assumptions, invite feedback, and make sure they have a broad-based response.
- Miles Efron & JoAnn developed the survey and pre-tested with the rest of the team.
- 45% of the respondents were faculty, 39% grads, 13% undergrads. Total of 81 respondents. Estimated response rate for faculty in Germanic Languages was 33% (3 of 9) and 20% for English faculty (12 of 61).
- Asked what libraries used:
  - Main, English, Undergrad, HPNL, Modern Languages and Rare Books were among top choices.
- How often do they visit libraries in person?
  - Highest response for “rarely if ever visit these libraries in person,” but many visit occasionally (less than weekly or monthly). In person usage is declining.
  - Based on what I’ve heard in conversations with faculty and grad students, they visit intensively at certain times of the semester or research cycle (preparing for new class, starting a new research project, etc.)
- What is preferred mode of access?
  - For journals online access is strongly preferred (70-80%)
  - For books and reference works, about half prefer to browse print. The remainder prefer campus mail delivery or online access
- Asked about impact of digital text on research/study/teaching.
  - Almost all of the respondents indicate digital resources have had an impact.
  - There is some distrust: don’t trust Google, will have “no choice” but to access texts electronically.
  - Appreciate the affordances: convenient access to online material, can compare old editions, hard to find texts, heavily used texts that might be checked out in print, can more easily locate specific passages
  - Discovery of new sources, especially when combined with full text access.
  - New types of questions, can work across a larger corpus more efficiently
  - Physical and digital are complementary resources.
- Main question: if MLA/English services were combined, how would this affect services?
Most were unsure or neutral.
Remainder were evenly split between this would make things easier and this would make things more difficult.

- Maintaining access to subject specialists was important, as was having print collections in the Main Library. Also saw the advantage to having multiple subject specialists collocated.
- Subject specialists were seen to be important for training in research methods, facilitating access to databases and materials in other institutions/ILL.
- People want comfortable spaces to work (and coffee!), easier access and a better working environment in the Stacks, more evening and weekend hours. Also tools for digital scholarship, geospatial analysis, and LC classification to facilitate browsing.

Sue Searing: Follow-up assessment one year after closure of the LIS Library

- Conducted survey about the LIS library in 2008. Respondents were mainly LIS students and faculty. 2/3 students, the rest faculty and staff.
- Respondents reported heavier virtual use of services. Library staff were the only ones to report using physical services more.
- What users value about virtual services:
  - Students value access to databases, e-content, guides, etc.
  - Faculty – access to new book list
- Physical services: What do people value that we can replicate/compensate for?
  - Browsing
  - Environment,
  - Access to people
  - Symbolic meaning, a place for the college (esp. for LEEP students)
- Taking this in mind, they developed a new service model:
  - Embedded services to stay close to users & retain personal connection
  - Maintained same offices in Main
  - In virtual library – built on strengths identified in survey. (Easy Search, browsable content, news feature, etc.)
- In evaluating impact of the closure: “is new model better?” is the wrong question, but rather “how is it working (or not working), for whom, and how can it be improved?”
- New survey: only faculty/staff at GSLIS. These are the people living through the transition – students starting this year only know the new model. Got IRB approval.
- Discussed new books list, how people stay aware of new publications (36% don’t try). Of those who use the list, most people just go to the website (rather than RSS or web app.)
- Asked how people identify new publications generally: rss/alert services/blogs & colleagues (invisible college)
- Asked how people get to the books: retrieve it myself, request delivery, or look for online copy. These responses were fairly equivalent.
- Not much contacting librarians or use of office hours.
Asked if they should hold hours at Main Library for better exposure, majority said no.

Primary reason for not using office hours was because they did not need to, or because they preferred a different mode of contact.

- Asked about benefits of current service model (open question):
  - Biggest response was more content, better access to online materials, access to experts, or no benefits.

- Asked about drawbacks, responses included no print browsing/physical collection is not together. Also received responses identifying no drawbacks

- Next steps: Analyze and compare by group, share more broadly, and use to develop service enhancements. Decide how often to repeat this?

Questions:

JoAnn – Looking forward to seeing a student survey, as incoming students will have a different set of expectations since the new model is the only one they’ve known.