



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What is UX?

The term “User Experience” (UX) originally emerged from the web usability and application interface design community. Over the past few years, other service-oriented industries, such as the marketing and retail services community, have adopted the term as a holistic approach to describe designing the ideal customer experience. More recently, innovators have applied the design of such experiences to libraries. As Aaron Schmidt points out in his *Library Journal* column about the user experience, a goal for UX design is to minimize “pain” points throughout library processes, whether they are physical (library facilities, for example) or digital experiences (Schmidt, 2010). Furthermore, user experience as applied to the research library includes both the traditional customer service approach of reacting to user concerns, as well as proactively including users in the library design and strategic planning process by employing a variety of means, including focus groups and advisory boards.

A review of the literature suggests that there is a lack of controlled vocabulary when defining user experience within the library context. This is a relatively new field with little standardization, especially in academic or library environments. As a result, and as the data from this survey demonstrates, user experience is interpreted to include a wide range of activities in library organizations, including but not limited to assessment, user engagement, library design, outreach, and marketing. As Knemeyer writes in “Defining Experience,” *everything* a company produces should be viewed through the lens of the user’s experience (2008). Therefore, every part of the organization has a stake in improving that experience. Research libraries

are beginning to adopt this integrative design approach and develop unique organizational structures to manage the user experience.

The Survey

The purpose of this survey was to explore recent and planned user experience activities at ARL member libraries and the impact these efforts have on helping the libraries transform to meet evolving user needs. The survey elicited examples of successful user experience activities to serve as benchmarks for libraries looking to create or expand efforts in this area. It also explored whether libraries have created positions or entire departments focused on user engagement and the user experience. The survey was conducted between February 7 and March 4, 2011. Seventy-one of the 126 ARL member libraries completed the survey for a response rate of 56%.

User Experience Projects/Feedback Opportunities

All but one of the survey respondents indicated that they engaged in at least one user experience project or activity over the past three years. Most of these past activities were both project-based and on-going. Almost all of the respondents report they plan to engage in at least one user experience activity in the coming year. As with the past UX activities, a large majority indicated that future activities would also be both on-going and project-based. Below are some examples of future activities:

- Our metadata and collections units are developing a User Experience Team to develop usability assessment and evaluation tools as well as run focus groups with various

campus groups (students and faculty) to better understand user needs and information seeking behaviors as discovery systems and collections continue to be amalgamated, redesigned, and/or acquired.

- Strategic planning, website usability, and OPAC usability testing.
- We plan an observational study of our library spaces in the spring of 2011, and an ethnographic study of how scholarly methods are changing due to new technologies and formats, also in Spring 2011.
- We will be starting a summer study of how researchers do their scholarly work, with a special emphasis on data management needs.

The survey asked respondents to select up to two user experience activities the library had recently undertaken that had the biggest impact or were most innovative. They were then asked a set of questions about those activities. They described 121 different activities. Many respondents reported on activities to solicit user input related to building renovation and redesign. Other UX projects included assessing the OPAC, user input regarding access to electronic resources, and general website usability.

Respondents were asked to describe techniques and tools they used to gather user input. The most frequently mentioned tool was surveys. The simplest were homegrown instruments that were printed and distributed in libraries or that were created using web survey sites. The most commonly mentioned survey tool was LibQUAL+® or a variant such as LibQUAL+® Lite. Many respondents indicated they regularly use LibQUAL+® every two to three years, creating a set of longitudinal data. A number of respondents also noted that they employ LibQUAL+® to identify broad areas of user concern and then utilize focus groups or targeted surveys to further understand those areas of concern.

Combined, the passive techniques of gathering anecdotal user comments or suggestions received physically or online were the second most frequently mentioned form of user input. Nearly two-thirds of the examples cited by respondents incorporated this

type of feedback at some point in the data collection process.

Half of the UX activities used focus groups and a third employed some form of usability testing. The latter technique was used primarily for redesigning websites. As might be expected, more labor intensive techniques, such as individual interviews and observations, were not cited as frequently; their use was noted in ten and five per cent of the responses, respectively.

For approximately half of the examples, respondents used a combination of both open recruitment and direct invitations to solicit participants for feedback. A fourth used open recruitment only and the other fourth used direct invitation only. The survey data indicates that libraries used a variety of techniques to recruit participants. The most frequently mentioned example was e-mail, closely followed by an invitation on the library's web page or personal contact from a library employee. More than half of the respondents used all three of these approaches. Around a quarter of the respondents used social media tools, and a like number used in-house media, such as a library newsletter, in their recruitment. Libraries planning to recruit feedback participants should budget for some type of incentive, as over 70% of respondents indicated that they provided incentives. The most common incentives were food and gift cards. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents indicated that the costs associated with their feedback projects were borne by the library's operating budget; the remainder were financed by library foundation funds or special, one-time funding such as a grant.

Funds spent on soliciting user feedback seemed to generate a high return on investment; 43% of respondents noted that the feedback led to a complete redesign of, or major modifications to, library services or spaces. Another 39% noted that the feedback led to minor modifications to existing services or spaces.

For nearly 90% of the projects mentioned, libraries reported feedback results to important constituencies, such as users and library administration and staff. Also, many respondents indicated that they share survey results and other products of user experience activities in written form with institutional governing bodies. Examples include:

- Library of Congress Executive Committee and Management
- Data used in budget presentations to the President's Executive Team
- Campus Renovation Committee
- Senior levels of the university administration via the library's annual report
- The Learning Commons design process mentioned in the annual report and in the faculty newsletter
- Institutional Research Planning

Some respondents also indicated they share results within the library community via conference presentation and publication. For example:

- Conference presentations (IUG, ALA Annual, and possibly IFLA) as well as an intended article for *Library Trends*
- Publishing the results more broadly, e.g., in an academic article
- Communicating to the broader academic library community through conference presentations

A smaller number indicated they share results with the general user community via more widespread and public means such as social media, posting results on websites, and through the use of open forums.

Organizational Structure

Several questions in the survey sought information on how libraries organized activities and staffed positions related to assessment and, more specifically, the user experience. Nearly all respondents indicated that their library at least periodically conducts assessment activities, but a surprising number indicated no formal assessment structure in their organization. Most respondents indicated that assessment activities were often ad hoc and conducted by one or more library units that hoped to benefit from the particular information sought. Still, half of the respondents reported a dedicated Assessment Coordinator position, and a quarter identified a dedicated position focusing on user experience. Based on respondent comments, one

might expect a future upward trend for these types of positions. Numerous comments alluded to new or recently revitalized assessment efforts and new organizational structures and personnel to support such programs. The comments also indicated a very broad and growing awareness of the need to have activities focused solely on measuring and improving user experience. Indeed, while many respondents noted that user experience efforts were but one component of a broader assessment program, the importance of the user experience component appears to be growing substantially. One particularly appropriate comment demonstrating this trend is the following:

(UX activities) are the heart of our assessment activities. Most of our other "assessment" activities are merely keeping statistics about usage and involve very little actual assessment at this point in time.

As noted above, many of the responding libraries do not currently have one person dedicated to coordinating an assessment or user experience program. An inherent danger in not having a coordinator is the potential lack of a consistent message or brand in this area. In general though, responding libraries seem to have some awareness of this issue and have assigned fairly high-level supervision here. When asked to name who in their library has primary oversight of user experience activities, libraries that do not have dedicated user experience and/or assessment coordinators routinely indicated oversight by another department head level position or by someone at the associate dean/AUL level. When asked to whom this coordinator reports, over three quarters of the respondents indicated the coordinator reported to someone at the dean or associate dean level.

Strategic Planning

While there was not a specific question about it in the survey, a number of respondents referred to the library strategic plan or planning process. Several comments noted how user experience, or in a broader context, assessment activities provided input into their most recent strategic plan. Two respondents specifically mentioned the use of focus groups for user input,

while one noted individual faculty interviews. Two respondents also remarked that their student advisory boards provided input during this process, and one indicated that their University Library Committee reviewed strategic directions. On the output side, a number of respondents indicated that user experience and/or assessment were identified as strategic priorities or as action items within their recent strategic plans. One respondent noted that library user experience activities were funded by their parent institution as a part of the campus strategic plan. While the total number of references to strategic plans was limited, we might expect to see an increased emphasis on user experience and assessment activities in strategic plans as the UX field matures and becomes more commonplace in research library agendas.

Advisory Boards

Over 80% of the respondents indicated that they had some type of formal advisory board in place. In their responses they described 117 separate boards, of which 60 were composed solely of students. Half of the student boards included both undergraduate and graduate members, or the respondent noted only that the board had student members but made no distinction on their classification. The other half of the student boards was split almost evenly between “undergraduates only” and “graduates only.” Nearly all the student boards were noted as providing a mechanism for student advice and input. When asked what specific outcomes resulted from these boards, respondents noted three primary areas: general input on policies and services, review of and possible extension of service hours, and input on library renovation and space utilization, especially as it pertained to the creation of quiet study zones.

Thirty-three of the advisory boards were composed of faculty only or a combination of faculty and staff. The majority of these boards were considered to be of an advisory nature, although a few had targeted missions. When asked about outcomes here, respondents indicated that for nearly half the boards the primary outcome was establishing and maintaining communication between the faculty and library administration. Interestingly, a fourth of the faculty boards had no outcomes listed at all. The

remaining boards had outcomes listed of improving services and collections, reviewing and/or approving proposed policy changes, and assistance in survey development.

Sixteen boards were composed of faculty and student members. The most common faculty/student board structure reported was of a faculty senate committee that included limited student representation. Notably, these boards more closely resembled faculty-only boards than student-only boards in their roles and outcomes. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated the primary board role was advisory in nature, and two-thirds associated no specific outcomes as a result of the board.

Eight of the boards did not include student members and had little or no faculty representation. These boards were primarily associated with library development efforts.

Based on the information submitted in this survey, it appears that a majority of boards associated with user engagement activities contain only student members. For the most part, respondents noted well-defined roles and outcomes for these boards. Boards composed only of faculty members or faculty members with limited student participation were often viewed as important communication tools but had less well-defined outcomes or no outcomes noted at all. Institutions seeking active student input on user experience activities may be better served by the use of student-only boards rather than boards with limited student participation.

Summary

This survey revealed that nearly all responding ARL member institutions are employing a form of user engagement, whether or not they refer to it as such. For some libraries, the activities may be limited to small surveys or perhaps a focus group, while other libraries are engaging users through formal advisory boards and are sponsoring comprehensive ethnographic studies. Organizationally, the responding libraries range from an institution with no formal assessment program that periodically conducts ad hoc exercises to an institution with a user experience department. While there appears to be a lack of common vocabulary or program standardization, there is a growing

awareness of the need to assess libraries from the user perspective with new positions and even departments created to accomplish this goal.

It is clear that creating the structure to measure and change the user experience takes time and effort. As one respondent noted, “You can’t just suddenly tell staff ‘Ok, today we have a new user experience’ and expect everyone to jump on the bandwagon. I hope in your study you will communicate that making this transition to a UX culture takes time and staff have to be ready to move forward because they believe in it, not because an administrator says we need a new UX or because we created a UX librarian position.”

Overall, respondents feel that efforts made in assessing the user experience are well spent. They articulated numerous projects that resulted in major program updates and facility revisions and that were well received by library administration, governing/funding boards, and most importantly, by library users.

These trends are significant because it suggests that user experience activities have been adopted by almost all respondents, and furthermore, that these activities and projects are long term in nature. Thus, the trends point to a present and future with UX activities more central to the operations of ARL libraries.

SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The SPEC survey on the Library User Experience was designed by **Robert Fox**, Dean of University Libraries, University of Louisville, and **Ameet Doshi**, Assessment Coordinator and head of the User Experience Department, Georgia Tech. These results are based on data submitted by 71 of the 126 ARL member libraries (56%) by the deadline of March 4, 2011. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Research libraries find themselves increasingly being asked to justify program expenditures in terms of their impact on research, teaching, and learning activities. An important aspect in generating high impact for the library is ensuring that its resources and services closely align with the evolving needs of its users. Libraries may engage their users through a number of methods to help create this alignment, including formal and informal evaluation tools, outreach efforts to specific user groups, and feedback from user advisory boards. Research libraries have a long history of evaluating collection needs and general user satisfaction. More recently, assessment has adopted a user-centered mindset focused on evaluation of the user experience for improving the design of library services and facilities. As Aaron Schmidt describes in the *Library Journal* User Experience column:

"Touch points are all the places your patrons come into contact with your library and its services. Things like your web site and databases, service desks, staff, programs, and even brochures. One goal of User Experience Design is to help determine if any of those touch points are also pain points—places of contact that make patrons confused, aggravated, or disappointed—and fix them if they are." (May 1, 2010)

The purpose of this survey is to explore recent and planned user experience activities at ARL member libraries and the impact these efforts have on helping the libraries transform to meet evolving user needs. The survey elicits examples of successful user experience activities to serve as benchmarks for libraries looking to create or expand efforts in this area. It also explores whether libraries have created positions or entire departments focused on user engagement and the user experience.

Definitions

In this survey, "users" include anyone who utilizes or could reasonably be expected to utilize the library's services and resources, for example, students, faculty, researchers, and community members. "User experience activities" includes any effort by the library to:

1. Assess or measure the experience users encounter with the library's services, resources, facilities, and technology;
2. Seek user input to help design or guide improvements in these same areas;
3. Collaborate with other library staff or campus/community partners to enhance library services, facilities, and resources in innovative ways;
4. Utilize advisory boards and/or outreach efforts to gain a better understanding of user needs.

BACKGROUND

1. Has your library engaged in any user experience activities as defined in the introduction during the past three years? (Examples include administering surveys, facilitating advisory boards, leading outreach activities, creating user experience positions/units, etc.) N=71

Yes	70	99%
No	1	1%

If yes, were these activities one-time/project-based or ongoing or both? N=69

Project-based	7	10%
Ongoing	6	9%
Both	56	81%

Comments

Project-based

Evaluation of the Visitor Experience at the Library of Congress.

Planning for development of new Taylor Family Digital Library that brings together library, archives, museum, and press together in new ways and also brings Student Services into the building and more solidly in the mix of services. Planning a renovation of our Health Sciences Library. Both projects involved research on the user experience.

We've used surveys of users in both paper and electronic formats, including LibQUAL+® and in-house surveys.

Ongoing

Our efforts are pretty much focused on outreach activities.

Student assessment of library skills course; active marketing department.

Both

A UX Librarian position was created in October 2009. We administered the LibQUAL+® Lite survey in the spring of 2010. In addition, a UX office, a physical space, was created in January 2010. The UX office has collaborated across departments to do informal surveys, as well as, an ethnographic study of the research activities in one building on campus.

At the J. Willard Marriott Library, we do a biennial Library Satisfaction survey in the spring semester about activity and satisfaction within the library. The Library Satisfaction survey is a one page print survey completed inside the Marriott Library gathering demographic information such as major, department, and visitor type. Most questions on this survey use a Likert scale with a couple of open-ended questions for comments. The LibQUAL+® survey is done every four years. We have done focus groups to gather more data on specific issues from LibQUAL+® data. The library has done

surveys in the past regarding a specific project or idea. Surveys, consultants, focus groups, student groups, university committees, planning task forces, furniture trials, outside committees were extensively used from 2004 until 2007 in the planning and renovation of an 80 million project at the J. Willard Marriott Library. Since 2007, survey topics include website redesign, library catalog redesign, hours within the library, and services and food quality in the café. The library has done transaction log analysis on catalog searches, interlibrary loan, website, collections, databases, and journals. In 2010, the library created a usability lab that has been used to test our library catalog and website. With the library website being moved to a new platform, online surveys will be much easier to create, implement, gather, and analyze data. The library has a Library Policy Advisory Committee that provides suggestions on new initiatives.

Broad categories include administration of surveys, advisory boards, usability testing, and various outreach activities.

LibQUAL+® in 2003, 2006, 2009; Student Advisory Group, Outreach Group, created a campus outreach coordinator to work primarily with freshmen, Assessment Group.

Project based have included the LibQUAL+® survey, website usability testing which led to a website redesign, and a strategic planning process. Ongoing includes liaison work to academic departments and the Library Affairs Advisory Committee, which has been around for many years and consists of faculty and sometimes student reps.

South (main) Reading Room study; Special Collections use study; Portland Library & Learning Commons user focus groups; usability testing for portions of the website (faculty services page, digital collections; WorldCat local); furniture evaluations; focus groups on new media studies; data services needs assessment; LibQUAL+®; Student Advisory Group; University Library Committee; Library Advancement Council.

The library has participated in two LibQUAL+® surveys—one in 2007 and one in 2010. This is an ongoing process, with surveys held every three years. The library has been holding interviews with college deans and associate deans as well as student groups to determine ways to improve the user experience. The library is also piloting a peer-assisted learning program.

The Penn Libraries facilitate a number of ongoing advisory groups, including groups of undergraduate students, life sciences faculty, and faculty in the humanities. We also conduct project-based focus groups and usability studies with university faculty, staff, and student advisory bodies to gauge their perceptions of and facility with library services and technologies.

Usability is ongoing and we are currently mid-way through a refresher of our Undergraduate Research Project. We also did a user study on the Carlson Science and Engineering Library.

Vast majority are project-based.

We conduct the LibQUAL+® survey every two years as well as targeted surveys, usability studies, and focus groups.

We conducted an annual user services survey, usually in the spring term. Additionally, we participated in the Kansas State Library Annual “Snapshot” day survey (April 2010 and November 2010). We also recently launched a new Learning Studio facility, and have conducted focus groups, surveys, comment and voting opportunities, and ethnographic observational studies related to this project. Additionally, Digital Initiatives and Publishing has historically employed user advisory boards for services like the institutional repository, a journal editor’s board to talk about issues with open access, an advisory board for shared digital image collections. Recently, we partnered with the campus humanities research center to co-lead a year-long advisory group to better understand the needs of humanists working in the digital realm. This work included both focused discussion and survey. Most recently, we utilized campus focus groups to help faculty understand the implications of KU’s new open access policy, and have subsequently established an ongoing advisory board for that group. In the area of library collections, we have met with multiple academic departments to gather input as we physically move collections to the annex.

We do usability testing every year and a large user survey every two years. We also conduct ethnographic studies, but the last one was in 2006, so won't be discussed in this survey. The next one will be in spring 2011.

We don't call it "User Experience" at BYU, but we do the activities defined in the questions above.

We have done several of each, surveys and boards. We have faculty and student boards. We have done focus groups with students. I personally make visits to department chairs to ask them about their experience with the library – it's an open-ended conversation that is sometimes attended by faculty. More important, at our public services retreat in July 2010 our topic was customer service and user experience. This was the launch of a conversation in public services about the differences between customer service and user experience. This is an ongoing project. For example, on January 14, 2011 we had a 90 minute program where we watched video by user experience consultant Joe Michelli, had lightning talks by staff on service issues, and started something we call "Capture an Idea" project. Back in the fall of 2010, our head of reference attended an ethnographic research workshop, and we are now planning our first study which will focus on faculty and how they create links to library content on their course sites.

We have done surveys, focus groups, a faculty advisory committee, outreach to campus organizations.

We utilize a year round online survey as well as an annual print survey.

2. Does your library have plans to engage in any user experience activities in the coming year? N=71

Yes	69	97%
No	2	3%

If yes, will these activities be one-time/project-based or ongoing or both? N=69

Project-based	7	10%
Ongoing	5	7%
Both	57	83%

Comments

Project-based

We're in the planning phases for more focus groups and surveys.

Ongoing

My hope is to increase our assessment activities and add an assessment coordinator to keep those activities focused and effective.

We will have a "Capture an Idea" project in which staff have special notebooks to record things that are broken, observations of users, comments, complaints; we have student workers participating as well. Before we can understand what the library user experience should be, we need to understand what it is now and how we go about designing it to be better. This is part of an ongoing effort to create more staff awareness about UX in the library. You can't just

suddenly tell staff “Ok, today we have a new user experience” and expect everyone to jump on the bandwagon. I hope in your study you will communicate that making this transition to a UX culture takes time and staff have to be ready to move forward because they believe in it, not because an administrator says we need a new UX or because we created a UX librarian position. My goal has been to start slow and more carefully, seeking to build staff support along the way. Part of that is retreats, meetings, videos, sharing news, interactive projects in which everyone can participate, etc., all designed to create awareness and an interest in the importance of having a well designed library experience.

Both

Cafe Gelman, Ear Plugs for Reading Days, student orientation sessions, Student Advisory Group to work with library and university staff on planning Gelman Library’s 1st floor renovation.

Comprehensive usability testing of the website is likely. Advisory groups will continue to meet. Other activities are not yet specified, but likely.

Continuation of activities outlined above with the addition of focus groups around the implementation of strategic planning initiatives.

Currently reviewing how students wish to access reference service. Looking at putting in place a resource discovery layer to assist users in accessing information resources. Installing a “suggestion box.” Establish a customer service committee.

Our assessment program has been in a rebuilding phase. Hope to return to ongoing program of activities in the future, but most will still be project-based.

Our metadata and collections units are developing a User Experience Team to develop usability assessment and evaluation tools as well as run focus groups with various campus groups (students and faculty) to better understand user needs and information seeking behaviours as discovery systems and collections continue to be amalgamated, redesigned, and/or acquired.

Strategic planning, website usability, and OPAC usability testing.

Usability and Undergraduate Research Refresher projects.

We are implementing a new strategic plan over the next 3 to 6 months, which will include metrics.

We plan an observational study of our library spaces in the spring of 2011, and an ethnographic study of how scholarly methods are changing due to new technologies and formats, also in spring 2011.

We plan to complete our biennial in-building survey, and others as may arise.

We will be conducting LibQUAL+® in 2012 as well as focused surveys in the college and departmental libraries and our annual Info Commons survey.

We will be starting a summer study of how researchers do their scholarly work, with a special emphasis on data management needs.

We will be validating a redesign of our periodicals room with students. We are also doing LibQUAL+®.

If you answered “Yes” to either question above, please complete the survey. If you answered “No” to both questions, please jump to the Other Outreach Activities section.

3. How do your library user experience activities fit within the library's broader array of assessment activities? N=59

According to our library's mission statement, the library must "understand the research, teaching, and learning needs of its users" in order to fulfill its mission. The desire to understand the experience and needs of library users is perhaps the *raison d'être* for the library's assessment program. There is substantial overlap between the library's user experience activities and its assessment activities, though they are not wholly coterminous.

All of our assessment activities are currently focused on our users.

Assessment of customer needs and assessment of the customer are the central components of our assessment activities. We assess needs to determine what our customers need from us to support their success. This information informs our strategic planning and development of new services or resources. Assessment of the user experience (including satisfaction with our services) helps us assess our progress toward our goals and helps identify areas in need of improvement. Our other assessment activities are primarily clustered around efficiency in use of our resources and staff climate and learning needs.

At this time, the library does not have a designated assessment unit, or a user experience unit, so these activities are generally done at the department or division level, in alignment with strategic priorities.

Currently, the majority of our assessment activities are focused on user experience with services that currently exist or on identifying gaps in services that would enhance user experience. However, we do "by the number" assessment of ILL/resource sharing, cataloging, and other production areas of the libraries to meet goals.

For many years, we have had a committee that administers surveys and works on branding and marketing issues. The UX office works with the chair of that committee to coordinate and report on survey activities. The UX office coordinates the library's marketing efforts, promotes outreach, and leads the web team's usability testing. Additionally, the UX office engages with users via focus groups, and informal surveys.

GWUL responded to LibQUAL+® results by creating position of Student Liaison who works with the AUL for Administration, Development, and Human Resources, and with the Outreach Group to plan and participate in several annual student centered activities. Examples are new student orientations during summer before freshman year, graduate student orientations, resident advisors assistance, "Take a Break" activities with snacks, fun giveaways, movies, etc.

I tend to view "user experience" activities as an attempt to capture feedback on a more narrowly defined basis, e.g., on a particular service or space, from a particular user group.

In 2002 and 2006, the UIC University Library participated in the LibQUAL+® Total Service Quality survey. The surveys highlighted a need for greater access to technology and overall improvements to library facilities (which had not been renovated since the 1980s). As a result, over the last several years, the library has conducted multiple user surveys focusing on experience with reference, instruction, circulation, and collections. Additionally, an annual user survey is conducted during the fall semester to measure library performance and patron satisfaction, with a particular emphasis on facilities, services, and technological resources. It has tracked satisfaction and improvement in these areas, while also gathering useful information about changing patron wants and needs. In response to patron feedback, the library has made significant changes. Over the past 18 months, library hours have been extended, physical improvements have been made in all facilities, and public computers have been replaced and upgraded. Later this year, construction will begin on a new IDEA Commons—a space intended for active learning and 24 hour access. Information gained is also being used to make strategic decisions about collections development and allocation of resources. The annual survey also provides respondents the opportunity to identify what they feel should be priorities for the library. Responses have

centered on continuing to improve the physical space and increasing access to technology and online services and resources. Together, this information helps the library focus its resources to responsively meet the varied needs of its users, while also ensuring that it is fulfilling its mission to support, enhance, and collaborate in the education, research, and service activities of the university. The UIC University Library is committed to ongoing assessment in order to best serve its users. Future assessment activities will continue to focus on the user experience, including plans for: a new comprehensive user survey evaluating satisfaction with services and resources; improved instruction evaluation tools; new in-depth reference assessment tools; and the introduction of online and physical suggestion boxes. Additionally, all current and future assessment activities will be complemented by a new marketing campaign aiming to better communicate assessment efforts and subsequent improvements with users, while also building a greater culture of assessment library-wide.

In addition to user experience activities, NARA also complies with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). In doing so, we survey virtually all users of NARA staff-provided services, and report these results to Congress.

Integrated—all part of administrative efforts at assessment.

It is one aspect of many, but in a “where the rubber hits the road” sort of way.

It’s really the centerpiece in many ways; almost everything you want to measure or improve has to do with the users.

Members of the library’s Assessment Team consult on user experience activities and conduct assessments of their own. The Team has worked to establish a culture of assessment so more individuals have taken responsibility for assessing their activities.

Most of our assessment activities fall into the category of “user experience” even though we might not call it that. Like most libraries, we do focus groups, surveys, usability testing, etc., but there is no formal assessment program or plan to guide these assessment activities.

Most of the activities of my department are involved in one way or the other with the user experience—either virtual or physical use of the library. There are other data kept by separate departments that are reported annually, but we don’t act on these very much. These are things like data reported to ARL.

Much of the assessment is identified and conducted by library departments that have specific assessment needs, with support (as needed) from the User Feedback & Assessment Committee.

Our assessment program relies on multiple methods to provide information about our community’s library and information needs, use, importance, and satisfaction on both an ongoing and project basis. We find that qualitative methods focusing on the user experience are absolutely critical in gaining student input.

Our intent is to develop assessment efforts this next year, as part of our strategic planning efforts. Assessment will primarily focus on user experiences.

Our library has a department dedicated to analyzing and improving the User Experience. Assessment is a major component of the User Experience department’s role, but other activities also include: facilitating an active student library advisory board, conducting outreach with users outside the library, collaborating with innovative campus partners, facilitating focus groups, monitoring and engaging with users on social media feeds, and performing both systematic and ad hoc surveys with students in library spaces.

Our most recent strategic plan includes the goal of improving the user experience.

Our user experience activities are “Actions” tied to the goals and objectives of our strategic plan. The measure of the success of the “Action” is an assessment activity.

Our user experience activities are an integral part of the library's broader array of assessment activities. Assessment is seen as a strategic priority both for the institution and the library. Data-driven decision making is essential in a resource-limited environment.

Piloting assessment for a user-centered library.

Some user experience activities are coordinated through the Libraries' Director of Planning, Assessment, and Research. Others are initiated as part of the regular management and improvement of Public Services.

"Student learning" and "community engagement" are two of the main strategic directions of the UBC Library Strategic Plan 2010–2015. The Assessment Program is designated as one of two "critical enablers" (the other is IT). The Assessment Office and Assessment Advisory Group identify activities and services to support the assessment goals of the Assessment Office, library-wide assessment projects, and unit plans at the branch/division level. In addition to the third LibQUAL+® survey of 2010, the library user experience has been the focus of at least a dozen smaller assessment projects in the last year (either completed, or in progress), including projects to redesign user spaces, improve the library website, and provide better access to collections. Results of the LibQUAL+® 2010 survey have been shared with public service managers, management committees, and with library staff in open forums.

The BC Libraries are in the midst of significant change related to the User Experience. Many of our current initiatives stem from our deep and wide discussions of our organizational culture. These discussions allowed us to really examine how we deploy all the resources (Web, desk, services, etc.) where users interface with us. The library continues to look at ways to improve the user experience—including building renovations and space allocation, student assessments of library instruction.

The library's user experience activities help to highlight the efficiency of the varied services offered to students as well as to identify those services that are not as effective in meeting users' needs. "Ineffective" areas are reported and acted upon by the senior staff so that they can be redressed to meet user needs. Within the broader array of assessment activities, user experience problems are taken seriously and are focused on to find a solution.

The Penn State Libraries assesses users' evaluative feedback on online and physical services, including the libraries' website, special outreach programs, and reference and instruction initiatives. These assessments complement the libraries' broader array of assessment activities by showing the impact of the libraries' collections, resources, staff, and services on library use and user satisfaction.

There is at most only a loose coupling in that I am responsible for both assessment and building our UX culture (and assessment culture). I think at this point we are looking at designing and implementing the UX concept outside of our more traditional assessment activity. I would hope that we can get to the point where we could begin to assess the impact of our UX, but before we can evaluate the library experience we have to define it, design it, and integrate it into our practice. Even UX experts struggle with assessment matters, because it is difficult to assess how much impact the experience has on community members. But we can perhaps assess this in other ways, perhaps more traditional satisfaction surveys, focus groups, and ethnographic methods.

There is strong collaboration between Management Information Services (MIS), UVa Library's general assessment office, and the User Experience Team, which does more targeted user studies. A faculty member of MIS serves on the UX Team and serves as convener of the User Requirements/Usability Community.

They are a regular part of the assessment activities.

They are an integral part of our assessment activities. Our assessment librarian spends 20% of her time in the User Experience Group and helps coordinate user experience activities with other assessment activities.

They are an important component, since responding to users' needs is a core value of the organization.

They are an integral piece of our assessment program.

They are currently the major priority, as they are driving changes to the library's website and v-reference hours, for example. We do sporadic "who is using this library" surveys, but they don't necessarily drive change.

They are one aspect of our assessment activities which include usability studies, process reviews, unit reviews, customer satisfaction surveys, focus groups, Information Literacy assessments, Reference Studies, and ACRL, ALA, NCES, and ARL projects.

They are the heart of our assessment activities. Most of our other "assessment" activities are merely keeping statistics about usage and involve very little actual assessment at this point in time.

They are vehicles for feedback on certain issues. We are employing them in planning library services (e.g., 24 hour library service) and space (Learning Commons).

This is all fairly new to our library. We understand the importance, but still need to integrate it into the organization.

To be honest, I think we are currently woefully inadequate across our whole system in finding out whether we are doing well or not.

User experience activities are a part of the assessment activities coordinated by our Planning and Assessment Officer. The user experience and the quality of the experience is part of our new strategic planning document for 2011–2014. User experience will be taking a more prominent role since our library finally completed a massive innovation/renovation project costing 80 million dollars. User experiences that we hope to measure include all aspects of library operations ranging from group study areas, computer usage, website, resource allocation, user environment, ease of navigation within the library and the library website, resource availability, hours, and collection development priorities.

User experience activities are integral to assessment and strategic management of the Penn Libraries' resources, services, and technologies. While we have a central office that oversees planning and assessment activities, library user experience activities are distributed throughout library staff and locations.

User experience activities are planned as appropriate to the question asked.

User experience activities complement and/or extend results of studies conducted as part of broader program, e.g., LibQUAL+®, WOREP, READ, Project Information Literacy.

User experience activities complement other forms of assessment. They may or may not be part of the portfolio of the Assessment Team.

User experience assessments are intended to help us understand user frustrations, expectations, challenges, needs and more. Such assessments may inform the development modification or elimination of services, or may be conducted in order to make necessary changes with the least amount of negative impact on the user.

User experience is one prong of our assessment program, but is the largest focus.

We are hoping to build an overall assessment plan as well as a culture of assessment. The activities in which we will engage in the near future will focus on creating and improving web-based services.

We are in the early stages of assessment planning on a broad and systematic scale.

We do more of this kind of assessment than any other.

We do not have a formal assessment program at UM but we do have a wide range of assessment activities. The most formal and ongoing work is done via the User Experience Department (a department within the Library Information Technology unit). There are also occasional assessment activities in the Technical Services unit and in Public Services.

The UX Department primarily focuses on UX for the online library presence but also advises in many of the public services department projects.

We do not have a formal assessment program so user experience is done with ad hoc teams by staff who have an interest in, and experience with, assessment.

We employ some activities to acquire data for decision-making purposes, but we also employ some activities as more general listening devices.

We have a three-member user experience team whose role and scope is still being defined. We also have an Assessment & Evaluation team, and one member of the UX team sits on it. At present, it seems the UX team is involved in qualitative research and A&E is more concerned with quantitative research.

We have system stats to help determine the use of existing systems, but we rely on user experience to assess planned and recent system changes, and to help with creation of future services and spaces.

Western Libraries participates in large scale projects such as LibQUAL+® to identify where users have concerns, and then works towards improving service/resources as identified by respondents. In some cases we engage in further user-centered assessment to gain a better understanding of the user experience as we work towards solutions. We also consult and check back through various means with users to ensure we are addressing identified problems. Assessment is included in all roles within the libraries and assessment involving users may be conducted by individuals or groups of staff across the libraries, e.g., web usability is addressed by the Web Services Librarian and the committee he leads whereas other assessment may be carried out by library directors and staff regarding local issues/problems, and the teaching/liaising librarians gather feedback for improved research support. In all cases, users are a part of assessment and the user voice is heard.

USER EXPERIENCE STAFF

This section examines how your library deploys staff to assess and design the user experience. Some libraries have created specific positions and departments to lead these efforts. Other libraries perform these tasks with staff who have multiple job responsibilities in addition to user experience.

4. What is the position title of the individual in your library who has primary responsibility for coordinating user experience activities? N=68
5. What is the position title of the manager to whom this person reports? N=65

Position Title	Reports to	Comments
Assessment Coordinator; and Instruction & Outreach Librarian	Assessment Coordinator reports to the Executive Associate Director and the Instruction & Outreach Librarian reports to the Head of Instruction Services.	
Assessment & Planning Librarian	AUL for Collections and Services	The Assessment & Planning Librarian has primary responsibilities, but several other staff from various departments are routinely involved in these efforts. The Assessment & Planning Librarian reports to the AUL for C&S.
Assessment Coordinator	Associate Dean for Organizational Development	Actually, the Assessment Coordinator has primary responsibility for user feedback and then distributes that to the appropriate staff to figure out how to address user needs and experience. Other areas, such as Access Services, Subject Librarians, and departmental libraries, have responsibility for user experience and report to other AD's.
Assessment Director	Head of Access Services and Assessment	Although the Assessment Director coordinates library assessment activities, many departments and staff have responsibility for conducting assessments and user experience activities.
Assessment Librarian	University Librarian	
Assessment Librarian	Associate University Librarian	
Assessment Librarian, and Communications Librarian	Both report directly to the Dean of Libraries.	These two librarians work together to implement user experience activity.
Assistant Dean (Client Services)	Associate Dean	This is a new position, established in October 2010, to which all the branch and unit heads report.
Assistant Dean for User Services	Dean of Libraries	We also have a newly formed assessment council made up of library staff and until recently we had an officer for assessment (.5 FTE). The Assistant Dean for Collections and Scholar Services and the Head of Spencer Research Library are also involved in assessment activities within their respective areas.
Assistant University Librarian, Outreach and Academic Services	University Librarian	

Position Title	Reports to	Comments
Associate Dean	Dean	We haven't really had anyone coordinating them in the past, but we have recently hired a new associate dean who has much more interest in increasing efforts in this area.
Associate Dean	Dean	But I get help from many folks: we have an Assessment Team and an Assessment Team Leader. We have a Data Officer and lots of volunteer public services librarians for these projects.
Associate Dean for Assessment, Personnel & Research	Dean	We have an Assessment Team which is led by a Reference/Outreach Librarian.
Associate Dean for Information Services	Dean	User experience tasks are primarily a function of public services.
Associate Dean for Research and Learning Services	Dean of the Marriott Library and University Librarian	With the assistance of the Budget and Planning Director and other Associate Deans.
Associate Dean of Library Services; Associate Dean of Library Services and Director of the Health Sciences Library	Dean and University Librarian	Two Associate Deans share the oversight responsibility.
Associate Director for Public Services	Director of Libraries	
Associate University Librarian for Collections and User Services	University Librarian	We have a distributed system with respect to user experience activities. While our AUL for Collections and User Services has primary responsibility, other groups also actively lead projects. I would include both our Associate University Librarian for Information Technology and our Director, Academic Technology and Instructional Services, as holding key roles in this area.
Associate University Librarian for Graduate & Research Services	University Librarian	
Associate University Librarian for Planning and Organizational Research	Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian	The work is shared with the Associate University Librarian for Research and Instructional Services and the Digital User Services Librarian, for which we are currently recruiting. The Digital User Services Librarian reports to the Associate University Librarian for Research and Instructional Services.
Associate University Librarian for Services	University Librarian	

Position Title	Reports to	Comments
Associate University Librarian, Information Services		This position has oversight for the reference department, branch libraries, circulation department, and the map and sound and moving image libraries.
AUL for Public Services	University Librarian	
AUL for Research and Instructional Services	Dean of the Library	At this time we are not really giving any one staff member primary responsibility for this although the AUL is working to lead the effort. The goal is to engage as many public service staff as possible and have them believing that they all (each one) are responsible for UX activity. At different times, different staff, be they department heads, access service clerks or reference librarians, can be leading some part of the activity.
Coordinator, Information Literacy and Assessment	Director of Libraries	The title is fluid, as we are in the process of reorganizing. After the reorganization, this position will report to the newly created Head of Discovery and Delivery Services.
Coordinator of Training and Assessment	Associate Dean of Libraries for Finance, Administration, and Human Resources	This is a new position (began November 2010).
Decision Support Analyst (DSA)	Associate University Librarian for User Services	
Development, Assessment, and Marketing Librarian	Associate University Librarian (Access)	
Director of Access, Information, and Research Services	Deputy University Librarian	
Director of Anthropological Research	Vice Provost and Dean of the Libraries	
Director of Assessment	Associate University Librarian, Organizational Development	
Director of Assessment	Associate University Librarian for Public Services	
Director of Education and Volunteer Programs	Director of Museum Programs	The Director of Museum Programs currently reports to the Assistant Archivist with oversight of all archival related programs in the Washington, DC area.
Director of Planning Assessment and Organizational Effectiveness	Dean of University Libraries	This is a newly recreated position. We're still exploring the scope and scale of responsibilities.

Position Title	Reports to	Comments
Director of Planning, Assessment, and Research	University Librarian	Public Services division also has significant responsibilities related to user experience design and assessment.
Director of Project Management and Assessment	Associate Dean of the University Libraries	We are in the process of finalizing an assessment plan, developed in collaboration with team leaders (department head equivalents) that will guide our activities over the next 3 to 5 years.
Director of Public Relations	Dean of Libraries	At this time, the library does not have a designated position, but coordination of much outreach and assessment of those efforts falls to the above position.
Director, Assessment and Planning	Senior Associate Dean of Libraries	This position provides support and coordination as needed but user experience activities occur throughout the organization and often are led by those individuals and/or groups closest to the specific issue. For example, usability is under the aegis of our Web Services person.
Director, Partnerships and Outreach Programs	Associate Librarian for Library Services	
Director, User Experience	Associate Dean for Library Technologies	
Faculty Director for Library Information Technology	Associate Director for Administrative Services	Even though we list this position, there is not much of a coordinated effort. This is mostly project-based for us.
First Year Experience Librarian	Head, Instructional Services	Yes, the effort is shared. The FYE Librarian leads the effort for freshmen and for undergraduates more broadly.
Head Library Learning Services	Associate Dean of University Park Libraries	
Head of Collection Management	Associate Director for Library Services and Collections	
Head of the User Experience Department	Associate University Librarian for Library Information Technology	
Head of UX office	AUL for Public Services	The head of the UX office was formerly the bibliographer for Physics, Math, Astronomy, and Statistics, and still performs those duties.

Position Title	Reports to	Comments
Head, Academic Program Services; Branch Library Head; Communications and Publications Officer; Library Director	Directors report to the University Librarian. Other positions report to the Associate University Librarian, User Services.	
Head, Digital User Experience Department	Associate Dean, Library Academic Services (Public Services)	
Head, Music Library	Associate University Librarian for Public Services and Collection Development	The head of the Music Library has dual responsibilities as she also serves as chair of the UX Team. This AUL position is currently in flux. The incumbent left in December. The library is restructuring and has not yet determined how either the AULs or the UX Team will be organized.
Head, User Experience Group	Associate Director for Research & Instructional Services	This is a new position for us, since June 2010. We reorganized the MIT Libraries at that time and created a new department.
Interim Director, Peabody Library (with system-wide assessment responsibilities; title in the works)	Dean of Libraries	
Planning & Assessment Officer	Dean of Libraries	
Research & Assessment Analyst	Director of the Program Management Center	
Student Liaison	Associate University Librarian for Administration, Development, and Human Resources	The Eckles Outreach Coordinator also has responsibility for user experiences at our Mt. Vernon campus. This position reports to Associate University Librarian for Public Services. AUL for Administration, Development, and Human Resources also chairs Assessment Group and meets with the Outreach Group.
User Assessment Librarian	Assistant University Librarian for Scholarly Communications, Personnel & Assessment	Although my title is User Assessment Librarian, I also plan, implement, consult, and collaborate on other assessment activities in the library.
User Engagement Librarian and Assessment Coordinator	Associate Dean	
User Experience Librarian	Head, Discovery & Access	There are two UX librarians and one UX team member who is not a librarian.

Additional Comments

Assessment broadly defined is the purview of the Director for Planning and Communication. As noted above, library user experience activities are more distributed.

No one particular individual who has primary responsibility for coordinating user experience activities.

No one position.

No single position has primary responsibility. In our current organization, the three Associate Vice-Provosts with responsibility for Collections, Learning, and Research Support respectively work collaboratively to coordinate user experience activities. All report to the Vice Provost (Libraries and Cultural Resources and University Librarian).

No such position. We have decentralized with departments and committees responsible for assessment in areas related to their activities. If we want to undertake a library assessment, we use a committee but that committee is currently inactive.

There is no position.

There is no single individual responsible for coordinating user experience activities. This responsibility is distributed among several individuals.

There is not one individual with the primary responsibility for coordinating user experience activities.

There is not one person; it's done on a one-time basis. We have an assessment committee with rotating membership.

We do have someone with the title, "Website Architect and User Experience Analyst" who is responsible for UX in the web environment. Reports to AUL for IT.

We do not have a specific position devoted to "user experience," however, we do have a committee called the "User Feedback and Assessment Committee" that helps with training and support for user experience assessment.

6. In the matrix below, please indicate which staff in your library participate in assessment and design/implementation of the user experience. Check all that apply. N=70

	N	Assessment	Design/Implementation
Individual staff from various departments depending on the need at the time	66	64	65
An ad hoc task force or committee	45	43	41
Staff in another department in the library	40	38	39
A standing committee	40	37	34
Assessment librarian	35	34	24
Outside consultant	18	12	13
User Experience librarian	17	16	16
Staff in an autonomous User Experience department in the library	10	9	10
Other individual(s) or group(s)	13	12	12

Please specify the other individual(s) or group(s) and briefly describe their role in user experience activities.

Assessment

Institutional Research Planning.

Design/Implementation

This is highly distributed. For example, we have a Web Development committee whose members conduct usability testing and then implement changes to the website. We have an ad hoc group working with the Assessment Team to analyze our LibQUAL+® data and recommend changes. We have hired outside consultants three times over the last several years to assess particular parts of the organization.

Both

Anthropology professor – collaborated with us on ethnographic studies. Process Improvement Specialist – works closely with anyone in the library doing assessment.

As needed, the Assessment Librarian draws in other experts to advise/assist with assessment projects.

Associate Vice-Provosts working collaboratively and with senior leadership team.

Consulting with staff at the university's Institute for Assessment and Compliance.

Decision support analyst performs a variety of assessments that library administration deems appropriate, and also assists other library groups, committees, or individuals in planning or implementing assessments related to their areas of responsibility.

George Washington University Program Board, University Student Association, Graduate Student Advisory Board, and Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries have various influences upon library services, library space utilization, operating budget, department funds.

Our Executive Council and the other Associate Deans of the Marriott Library (Special Collections, Information Technology Services, Research and Learning Services, and Scholarly Resources and Collections).

Research Librarian for Emerging Technologies and Service Innovation focuses on investigating and implementing new technology initiatives to enhance user experience.

The library has hired a graduate student to specifically focus on assessment activities.

We have an Assessment Interest Group focused on learning more about library assessment and creating a culture of assessment in the libraries. The group helps to inform our assessment program and activities.

Additional Comments

Participation in these activities is dispersed throughout the organization. The Libraries Assessment and Metrics Team is a standing committee that serves as a resource for design/development and assessment activities.

Our Head of Digital Experience Services leads website and discovery related user experience activities. Led by the Head of Digital Experience Services, we have a Web Interfaces Group (WIG) that includes an implementation team. The implementation team is co-led by two user services librarians. Our overall assessment strategy is coordinated by the Head, Assessment and Planning.

Our Reference, Instruction, and Circulation departments are active in assessing user services and we have just formed

a library-wide standing assessment committee that will coordinate assessment needs throughout the libraries. Our subject librarians have held periodic focus groups on issues such as moving materials to storage. The Center for Digital Scholarship librarians and staff have established advisory boards for various services.

Staff in the Learning Commons, in particular, help with surveys. For project-based assessment, like usability testing of the library's web tools, interested staff may participate.

Task forces involved in initiatives have conducted their own assessment, e.g., VuFind user groups. Standing committees such as the Information Literacy Committee are involved in assessment of their activities.

Technology and public services staff conduct usability testing. The Dean conducts focus groups. An ad hoc group led the LibQUAL+® survey efforts.

The Coordinator of Training and Assessment will, eventually, be the person primarily responsible for overseeing all assessment activities and for reporting results to stakeholders. Assessment Steering Committee—comprised of individuals throughout the organization and tasked with providing guidance to assessment activities and conducting library-wide assessment as needed User Spaces Task Force—tasked with looking at how library patrons interact with our facilities and making recommendations for improvement. Web Services Coordinator conducts web usability studies and involved representatives from other departments as there is an interest. Strategic Plan Oversight and Implementation Committee indirectly involved in that the Assessment Steering Committee and the User Spaces Task Force report back to this group and SPOIC actually makes recommendations to the dean. Lindsey+Asp is a relatively new partnership but this is a student run public relations agency on-campus that we hope will conduct focus groups with students.

The university's office of institutional research provides support and expertise in assessment activities.

The Virtual Library Group (a standing committee of sorts) has primary responsibility for user experience assessment for virtual spaces and products.

We have a standing usability committee comprised of 5 to 6 librarians who are called up to do usability testing of library websites, software, etc.

We have recently formed a Learning & Assessment Team that is focusing primarily on assessment of our information literacy program.

We use project teams to develop and implement new services and products. These teams are usually responsible for assessing the effectiveness and satisfaction of users as well. We do not have a position designated as user experience librarian. We do have a recently implemented website product management group that has responsibility for usability and assessing effectiveness of the library's website. We have used an outside consultant in the past for usability studies but now rely on trained staff.

Web Librarian: implementation of interface improvements, web usability. Digital Technologies Librarian: implementation of design improvement. Assessment Working Group: plans and implements system-wide assessment projects like LibQUAL+®. Others: as appropriate by project.

USER EXPERIENCE ACTIVITIES

Please select up to two user experience activities the library has recently undertaken that had the biggest impact or were most innovative and answer the following questions about those activities.

USER EXPERIENCE ACTIVITY 1

7. What broad aspect of the user's library experience was the activity trying to assess and/or design?
Check all that apply. N=70

Library facilities (space configuration, navigation)	45	64%
Library services (ILL, reference, instruction, etc.)	37	53%
Library technology (website usability, navigation)	36	51%
Library resources (search and discovery, collections, formats)	35	50%
Other aspect	4	6%

Please describe other aspect.

ClimateQUAL® to assess staff perceptions of their working environment.

Desired outside services (writing center, tutoring, etc.)

Intersection of library services, resources, and facilities with those of archives, museum, and press.

The totality of the library service and physical environment.

8. Please briefly describe the scope of the activity. N=64

A campus-wide investigation of faculty, staff, and student perspectives on the highest priorities for library services and resources, and the importance of various services and resources.

A completely renovated main floor, including information and circulation service points, offices for staff, reference collection, many public seating and work spaces, and a cafe.

A Faculty Library Survey was administered in October 2010. Thirty-two percent of faculty completed the web-based anonymous survey which asked faculty about their use of, and satisfaction with, library resources, services, and facilities.

A paper survey was administered to all users of the Learning Commons during a 24-hour period.

A service quality survey was administered and 3000 faculty and students responded.

A study of undergraduate library use including, but not limited to, input on the redesign of our periodicals room.

A user survey (via SurveyMonkey) was sent to 16,000 library patrons in fall 2010 to measure library performance and user satisfaction with an emphasis on facilities, services, and technological resources.

A work group was formed to investigate developing a Research Commons in the library. Focus groups and a survey were conducted.

At this point we are not talking about UX in the context of a particular service or technology, although we have in the past done usability studies of the OPAC and website. We are more focused on discussing UX in a holistic way. What is the experience we have now and what could it be?

Collections: Library moved to a new approval plan that emphasizes electronic over print as well as print/electronic purchase-on-demand. Users now have greater input on collection decisions.

Comparative usability of discovery tools and next generation catalog interfaces.

Conducted five focus groups targeting various user groups to assess the library's homepage for functionality and usability.

Digital Social Science Center (DSSC) Evaluation: understand the awareness, use of, and service quality of the DSSC, which has been open for 1.5 years. This was primarily done via a questionnaire distributed in-library, and via e-mail to target student groups.

Ethnographic study incorporating 20, one-hour interviews with undergraduate students captured on video.

From December 2008 through to June 2009, Libraries and Cultural Resources conducted a thorough implementation planning exercise in preparation for the opening of a new facility, The Taylor Family Digital Library. Six teams: Collections, Learning Services, Media/Technology, Outreach and Community Involvement, Research Support, and Staffing; included representation from all areas of Libraries and Cultural Resources and all staffing groups. The work was coordinated by a librarian assigned full time to this project in the role of Director, Implementation. All teams included gathering information about the User Experience within their mandate.

In an effort to improve the "way finding" in the library, we observed users, asked them to get from point A to point B in the library and mapped their route, and put up temporary signs and asked for user feedback on their design and content.

In planning and preparing for the Learning Studio, we conducted a wide range of activities to gather user input. This included observational studies, e-mail survey, furniture voting, focus groups, and in-person survey with handheld devices. These focused on the use of space, furniture, and group needs, technology required, and available services desired.

In planning for a major renovation of the first and second floor of the main library, we have been gathering input from our users in formal and informal ways to better inform our planning.

In the spring of 2010, the library ran a LibQUAL+® survey, has already responded to some key concerns raised in the survey regarding library hours, and is developing an action plan to look at other areas.

Last year, a number of librarians and IT staff were charged to create a replacement for WebVoyage, the current OPAC interface. To determine the elements necessary for this new discovery tool, the group identified a group of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, librarians, and university staff for usability testing of various library catalogs, including the Penn Libraries' new books discovery tool, whose digital library architecture was proven successful and envisioned as a suitable replacement for the current OPAC.

Learning Commons design: Affinity focus groups were set up to ask undergraduates: "How would you design or imagine the learning space for your ideal academic learning environment?" Students were given post-it notes and grouped their ideas based on themes. Design charettes were used.

LibQUAL+®.

LibQUAL+® 2010 survey: campus-wide, Vancouver campus. The UBC Okanagan campus conducted its own LibQUAL+® survey.

LibQUAL+® 2009 survey.

LibQUAL+® Lite.

LibQUAL+® Lite, Canadian national edition.

LibQUAL+® survey. "LibQUAL+® is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users' opinions of service quality."

Library Live is an all-day conference for faculty and graduate students highlighting information resources, tools, and services.

Library services: two combined studies looking at building use, activities engaged in while in the building (survey and unobtrusive observation), and a reference question analysis project.

Overhaul and redesign of library's website.

Re-envisioning first floor as student-centered, collaborative spaces that offer rich technologies and high quality services from the libraries and several university partners.

Redesigning the old computer lab from rows of computers to include modern collaborative spaces while maintaining individual workstations. Redesigning study rooms.

Renovation of a branch library.

Single Search Box Usability Testing: users were asked to search for an item on the website or in a database using a single search box.

Studied use of various reference services. Analyzed categories of questions asked at the desk (notes are kept in online database) and through virtual services. Satisfaction survey/feedback form was redesigned and linked from these services. Services are currently undergoing a redesign based on the results. Partially related to this was a study of how students use the physical spaces in the central library including the main information desk.

Student Advisory board and an ad hoc provost-formed student group with library and university staff are gathering ideas for the renovation of the 1st floor, long wished for, partially planned, but not definitely funded. Now that the university has agreed and has hired an architect, the planning is moving along quickly.

Survey to assess instruction.

The concept for Patron for a Day (PFAD) was generated in one of the first meetings of the User Experience group. The discussion focused on how empathy is a key ingredient in "design thinking" and we wanted to find a way to help our staff build empathy for our users. Technically speaking, PFAD is a collection of three different tests, taken by staff volunteers at one of our four different locations. Practically speaking, it is an opportunity for staff to learn what it is like to be a user by performing a series of tasks patrons regularly perform in our physical spaces. While designing a series of tests to develop empathy, we realized we were also designing usability tests of our physical spaces. Some tasks required interaction with technology, such as scanners and computers, while others just required interaction with the physical space and collections. Some tasks were easy – "find the restroom;" others were harder – "scan pages from book X and send to your e-mail." In most cases, staff members visited libraries they were less familiar with to complete their "test." They were asked to take notes about their experience (good and bad) and, after completion, were asked to rate each task and enter their comments into an established web form. We had twenty volunteers complete one of three different tests at one of four locations.

The concept for the University of Washington Libraries Research Commons came out of the Libraries' desire to respond to the evolving research and collaborative needs of student and faculty. The growth of data-driven research, digital scholarship, and interdisciplinary studies required a re-examination of services and physical spaces being provided for our community. The consolidation of print collections and service points at the UW Libraries, in response to budget reductions and trends away from physical collection use, left the ground floor of the Allen South Library available for

renovation in late 2009. A Research Commons Planning Committee reviewed the literature on information commons within academic libraries, examined library digital commons, and conducted interviews and surveys with faculty, staff, and students around campus to identify service gaps and departmental research needs. In doing so, a set of needs emerged that informed their final recommendation on services and resources to be offered in the future UW Libraries Research Commons space. A report from the UW Learning and Scholarly Technologies group on their extensive study of UW student learning space needs was also examined in planning for the space. A design firm was hired in early 2010 and, utilizing data from both of these sources, they developed an initial plan for the space and followed this with a design charette conducted with library staff, students, and faculty to get more feedback. Assessment was an integral part of the initial design of the research commons, and comes out of the Libraries' ongoing assessment program. The design and construction of the Research Commons was completed in October, and the space opened at the start of Autumn Quarter 2010. Once open, assessment was conducted through regular observation of user activity in the Research Commons. In late February 2011, we began conducting strategic discussion groups with users of the Research Commons to find out how the space, furnishings, equipment, and services have been utilized. The results of these discussion groups will help inform the development an in-libraries use survey for Research Commons users, to be distributed in Spring Quarter 2011.

The design and implementation of a new online credit-bearing course: Research Lab. The project involved collaboration with the English department to identify learning goals, development of the online course including content, offering the course for the first time, and assessing the student experience through use of a local Teacher Course Evaluation tool, other feedback from students, and feedback from instructors in the English department.

The goal of the South Reading Room research project was to determine how the main library reading room could be improved to meet users' needs. The project had three components: observations, then focus groups, followed by a survey. Subsequent to the formal study, alternative types of furniture were brought in for users to indicate their preferences.

The goal was to launch a new search and discovery unified interface for the online catalog and the digital library.

The library conducts an annual survey, which surveys graduate students, undergraduates, and faculty in rotation on a three-year cycle. The survey is intended to gauge user experiences and needs with regard to collections, services, and both virtual and physical spaces.

The library recently completed a redesign of the entire library website and catalog. Users were involved throughout the process.

The library recently renovated a commons space, primarily relying on input about furnishings, aesthetics, layout, and design ideas from students. After the space opened in fall 2009, the User Experience department and Associate Dean for Public Services began an effort to determine how well the space was meeting student needs using a survey instrument that included both quantitative satisfaction measures, as well as open-ended qualitative comments.

The library was opening up a new space in a building on campus. A small-scale ethnographic project was undertaken to assess user needs for that space.

The Music Library Space Use Study was set up to investigate low scores and accompanying comments from a LibQUAL+® survey that identified space as a problem by all three user groups in the Music Library. Western Libraries conducted a Music Library Space Use Study in two phases: first, an observation study and then later, in phase 2, interviews.

The scope was to answer the following questions: Who are the current visitors? What were visitors' general reactions to the Library of Congress? Are visitors' expectations being met? Why? What types of experiences did visitors take

advantage of at the Library of Congress? How do visitors perceive the Library of Congress compared to other DC cultural attractions?

The survey was used to assess the frequency of utilization and satisfaction level with the library's resources—including computers, audio-visual equipment, databases, and printers—and its services such as instruction, information or reference, interlibrary loan, and circulation.

The User Spaces Task Force created a survey to poll users on how they interact with the libraries facilities, what improvements they would like to see, and the considerations made when choosing where to study within the library.

This study employed methods of user feedback collection to learn about the information needs of sciences faculty and students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in order to improve library services for this population. Our research questions we were attempting to address were: What are the information needs and behaviors of faculty and students in the sciences at UNC-Chapel Hill? How can the UNC libraries best meet those needs through the provision of resources and services?

To learn how users navigated our Digital Collections website and how they used the search options.

Upon the launch of a re-designed website, we mounted a feedback survey and conducted usability testing.

Usability testing for redesign of library website.

User-centered website redesign.

Way finding Exercise: We conducted three way finding studies with a total of 10 participants covering three distinct areas of a single library building. Each participant performed at least 10 tasks over the course of one hour. For each task a printout of a preselected OPAC item record was given to the participant, who then had to attempt to locate the item on the shelf while the facilitator observed. Participants were also asked to locate amenities such as bathrooms and copy machines, and completed a survey following the tasks.

We administer LibQUAL+® every two years to capture user perceptions on library service quality, by asking questions in three "dimensions": Affect of Service, Library as Place, and Information Control. Survey results provide a snapshot of user perceptions of service levels (minimally-acceptable, desired, and perceived) at a particular point in time.

We administered LibQUAL+® in fall 2010 for the first time. We also surveyed faculty for their rating of liaison services. We routinely assess instruction. Other recent surveys include MINES® and ClimateQUAL®.

We conducted a series of observations (remotely) with students conducting research for a class assignment to see how they used library resources (or not!) in an unmediated setting. We did not identify ourselves as the library so as to not influence their behavior. We've completed a pilot phase and have plans to expand it in the fall.

We conducted an ethnographic research study using surveys and interviews to study how undergraduate and graduate students and faculty were using the existing Rutgers University Libraries Web interface to conduct online research and compose papers and reports.

We examined the use of our central search and discovery interface that resides on our library home page. Currently, we use a tabbed system where the user must select which tool they want to use, such as the catalog, e-journals, databases, or article search. The goal was to determine which tabs were seen as most useful, as well as whether the presence or number of tabs was confusing. A second project was spawned in which we investigated the use and effectiveness of our federated articles search interface. This included looking at use statistics as well as user interviews. For both studies we used Morae software, filmed the participants, and presented results to the larger library community.

We recently completed a two-part web UX study: one on performance support needs and another on conceptualizing web space in general.

We undertook a two-year study of how undergraduates do their work. We had a number of sub groups that specifically looked at services, technology, and facilities.

We were gathering user feedback to proposed plans for the renovation of a particular, subject library.

9. Is the target of the activity any typical library user or a specific category of user (e.g., faculty, graduate students, etc.)? N=70

Any user	39	56%
A specific category of user	31	44%

If you answered “A specific category of user,” please identify the category.

Educators, primarily, and their students.

Faculty.

Faculty and graduate students.

Faculty and students in the sciences.

Faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students of the Don Wright Faculty of Music.

Faculty, staff, students; the project did not include community users.

For the pilot phase, we focused on undergraduate students in humanities. Prior experience using the library was not required.

Graduate and undergraduate students, teaching assistants and faculty.

Graduate students.

Last year we surveyed graduate and professional students; this year we’re surveying undergraduates, and next year we’ll survey faculty. We’ll continue to survey each population in rotation in a three-year cycle.

LibQUAL+® and MINES® included all users, while other assessment tools targeted faculty (liaison survey), staff (ClimateQUAL®), and students (instructional assessment).

Primarily undergraduate students.

Social Science graduate students and library users.

Students (undergraduate or graduate).

Students using the newly renovated 2nd floor West Commons area.

The focus is ASU faculty, staff and students.

Undergraduate students.

Undergraduate students.

Undergraduate students.

Undergraduate students, graduate students.

Undergraduate students taking English 102 courses (a required General Education class).

Undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty.

Undergraduate students, primarily lower-division.

Undergraduate, graduate, and faculty.

Undergraduates.

Undergraduates.

Undergraduates, graduate students, faculty.

Undergraduates, graduates, and faculty.

Usability was conducted with students, primarily. The feedback survey was open to all.

Users of the Learning Commons.

We've done both. Some efforts have been open to the entire community; other projects have targeted a particular group, such as graduate students, or ENGL 101 class instructors, etc.

10. What is the source of funding for this activity? Check all that apply. N=70

Library operating budget	61	87%
Special one-time funds	10	14%
Grant	3	4%
Other	13	19%

Please describe other source of funding.

Campus funded as part of a campus strategic planning taskforce.

Campus Operations (facilities) supplemented library gift funds to implement the improvements.

Collections – use collections budget.

Foundation funds for survey incentives (donuts).

Gift money.

Kresge Challenge Grant.

MINES® was paid for by the Controller's Office.

Most of the monies are being raised from private donors.

No funds were used; staff on that floor managed the collection and analysis.

No special funding need.

Special one-time funds came from the Office of the Provost; "other" funding came from endowments.

The Foundation for the National Archives raised private funds for the project.

University and fund raising.

ASSESSING THE USER EXPERIENCE

11. What tool(s) did/will your library use to evaluate or inform the user experience? Check all that apply. N=70

Surveys	56	80%
Focus groups	39	56%
Anecdotal comments	29	41%
Suggestion box (physical or online)	25	36%
Usability testing	25	36%
E-mail	24	34%
Social media	18	26%
Design charrettes	15	22%
Furniture trials	13	19%
Instruction session evaluations	13	19%
Online discussion forums/message boards	8	12%
Video diaries	3	4%
Audio diaries	2	3%
Other tool(s)	29	41%

Please specify other tool(s).

Annual statistics on circulation, gate counts, reference and instruction.

Database recording of all reference transactions: type coded by categories, mode of transaction, date and time.

Earlier LibQUAL+® survey comments.

Ethnographic observational studies.

Ethnographic research.

Faculty interviews. Online card sorting.

Had a revolving question of the day on our website asking questions about user experience.

Individual way finding sessions (usability for the physical building).

Interviews.

Interviews, mapping exercise, photo diary.

Mapping diaries, interviews, photo diaries.

Notes and photographs.

Observation survey tool with 52 variables completed by researchers. Interview survey tool. Interviews were audio-taped and researchers took notes during the interviews. Audio-tapes were later transcribed.

Observations.

One-on-one interviews with a consulting anthropologist.

Photo diaries, day mapping, print diaries.

Regular staff observation of space use.

Remote observation.

Student Advisory Group input. Student interns.

This project is not geared toward assessment of a particular service or technology, but is instead focused on helping us to better understand what our UX is and could be.

University of Arizona Teacher Course Evaluation tool and assessment of student learning comparing student competency at the beginning and the end of the course and comparing the abilities of students who took the course to students who did not take the course.

Unobtrusive observation; reference question analysis; Plus Delta.

User interviews were used to develop composite personas that guided user-centered discussions about information architecture and design. Also used an anthropological approach of going to dormitories and observing students as they searched for information.

Videotaped interviews; LibQUAL+®; flip charts with questions and users were asked to write down their answers; consultation with the Library Student Advisory Group; survey tours with photographs.

We conducted focus groups prior to the survey to identify marketing strategies and to raise awareness of the survey and gain support prior to the launch.

We created a Ning called "Collaborate" through which we continually talked with our target audience throughout design and development.

We have used several methods to gather input from our users regarding the renovation. We used white boards placed throughout the library asking various open-ended questions about the renovation. We collected over 1000 comments that were analyzed. Also as part of a class project, students from a graphics design class analyzed the way-finding aspects of the building by observing students who were roaming the stacks looking for items. The students prepared a formal report and presentation outlining their findings and recommendations in the following four areas: signage, interior design, communication points, and maps & floor plans.

We used Morae software to record and analyze the user interviews which captured video and audio of users in process.

Worked with a design engineering class. The renovation was the focus of one of their projects. Individual interviews.

12. Did/will your library send a direct invitation to potential participants or have an open recruitment of library users to participate in this activity or use both methods to recruit participants? N=69

Open recruitment	18	26%
Direct invitation	14	20%
Both	37	54%

13. What tools or outlets did/will your library use to recruit library users to participate in this activity? Check all that apply. N=69

E-mail	49	71%
Library web page	42	61%
User contact from subject specialist/faculty liaisons/bibliographers	41	59%
Posters and/or flyers	36	52%
Social media	19	28%
Giveaways (bookmarks, pens, pencils, etc.)	18	26%
Campus media (newspaper, radio, TV)	18	26%
In-house media (library newsletters, for example)	17	25%
Cover letter attached to survey	15	22%
Local media (newspapers, radio, TV)	2	3%
Other	15	22%

Please specify other tool or outlet.

Announcements to Senate members and Senate Committee members. The current Assessment Librarian is the elected librarians' representative to Senate through 2011.

As we receive critical feedback from users, we typically contact them after we have attempted to improve some issue they addressed. We will invite them to serve as usability test or focus group participants.

Asked for participation by users in the reading room. Graduate student project leader invited classmates to participate.

Electronic signage.

Faculty of Music meetings with all user groups, undergraduate student newsletter in the Faculty of Music.

On-the-spot questions to students in the user spaces.

Partnered with administrators in other units of the university.

Recruited users in the building.

The Library Executive contacted faculty members and team members contacted students.

Those who volunteered after filling out our annual user satisfaction survey.

Used students to recruit participants.

User contact from campus academic advising unit.

Visitor interception at strategic locations throughout the library.

We surveyed every person who left the library during pre-defined times. We recorded every reference question asked.

14. Did/will your library offer any type of incentive to encourage users to participate in the activity?
N=68

Yes	50	73%
No	18	27%

If yes, please indicate the type of incentive. Check all that apply. N=51

Food, drink, and/or candy	31	61%
Gift cards	26	51%
Cash payment	3	6%
Other prize or incentive	11	22%

Please specify other prize of incentive.

Apparel from the university bookstore.

Bookmark or a DVD with interactive games.

Donation to the local food bank for every survey received.

Drawing for a gift card to a local business.

iPad.

MacBooks and iPods – one each for the undergraduate and graduate student categories.

Nooks.

Pizza works with students!

\$20 gift card from campus bookstore, + food service for each 1-hour session.

Thumb drive.

We offered a hand written thank you, and a small token card to the campus coffee shop.

We offered prizes that were donated by local businesses. We also made a small donation to a local food bank for each survey response.

SHARING THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS

15. Did/will the library share the results of the assessment with others (funding/governing boards, users, etc.)? N=69

Yes	58	84%
No	11	16%

If yes, please briefly describe to whom the results are communicated, the method(s) used, and whether the communication method varies by audience.

A written final report was shared with the Library (leadership) Council as well as with Campus Operations. This led to partial funding to implement the recommendations. An executive summary appeared in our Library Annual Report that was shared with campus leadership, donors, etc.

A written summary of results was shared with the in-house Content DM Administrators Group which is responsible for the content on our Digital Collections website. A presentation about the project was given to the Assessment Team and there was brief write-up about the assessment in the staff newsletter.

ALA poster session (poster), library employees (presentations in meetings), university library committee (presentation).

Campus community and campus leadership: communicated through written reports.

Comments obtained through interviews with faculty members were summarized in a Strategic Planning Report created by the architects. The report was shared with a University Space Planning Committee.

Conference presentations (IUG, ALA Annual, and possibly IFLA) as well as an intended article for *Library Trends*.

Data is used in budget presentations to the President's Executive Team; data is also presented to staff. Method varies by audience.

Depending on the assessment it will be shared with users and stakeholders at open meetings or internally through sharing reports.

Faculty Senate Library Committee Council of Academic Deans Libraries' Faculty and Staff Professional Presentations IT Administrators.

Final reports completed by each team and an executive report summarizing most important recommendations written by team chairs in collaboration with Director, Implementation. Reports posted on Libraries and Cultural Resources

web pages and shared with key stakeholders. Teams all provided formal report-back sessions to staff in Libraries and Cultural Resources. Learning Services team shared findings in a presentation to the 5th Canadian Learning Commons Conference.

Hard to answer this question. Some of the results will be directly communicated with the public (we have a “We Heard You” poster campaign every couple of years to highlight what we’ve changed based on LibQUAL+® results, we have written reports of the results, in some cases, we’ve written articles about the various projects). We don’t have to file a report on the activity with a particular office.

Information on the decision-making process and design has been shared broadly throughout the university and governing board.

Information was shared with library staff, colleges, students union, as well as other libraries. This information was shared via meetings and will also be communicated on the library website.

Institutional Research Planning with a report and PowerPoint, if needed.

Library Administrative Council received a full written, as well as oral, report. All library employees received a brief oral report at a Town Meeting. The study report is posted on our intranet where anyone employed by the library can access the full report.

Library Development Advisory Board, Library Renovation Committee, University Faculty Senate Library Committee will be kept informed and/or assessed for ideas by use of meetings, e-mail, correspondence, and possibly videos or CD-ROMs.

Library management council: presentation and written report.

Library of Congress Executive Committee and Management.

Library staff and advisory committee by direct presentation. Results placed in institutional repository for public access.

Library staff, faculty, Deans, Provost, library supporters.

Other institutions have requested information via e-mail. Library administration: via paper report and presentations. Library staff: via presentations at town hall and other group meetings. Development team working on the user interface: via reports and meetings.

Plans are underway to share results via our website and Facebook site.

Presentation of results at professional conferences.

Public website, Annual Report of the University Librarian to Senate, library advisory committees, Planning & Institutional Research (President’s Office), newsletters.

Report is posted on the website/blog. Presentations on campus and at professional meetings.

Reports to the Foundation Board, internal agency reports, using Twitter when new activities are created, alerting workshop participants, etc.

Results are available to library staff in narrative and quantitative form, collected on the Penn library staff web. Results have also been communicated at department head and administrative meetings, as well as public services meetings and forums open to all staff. There is some discussion about publishing the results more broadly, e.g., in an academic article.

Results are communicated to the appropriate user group.

Results are used internally after review by administration. They are e-mailed directly to those who may find them of interest, or who should take action. They are also then posted to our internal intranet for access by other library staff.

Results have been shared with the library administration for inclusion in planning; Faculty of Music Library Council for information; Faculty of Music space planning committee and architects chosen for building redesign and renovations (Music Library is a part of a larger project). A report will be prepared for posting on the Music Library web page.

Results in the form of written reports for the focus groups and surveys were shared with library administrative team and ultimately posted to internal library website for any interested library staff to view. Results were also shared by the Graduate School representative to interested parties in the graduate school administration and by the IT representative to interested parties in the campus IT administration.

Results of the usability testing and survey were shared with the Web Development Committee and the Associate Deans.

Results often show up on our suggestion board but mostly from the results of our efforts, i.e., new lab and new study rooms.

Results shared with Libraries administration and campus administration in report and proposal formats.

Results were communicated to library staff through public meetings and documents posted on the staff intranet.

Shared internally with all relevant committees, who were asked for response reports, posted on our staff web pages for everyone internally and externally to read, shared with our Libraries Advisory Committee of teaching faculty, and included in our annual report.

So far we have shared this only internally with other library departments, but we plan to publish something about it later and perhaps speak at a conference.

Some results were communicated to users via e-mail feedback and a publicly accessible blog. Results were shared with library professionals through conference presentations and published articles.

Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester.

Summary results were shared with participants in the focus groups (faculty, staff, and students). Communication methods varied: information was posted on the library's website; story in the student newspaper; presentations at departmental/faculty meetings/staff meetings.

The Learning Commons design process was mentioned in the annual report and in the faculty newsletter. The story of the Learning Commons has been communicated to donors by the York Foundation. Internal to York media (YFile) has posted stories on the learning commons.

The related graduate school departments. The results will also be presented at various library meetings and conferences.

The results (including actions taken in response to the results) are posted to the library's web page, shared with those who took the survey, and communicated to all library staff, the Library Board (composed of faculty), and the Library Student Resource Group (advisory group of students).

The results are communicated to the advisory board, library leadership, campus leaders, and at the ARL Assessment Conference.

The results have been communicated to the University of Arizona Provost (in-person presentation), to affected instructors in the English Department, the UA Deans Council (in-person presentation), to the library at large (via e-mail), and to the broader academic library community (through conference presentations).

The results of the assessment are communicated to the most senior levels of the university administration via the library's annual report.

The results were shared with all library staff via our internal website and via e-mail. The results were also shared with the Campus Renovation Committee and the University Committee on Libraries. We also shared the results of the white board comments with students on our large screen monitor display.

The survey results were shared with the Dean and University Librarian, the library staff, the Provost, the funding/governing board, library users and planners in the University Architect's Office. Communication methods varied and were targeted to the audience. We prepared both PowerPoints and summary documents. We had open forum meetings with a presentation and a question and answer segment. At times, only specific data was shared with an individual that was relevant to the topic at hand.

The University Librarian will present the Faculty Library Survey Report to the Provost. After that the report will be distributed to deans, faculty, and library staff. Customized reports will be disseminated as appropriate. All dissemination will be electronic.

Through the design program, press releases, and tours with campus administration, we shared the outcomes and the student input with the entire campus in some form or another.

To user community on our website, through faculty advisory committee, through subject liaisons, to Provost, Chancellor and other deans personally.

We did get IRB approval for this study, but the results were only shared internally with the librarians that work in the new space, the head of reference, and the executive team of the library.

We gave a presentation to staff to share results and discuss findings. Next we will post our final report to our public website and shared via the staff intranet. We'll also be holding a series of discussions with staff who are interested in continuing this work and/or incorporating it into another research project.

We have shared the results with Lindsey+Asp as they prepare a PR campaign for us.

We presented the results of both studies to the library community at large. The data and presentations are posted on our library website.

We shared the results with the Provost and incorporated our findings into a larger self-study written for a task force examining potential cost savings due to anticipated budget cuts.

While this project was not really an assessment, we are sharing our work with the library staff and administration. We report on it at all-staff meetings and we recently started a blog where we are sharing ideas and information about the library experience.

DESIGN CHANGES

16. Please briefly describe any design changes that have been/will be made based on this user experience activity. N=63

A few minor enhancements will be incorporated into our website design but most of the more complex findings/recommendations will be incorporated into our next large-scale redesign. Many librarians who do instruction reported

that the findings have greatly influenced how they will now approach how they teach citation management and advanced search techniques (among other things).

A new Undergraduate Learning Commons is being built adjacent to the library. The commons spaces will include many similar features found in the 2nd floor west space. Furthermore, the approach to evaluating the success of this space will be based on the approach taken for evaluating the library's 2nd floor west commons.

Allocation of graduate study spaces; redesigned learning commons space (Woodward Library); website/access improvements. Underway: a follow up survey on graduate student space/equipment needs for Faculty of Arts users; a follow up inventory of "hidden" collections is in progress to improve access. Student learning activities are being documented in a more systematic way through Desk Tracker. A reference service assessment is underway to identify reference activity in a more detailed way (Desk Tracker).

As a result of feedback gained from the surveys, the library has upgraded computer resources and made physical improvements to the facility, including new seating, retiled floors, and the addition of vibrant artwork throughout the main library.

Based on the results of the survey, the Assessment Committee has identified six areas that will be addressed programmatically.

Changed configuration of new reading room. Added Mac classroom. Glass-walled rooms. Furniture choices.

Changed how the service is staffed. We are looking to purchase management software based on the high number of referrals. We are developing a new training and certification program based on results. We are responding to dissatisfaction expressed with a new management structure and unified services (previously dispersed.)

Changed placement and labeling of search tools on web page. Additional explanatory page on different searches.

Collections: print/electronic purchase-on-demand is impacting how the collections budget will be allocated in the future.

Computer lab: collaborative spaces; better lighting; more electrical outlets; comfortable furniture; added software; more computers, specifically laptops and Macs. Study rooms: increased number of rooms; glass wall to increase light and openness; added some color; new carpet; comfortable furniture; white boards; better lighting; several rooms have technology for group project preparation; added two group film viewing rooms; two small classrooms; several rooms now accommodate 8 to 12 users.

Created a Web Board responsible for a total website redesign and rebuild; other user comments have been woven into goals for other service improvements.

Currently in planning stages of a complete building redesign and renovation to meet the needs of the Faculty of Music, a faculty with a growing student base, both undergraduate and graduate. The results of the Music Library Space Use study are being taken seriously by the architects. It is, however, too soon to say what the changes will be for the Music Library.

Design plans changed, e.g., we added more enclosed group study rooms; decreased amount of lounge furniture, increased number of traditional carrels and small tables; allowed for more collection space so that more of the collection remained on open stacks as opposed to in storage.

Hours of opening for one of the branches have changed and potential changes of hours of opening are being considered for other branches. E-mail notification prior to items being due was instituted. Better coordination of borrower services is being looked at. Resource discovery layer is being looked at. Changes to physical space to improve study areas.

Improved remote access. More online journals. Improved signage. More quiet study areas. New library catalog.

Improvements to signage and documentation in our physical spaces are underway. Larger changes involving creating a more uniform experience for all libraries on campus are under discussion.

Informed redesign of components of library website, as well as space and services in Undergraduate Library.

Initial renovation to develop the Research Commons included the addition of whiteboard walls and tables, rolling chairs, and large plasma screens for collaborative work. A new open presentation place provides an area for research presentations, research skills, and grant writing workshops. Campus partner organizations, including writing centers and the UW Center for Commercialization, provide drop-in office hours in the space. The Research Commons increased UW Seattle Libraries reserveable areas for collaborative work 22%, and has been utilized to leverage partnerships with other organizations on campus and thus provide support on issues of copyright, commercialization of research, grant writing, and media literacy. Current assessment, including focus groups, surveys, and consultation with the Research Commons Advisory board, will inform design changes going forward.

Input from attendees influences our service and resource offerings.

It was determined what services to offer in the space, what hours of staffing would be best, and when to offer classes.

Libraries' main website was redesigned, streamlining search, discovery, and access process, and promoting core user tasks as identified through user testing and feedback.

Made some changes to the interface. For example, we increased the font size of search box labels.

Minor adjustments in library building hours and ILL staffing.

New signs will be put in place this summer to help with navigation in the library.

No specific design changes have been made yet. The purpose of the study was to help us understand the needs of our science faculty and students. Collected data will help inform future decisions about our services and collections for these users.

None yet, but I am hoping we'll use our work to fix things that are broken, be they processes, workflows, physical items, or relationships with the user community.

Not yet known.

Our renovation has been put on hold, unfortunately, but the results have made us rethink some of our current thinking regarding the renovation. Once the renovation begins, there will be many design changes based on the input we gathered. We have made some modifications including changing the design of our floor maps based on the recommendation of the students in the graphic design class.

Over the past few years, we've done a number of large and small redesigns of our web page ("digital branch"). We've made changes in our facilities based on focus group feedback (technology in group study rooms, adding power strips to areas to facilitate laptop use with older furniture, etc.)

Physical signage throughout the building was updated, with many new signs made to address the buildings and the user perspective. Additionally, the project caused us to review all language used in the OPAC to describe the physical locations of materials, all of which will be streamlined, updated and made more uniform.

Radically re-envisioned and re-modeled spaces.

Reassignment of some spaces in our multimedia area to accommodate class viewing of feature film. Provided additional evidence to increase urgency of redesign of web presence. Reorganization influenced by findings, especially the need to

reorganize expert staff to better support the research enterprise. Helped clarify for staff how the newly designed facility will support new approaches to learning and research. Access Services and Reference Service workflows are in the process of being redesigned to improve the user experience.

Redesign of the website.

Relevant, effective changes to previous design and structure; more user-friendly interface; more logical arrangement of information for audience.

Renovation of main library facility, including student study areas and a cafe.

Results have been used to support renovations and improvements to physical facilities, the acquisition of Summon, and the acquisition of an ERMS, as well as to establish usability testing of the website.

Several features of the renovation were based on these activities. Furniture design and noise abatement features are two of the most prominent.

Still analyzing data from this survey.

Subject to available funding, research and analysis is in process to implement some of the results identified in the survey.

Survey results informed facilities changes and helped to address the need for a variety of study spaces for students, including quiet study areas. It resulted in modifications to the library web page and our online access tools. We revised and strengthened our student training program to enhance our students' abilities to provide quality service.

The architect's design of the Learning Commons and colors used were informed by the affinity focus groups, as well as concerns raised in LibQUAL+® 2007. The furniture selection and placement was informed by student feedback.

The course has been revised based on feedback and is being marketed specifically to a group of students (Arizona Assurance students) who have been identified as specifically needing to acquire information literacy/fluency competencies in order to help them succeed.

The design changes are still in process but will include installing more outlets, adding group study rooms, and additional comfortable seating.

The home page for the Digital Collections website was redesigned to incorporate drop down menus for all browsing categories. Also the Advanced Search feature is now available from the top-level page and there is an example of how to use the wild card feature.

The library has acquired new printers with greater capacity; additional databases and new titles for both reference and general circulation.

The library's website was simplified.

The performance support and web redesign studies resulted in many changes to the website. For example, the homepage was tabbed to reduce visual clutter, a tab highlighting services provided by librarians was created (amongst other things), and a "Haven't found what you're looking for" box was added to the bottom of each page to provide a safety net for users who've dead-ended on the site.

The project began as a complete redesign of the online catalog's user interface. UX activities are ongoing, however, and we are committed to an iterative design process.

The renovation and creation of a 24-hour library space was directly influenced by the results of this study.

There have been several changes made based on the two studies. We reduced the number of tabs as many users reported that they didn't understand the difference between them. We redesigned the entire search resources box on the home page to better highlight the key resources. The investigation of the federated articles search interface resulted in a task force being formed to determine whether we should move to web scale discovery. We are now in the process of implementing Summon based on the decision of this task force.

These assessment activities greatly shaped the design and furniture selections of the first phase of the Learning Studio. It also impacted the need for an expanded cafe and the types of services offered within the studio.

This activity is too recent for changes to be seen. The task force will submit their report and recommendations for action will derive from the report.

Too early yet for this.

User feedback directly affected the development of the new OPAC. User comments and suggestions have led to the development of, for example, specific search facets, the layout of the site, and how search results are displayed.

Users helped clarify terminology, subject groupings, overall design (use fewer words, more graphics), simpler navigation/flatter organization; more prominent search features.

We added 80 new electrical outlets and provided wiring to 36 individual study carrels. We added a few more fixed computers and a print station. We purchased 15 tablet-arm chairs and 10 individual study tables. We decided NOT to install display cases in the room after the focus group participants indicated this was definitely not desired.

We are in the process of conducting further studies of the least used service points (by time and place) to decide whether to close them or to revitalize them.

We expect to alter physical arrangements of reference, circulation, services departments/units and student computer space. We might also relocate the building's public entrances, loading dock, and Starbuck's entrance.

We have changed our performance management system based on the results of ClimateQUAL®. We are in the process of analyzing our LibQUAL+® data.

We have created a new coffee shop, upgraded furniture, changed library borrowing policies, changed collection practices (e.g., purchasing additional e-books), and pursued new services (e.g., consortial borrowing, paging).

We rely on user testing to design any web interface and we will modify programming of search appliances and API s based on testing.

When the economy improves and funding becomes available, work may begin on a Research Commons.

17. How would you characterize the impact of these changes on the user experience? N=63

Minor modification(s) to the existing design	25	40%
Major modification(s) to the existing design	15	24%
Complete redesign	12	19%
Other	11	18%

Please describe other impact.

It could be major, but there are some contingencies that will affect the outcome.

More of a mix. Some of the findings still need to be fleshed out more with other studies. Some problems witnessed are too big for any single change to solve, some are pretty quick fixes.

Most of the time we will make modifications, but often we design and test as we go along.

Project began as a complete redesign of the online catalog's user interface. We continue to make modifications based on continuing user feedback, usability studies, and a list of redesign projects that could not be completed before the initial launch of the new interface.

Selected issues that surfaced in the survey and focus groups that could be attended to without additional funding were addressed. However, the original purpose of the activity was to collect data to be used in creating a Research Commons.

The immediate impact is visible in the redesigned/renovated user spaces. Some of the longer-term projects have not been assessed yet because the data gathering is underway now.

This was a new space, so it was great to start from a user-centered services point. As the space develops, we will want to do additional focus groups over time, to make sure that we are still making the mark.

Too early for specifics.

Unknown at this point in time, but we are hopeful we will see improvements.

We are in the process of making decisions based on the feedback collected. The purpose was not to redesign a specific website or service desk, but was to help inform future decisions about library support for the sciences generally.

While we don't have specific examples, LibQUAL+® and ClimateQUAL® have changed the mindset of upper management to be cognizant of how the current environment is negatively impacting the user experience.

If you want to describe a second user experience activity, please continue to the next screen. If not, please click here then click the Next>> button below to jump to the User Groups and Advisory Boards section.

Only one user experience activity to describe. N=19

USER EXPERIENCE ACTIVITY 2

18. What broad aspect of the user's library experience was the activity trying to assess and/or design?
Check all that apply. N=51

Library technology (website usability, navigation)	32	63%
Library facilities (space configuration, navigation)	23	45%
Library services (ILL, reference, instruction, etc.)	20	39%
Library resources (search and discovery, collections, formats)	20	39%
Other aspect	6	12%

Please describe other aspect.

Context, Staff, Equipment.

Gather data on the users of the Info Commons in Langsam Library.

Marketing tool for reference services.

Regular meetings with student governance and advisory boards to assess needs and build support for student fee increases.

The role of the libraries and readiness to partner in support of new forms of digital scholarship in the humanities.

19. Please briefly describe the scope of the activity. N=50

A librarian and a member of the Center for Instructional Technology did an intensive study on the Cultural Anthropology department. They employed methods used at the University of Minnesota to interview each individual faculty member. They also held focus groups with graduate students. The goal of the study was to better understand the research process for these more intensive scholars, as well as to form a strong working relationship between the library and this department.

A task force was formed as a partnership between KU Libraries, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Hall Center for Humanities (a research center). Through an 18-month series of meetings, focus groups, survey, and site visits we assessed readiness to develop a more formalized support system for digital humanities research.

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is an established organizational development theory based on the belief that organizations change in the way they inquire (Cooperrider & Srivastava, 1987). In other words, you become what you study. As such, appreciating what is exemplary in an organization will lean an organization to discover how to create more excellence. The Business Library undertook this process starting with the engagement of two consultants who conducted focus groups with participants, including faculty members, students, and staff. Through stories and exploring themes, participants shared what was most successful about the library and how they envisioned this success could be extended into the future. These focus groups not only provided useful data, but were also a great way to publicly discuss the successes of the library and to engage stakeholders in positive conversation.

Brief survey distributed annually about specialized library services provided by one of our libraries.

Card sort analysis of library research and subject guides. RIOT- Information Literacy Tutorial.

Comparative, task-based usability study of current library website and revision prototypes.

Customer Satisfaction Survey continuously available on our website.

Facilities: observational studies were conducted to see how students currently use spaces. Results of study were combined with service-related metrics to determine what new furniture to purchase.

Faculty Journal Study: This was an in-depth analysis of LibQUAL+® data from across years and ARL institutions, to better understand faculty perceptions of journal collections. Individual phone interviews were also conducted with faculty on campus to gather more information about journal use and satisfaction with collections.

Graduate student focus groups.

"How do you love us?" Valentine's Day Raffle.

In 2002 and 2006, the UIC University Library participated in the LibQUAL+® Total Service Quality survey. In addition to providing comparable assessment information from peer institutions, the LibQUAL+® surveys compiled UIC library patron feedback on service quality. The surveys highlighted a need for greater access to technology and overall improvements to library facilities.

In progress. Study of graduate student needs to assist in creation of a general graduate study area as well as services targeted specifically at PhD students.

In the fall of 2009, we conducted usability tests of our new homepage and two newly redesigned websites, one about scholarly publishing and the other a new site for the Rotch Library of Architecture & Planning.

In the spring of 2009, the Penn Libraries began a new strategic planning effort. As part of an extensive environmental scan and information-gathering phase, we hired a consultant to facilitate a series of focus groups with university faculty and graduate students across disciplines. These focus groups were designed to examine their conceptions of "the library"; to explore their work habits and teaching, research, and study behaviors; and probe their attitudes towards training in information and technology proficiency.

LibQUAL+® survey will be administered this semester.

LibQUAL+® survey.

Re-architecting of Libraries web presence.

Redesigned the entry floor of the undergraduate library to encourage usage of student's own laptops as we planned to remove most of the library's public computers.

Setting up of a Library Student Advisory Group (LSAG) in 2009.

Student competition to redesign the main floor of the library and to make suggestions about the layout and use of services on other floors as well.

Student Information Seeking Behaviors study including faculty interviews and website evaluation.

Survey of all instruction activity conducted throughout organization.

Survey happens every two years. In 2009, the survey was done March 30 through April 5th. The survey was distributed to patrons entering the building at selected hours each day during the week.

The Dean of Libraries and selected team leaders regularly meet with the officers and library advisory boards Associated Students of the University of Arizona (primarily undergraduate) and the Graduate and Professional Students Council. They are provided with information about LibQUAL+® results and other student needs assessment activities that have identified areas of high importance or dissatisfaction along with some possible changes in or additions to the library's services. The students give feedback, identify additional services or resources that they think are needed, and together the group identifies priorities for use of the income from student fee and priorities for implementation if the fee is increased.

The Info Commons @ Langsam Survey is an annual survey conducted since 2002 during a one-week period in spring quarter. The purpose of the survey is to get more information about our users, how they use our libraries and our resources, and their satisfaction with our service.

The Libraries sought to increase the accessibility and findability of its collection through the use of a new discovery interface tool.

The library engaged in many assessments around the creation of a new catalog interface.

The library website user needs project aims to collect information on the current usability of our website navigation, terminology, and content in order to improve it. It also aims to collect information on user needs, user preferences, and user terminology to plan for new user requirements, new information architecture, and new navigation.

To create an entry point to library resources for every course on campus, to tailor the content of each course as much as possible, and to provide a scalable and sustainable system to deliver this content to students.

University Archives and Rare Books & Special Collections Survey. The survey examined user satisfaction in these two branches with four services: facilities, staff services, website, and finding aids, in addition to gathering information on general usage and user demographics. Anyone who had used the services in the past was invited to complete the survey.

Usability studies of the library's website.

Usability testing.

Usability testing of library website to facilitate redesign. Tested several times over the course of the project.

Usability testing of new website.

We are currently assessing library branch usage and needs for a particular clientele group.

We are renovating a large space in O'Neill Library and also in the process are rethinking how and what service should happen at a single service point. Eventually, I think this desk will be seen as a starting point for all campus services.

We asked the student advisory board to divide into small groups and use Flip cameras to identify areas around the library that needed improvement. The groups were assigned various floors and asked to both film and narrate what improvements needed to be made.

We conducted a poll on our library's main web page to determine what mobile devices people use for accessing the library's website.

We conducted a website usability study.

We have conducted several usability studies of the library's catalog, web pages, and physical spaces.

We observe students and faculty using our website to conduct several common tasks.

We performed 15 (1/2 hour) card-sorting sessions with a mix of graduate students and undergrads to inform the language used on the primary tabs of our library home page, and the structure of those tabs. Participants rearranged, ranked, and renamed the tabs to help us to understand what makes the most sense to them.

We recently finished a semester long project to conduct a series of evaluations on our library catalog. Each phase had a different goal: have an open discussion with library staff to discuss what is working and what isn't; to do an overall assessment (heuristic evaluation) to find problem areas; to gauge satisfaction with searching overall vs. known item searches vs. subject searches; to fine-tune labels used to describe items that have full text available; to test proposed functionality changes.

We recently held a week-long thesis camp for senior honors students in collaboration with the Writing Center and the Center for Undergraduate Scholarly Engagement. The program fit in very well with one of the major goals of the College of Arts & Letters to "increase the intensity and sophistication of our undergraduate education" and is a good example of reaching out to users based on their activities and needs.

We used a short in-person survey with students to gather feedback on tabletop signage that promoted our reference services.

We worked with a class to redesign and renovate a branch library in the business school. The class used the library as a case study and we implemented selected recommendations from all of the case studies submitted.

Website redesign.

Website redesign and development of LibGuides.

Whole redesign of new service. Bringing together Data Resources Library, Serge A. Sauer Map Library, and Government Publications service into one service.

20. Is the target of the activity any typical library user or a specific category of user (e.g., faculty, graduate students, etc.)? N=51

Any user	23	45%
A specific category of user	28	55%

If you answered "A specific category of user," please identify the category.

Faculty and graduate student users.

Faculty and graduate students in the cultural anthropology department.

Faculty and graduate students in the humanities.

Faculty, graduate students, and staff in particular departments.

Four types of users: graduates, undergraduates, librarians, and faculty.

Graduate students.

Graduate, undergraduate, faculty.

Pediatric residents.

PhD students and more generally grad students.

Primarily students.

Primarily undergraduates.

Senior honors students.

Students.

Students.

Students enrolled in courses and faculty.

Students using the library's group tables in the learning commons.

Students were the primary focus.

Those involved with the school of business.

Undergraduate and graduate students.

Undergraduate and graduate/professional students.

Undergraduate students.

Undergraduate students (with small number of graduate students also taking part).

Undergraduates.

Undergraduates.

Undergraduates and graduate students.

We choose participants representing faculty, undergraduates, graduate students, distance education, and foreign exchange students.

We targeted undergraduates, graduates, and faculty in equal measure.

21. What is the source of funding for this activity? Check all that apply. N=50

Library operating budget	46	92%
Special one-time funds	5	10%
Grant	1	2%
Other	6	12%

Please describe other source of funding.

Co-op funding for Co-op student (SLAIS graduate student).

Funds from College and Hall Center.

Library IT money.

No special funding was necessary.

There were also contributions from other support units and academic departments.

We used Survey Monkey and contributed staff time to design, implement, and compile the data.

ASSESSING THE USER EXPERIENCE

22. What tool(s) did/will your library use to evaluate or inform the user experience? Check all that apply. N=51

Surveys	27	53%
Focus groups	24	47%
Usability testing	21	41%
Anecdotal comments	16	31%
Suggestion box (physical or online)	9	18%
E-mail	5	10%
Design charrettes	4	8%
Social media	4	8%
Furniture trials	3	6%
Audio diaries	2	4%
Instruction session evaluations	2	4%
Video diaries	1	2%
Online discussion forums/message boards	1	2%
Other tool(s)	15	29%

Please specify other tool(s).

Analysis of existing data. Phone interviews.

Individual card-sorting sessions.

Interviews with participants were recorded and transcribed for analysis and use in writing the final report.

Interviews—both student and faculty—photo diary, mapping exercise, web page redesign activity.

Log file analysis.

Site visits to other institutions.

Some students contacted the library re. class assignments where they had to assess a process on campus. Some students chose to work on library space planning and reported their findings to the library administration.

The library-wide LibQUAL+® survey did not suffice as an indicator of service quality for the smaller, specialized collections, such as University Archives and Rare Books and Special Collections. This new survey reached the intended audience more effectively.

Usage data.

Use statistics for electronic resources and the online catalog (The CAT).

Use statistics analysis of log files & using Google Analytics. Informal "budget" usability testing methods. Heuristic evaluation. Staff feedback discussion.

We also interviewed participants after they had completed the usability study.

We have ongoing involvement of students in assessment of the website through a class assignment from an Information and Computer Sciences professor.

We worked with a class to redesign and renovate a branch library in the business school. The class used the library as a case study and we implemented selected recommendations from all of the case studies submitted.

23. Did/will your library send a direct invitation to potential participants or have an open recruitment of library users to participate in this activity or use both methods to recruit participants? N=51

Open recruitment	16	31%
Direct invitation	14	28%
Both	21	41%

24. What tools or outlets did/will your library use to recruit library users to participate in this activity? Check all that apply. N=51

E-mail	32	63%
Library web page	29	57%
User contact from subject specialist/faculty liaisons/bibliographers	22	43%
Posters and/or flyers	18	35%
In-house media (library newsletters, for example)	17	33%
Giveaways (bookmarks, pens, pencils, etc.)	12	24%
Social media	12	24%
Cover letter attached to survey	6	12%

Campus media (newspaper, radio, TV)	5	10%
Local media (newspapers, radio, TV)	1	2%
Other	20	39%

Please specify other tools or outlets.

Agenda item at student advisory board meeting.

Class assignments for an Information & Computer Sciences class.

Contact with student groups on campus.

Department chair recruited candidates at faculty meeting.

Direct contact with relevant constituents.

Discussion with leaders in stakeholder areas to identify key participants.

Electronic signage.

E-mail addresses retrieved from circulation records.

For one study, we approached students as they entered the library, offering Hershey bars in exchange for their time filling in a quick survey about what they did while in the library that day.

Graduate Student Organization helped with initial recruitment.

In-person recruiting in high traffic areas.

On home page and 12 other library web pages.

Project website as well as library home page.

Students recruiting participants.

Students within a specific course.

Table set up in lobby to recruit volunteers.

The Dean of Libraries consulted with other deans and student offices for assistance in identify potential participants.

We call this a “guerilla” survey, where staff rove throughout the learning commons areas and ask students to engage with them about a topic, in this case a small placard promoting our services.

Word of mouth.

Worked closely with campus colleagues who run learning management systems and train faculty in their use (helped market to faculty).

25. Did/will your library offer any type of incentive to encourage users to participate in the activity?
N=51

Yes	34	67%
No	17	33%

If yes, please indicate the type of incentive. Check all that apply. N=34

Food, drink, and/or candy	19	56%
Gift cards	17	50%
Cash payment	3	10%
Other prize or incentive	4	13%

Please specify other prize or incentive.

Each test taken allowed users an additional entry for a chance to win an iPad or an iTouch.

Food service for 1/2-hour sessions.

iPod Touch 8GB (quantity 5).

Lunch is provided at the advisory board meetings.

SHARING THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS

26. Did/will the library share the results of the assessment with others (funding/governing boards, users, etc.)? N=50

Yes	45	90%
No	5	10%

If yes, please briefly describe to whom the results are communicated, the method(s) used, and whether the communication method varies by audience. N=43

A brief overview of the results was presented at the 2010 Special Libraries Association Conference and a paper published in that conference's proceedings. Presented methodology and findings to Libraries and Cultural Resources Senior Leadership Team.

A final report was written summarizing the results of the interviews. The report was shared widely within the library and with the Cultural Anthropology department. Presentations have also been made at a local conference, the ARL assessment conference, and a poster was presented at another national conference.

All library staff, but primarily to Public Services Steering Committee, Virtual Access Committee, Web Program Director, Library Planning Council, and the Administrative Committee. Results were also shared with Library Board and Library Student Resource Group.

Brief results will be shared through the project website.

Following any big project we hold an open presentation for staff to discuss findings. We also put our final reports on our website. For this particular project, the group that conducted the work reports to a high level committee so results are also shared with that group.

Information has been shared broadly throughout the university and with governing board.

Internally and only with other librarians at a conference and in a published paper.

Libraries website - news feed e-mail to Faculty of Social Science primary users, Western Libraries staff, and university administration. Attended Department of Geography Faculty Council for presentation to answer questions.

Library administrators, Collections Associate University Librarian, Library Advisory Board, Library/Archives staff.

Plans are underway to share the information via our website and Facebook site.

Presentations at conferences (Virginia Library Association, Library Assessment Conference) and library staff meetings. Reports to library administration. Report to Information Technology and Communication division. Report to students who participated in project. Article in student daily newspaper.

Presentations to staff will be the major method.

Presentations will be made to Provost and Deans, faculty senate, student government groups, and departmental faculty. Provost.

Public posted results on web, held several forums.

Reports available internally via Sakai site; presentations to internal and advisory groups; included in annual reports, reports on improvements, and other administrative reports; news items.

Results are communicated to staff through public meetings and the staff intranet. Results are analyzed within each broad department area.

Results have gone to administration. Thereafter, they will be e-mailed to our web office and others for whom they may be of interest. They will likely also be discussed by our library-wide group of web editors who will be charged with considering, and possibly making, the appropriate changes.

Results of the survey were shared with the designer of the sign and our communications director.

Results were communicated to focus group participants, to a graduate and professional student organization on campus, and to all standing faculty via a Penn Libraries newsletter edition devoted entirely to the strategic plan and planning process.

Results were presented at a conference. They were also shared verbally at the library's monthly management meeting and with the Chair of the Pediatrics Department.

Results were presented to library staff, Management Committee, the Collections and Services Directors, etc. Results were presented at the Library Assessment Conference 2010. Results will be shared with faculty once an action plan has been developed.

Results were shared with the library staff and the University Committee on Libraries.

Results will be communicated back to the departments and up to the Provost. There will likely be a campus newspaper article on the results.

Results will be communicated through professional presentation and/or publication, as well as through presentation to campus student advisory group.

Results will be shared with the university administration.

Select comments shared with advisory boards.

Students involved in the website assessment through their class assignment produce a report of the results, which is shared with future classes.

Study is not fully analyzed yet, but the Library Administrative Council will receive both a written and oral report. A briefer report will be presented in the library's Town Meeting. The study will be posted on the library intranet for any library employee to examine.

The Graduate School will receive a report on what we find are the biggest needs for PhD students.

The library website is being redesigned by The Office of Information Services & Technology and Creative Services. The library has communicated the results of the focus groups and usability testing to these groups.

The Penn State community through our Newswire, social media, Libraries' internal newsletter *Interview*.

The report was widely distributed to the campus through various media outlets following presentation to the Deans of the Libraries and College, Director of the Hall Center, and the Provost.

The resulting information is shared with the university administration (president and provost), the Library Cabinet (administrative group), and with specific teams affected and with all library staff. Memos (e-mail), written reports, and in-person communication are used with the university administration. In-person reports from the Dean are made to Library Cabinet and team leaders of targeted teams. E-mail and reports at all staff meetings are used to inform all library staff.

The results were published on an open website, as is our practice for all usability tests. We also sometimes speak at conferences and publish papers about our results.

The results were shared with the library facility manager.

The results will be shared in a journal of library and information science.

Varied by audience: direct contact, articles in library publications (internal and external), and presentations at conferences.

We have reported on LSAG activities on a semi-annual basis at the Library Council, and in the online faculty newsletter. We have reported on LSAG in the Libraries' Annual Report.

We shared this data with the Dean and University Librarian, our library staff, and the Provost. The data helps us to better understand our users, their needs, and to inform changes to our services and facilities. Communication methods varied and were targeted to the audience. Summary documents were shared. At times only specific data was shared with an individual that was relevant to the topic at hand.

We will share the results when the competition is completed.

DESIGN CHANGES

27. Please briefly describe any design changes that have been/will be made based on this user experience activity. N=47

A mobile site was designed to work on the devices that we discovered were used most frequently from doing the poll.

Adjustments were made to the Business Library's physical space, including replacing tables with modular furniture that could accommodate a variety of group sizes. Developed an improved delineation between quiet and collaborative spaces. Adjusted the Business Library website to make it more interactive, incorporate social media, and to increase awareness of services offered.

An area that had been planned for staff offices was reclaimed for student study with public services and technology staff on the perimeter of the study space. Group study rooms were added.

An Institute for Digital Research in the Humanities has been established with seed funding for two years. The home for the institute is within the KU Libraries' Center for Digital Scholarship. The co-directors are a librarian and a faculty member from the humanities.

Better way finding. Cleaner restrooms. Customer service training. Best Practices for Services.

Changed the signage, improved access procedures, reduced noise, reviewed policies (e.g., copying), followed up with further analysis of user groups.

Changes have been made in training our Peer Mentors to best meet the needs of the undergraduates. Understanding user needs has helped inform the work of the librarians. Changes have been made to the library website and to what is emphasized in library instruction classes. The survey results have also informed and supported facilities improvements such as varied study spaces (including support to create a 24/7 space in the library), spaces for laptops, and more electric to support laptops.

Complete redesign of library home page, investment in new integrative search tools (e.g., Ebsco's Discovery Services), changes to library catalogs, and new signage throughout buildings.

Complete redesign. So far have merged Data and Map resources and services to one location with the aim of better coordinated service delivery. Further implementation pending funding announcements.

Complete website redesign.

Continual improvement of library website and LibGuides to improve usefulness and usability.

Don't know yet.

Graffiti was removed in areas of the library that staff do not normally use (student study carrels).

Integration of the product into different learning technology systems in use on campus; adjustments in content, features, and design of the site. For the future: adding support for distance education classes, addressing specialized needs of science and technology majors, integrating faculty-suggested content customization, and providing more entry points into the system.

Library space layouts will change. Some spaces (e.g., collaborative study) will be enhanced with technology. More electrical outlets have been added to all the libraries.

Lots of minor changes. One thing that has come up before but we'll finally be addressing is that users are obviously searching the library catalog for individual articles (which it does not currently do). Short-term solution will be to add a message at top of search results, "Looking for articles? Try ArticlesPlus search!"

Major changes to structure.

More group study and quiet spaces, more wireless, more e-resources and e-services, better equipment (scanning/copying, computers/printers).

No changes as of yet because the competition is still in progress.

No changes have been made based on survey results.

None thus far, though once the results have been reviewed more widely, changes may be made to the design of our homepage and the language used there.

Over the past few years we have made iterative changes to the library's website based on the results of the focus groups and usability testing. The website is now being redesigned and the library has shared the user feedback with the designers.

Overhauled how facets are presented in the service (placement, number offered, field values) and we modified the search; other interface changes.

Redesign of website and supporting subject pages.

Renovation in O'Neil. Redesign of website (look and feel) adding content, working with campus instructional designers. Rethinking how bibliographers engage with departments, faculty, and students.

Renovation of one section of information commons area, with improved hardware and more robust suite of software/applications.

Results from these focus groups informed the major emphases of the Penn Libraries' strategic plan.

Several improvements were made to each of the three sites tested.

Signage will be redesigned to incorporate student feedback.

Significant changes to content, organization, and interactivity supported through library website.

Still compiling results, but will probably make changes in the website and in the physical landscape of the library buildings.

Subject guides results will be used to spark a library-wide discussion on design. RIOT will be revised based on faculty and student feedback.

The complete renovation of a branch library.

The experience has been eye opening, we have had good discussions with the group and they have given us useful feedback. They are contributing to development of our upcoming mobile-ready web pages; they helped with the development of library learning zones (quiet study, etc.); food policy changes, the design of the new catalogue interface. The LSAG has also participated in the planning, promotion, and hosting of the Learning Commons Opening.

The Libraries have recently completed a document that shifts the role of subject librarians from a collections focused model to engagement focused. This survey was seen as a model for how subject librarians might evaluate their departments to better understand the services the library can offer in order to partner in their research process. Several

librarians have embarked on similar surveys of their assigned departments and have discovered new methodologies to uncover interesting findings.

The overall concept for the redesigned website was directly influenced by usability testing as were many, many smaller design decisions.

The project is the first phase of a full library website redesign. We expect it to impact our information architecture, navigation menus, preferred language, site features (e.g., gateways), and sub-site creation.

The study is not analyzed enough to determine findings and recommendations or to receive approval for implementation.

The website had a complete redesign to make it more accessible, up-to-date, and responsive to user needs. Continued review and formal usability testing to be held this spring will further improve the website.

There were major modifications to the layout of the floor. Many outlets were added, seating was replaced, new tables with different configurations were added, space was reallocated, and we acquired a fish tank.

These surveys served as a catalyst for deeper assessment activities and, ultimately, also contributed to the library's recent technology upgrades and facilities improvements.

We are looking at addressing three aspects of journal services in response to the data: outreach, interface design, collection development.

We are making immediate short-term simple fixes as well as developing in the long-term a completely new website based on our findings.

We have increased the number and variety of equipment that we provide for check out by library users. We have increased the number of group study rooms. We have added carrels that graduate students can "check out" for short-term use. We have added presentation practice rooms and equipment.

We received further justification for a graduate study room and a better understanding of the type of space and services that should be included. PhD focus groups will assist in the creation of services targeted at PhD students.

We redesigned the website and have since made minor modifications based on feedback.

We will decide which branch to close and ways to mitigate the closure on the most effected users.

27. How would you characterize the impact of these changes on the user experience? N=44

Major modification(s) to the existing design	17	39%
Minor modification(s) to the existing design	11	25%
Complete redesign	8	18%
Other	8	18%

Please describe other impact.

Depending on the issue, some major changes and some minor.

Development of a new product, with major modifications in the iterations as a result of users' suggestions.

New design.

Not sure at this time.

Partial: we weren't able to make all changes because the project is not finished.

Since this is an ongoing endeavor, we have used the information for a complete redesign, but currently, we are using the information for minor modifications.

The changes we make may seem minor, but they help to create a more user-friendly environment in the learning commons where student feedback is taken into account as we develop our communication strategies.

This was an entirely new design.

USER GROUPS AND ADVISORY BOARDS

28. Does your library consult with any user groups or advisory boards (such as the Student Government Association, campus academic departments, community organizations, a Student Advisory Board, Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries, or Community Advisory Group) to design, conduct, or analyze user experience assessment activities, or to recommend or implement design changes?

N=69

Yes	56	81%
No	13	19%

If yes, please identify up to three groups that consult with the library on the user experience and briefly describe the composition of the group, the role it plays, and representative outcomes achieved through the library's engagement with the group.

Group 1 N=53

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Advisory Committee on Library Policy (ACLP)	Faculty, university and library administrators, current students	Meets occasionally to hear reports and updates about the library, and provides advice on policy questions under consideration.	ACLP advice has occasionally affected library programs, priorities, and budget issues.
Chapman Learning Commons Student Advisory Committee	Students, library staff. Students include student senators, reps from student societies, and students at large.	Provide feedback on programs, services, and spaces.	A valuable asset to the library in soliciting and receiving feedback to improve programs, services, spaces.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
College library committees	Includes the branch library head and faculty members in colleges	To advise the branch head of changes in curriculum, research, etc and desired changes in service.	Ongoing relationship with branch library, responsive library service.
Faculty Library Advisory Committee	Associate Vice Provost and faculty with Library Dean	Communicate faculty concerns and Dean's. Dean can discuss trends and issues relevant to university library.	Dean has a platform for speaking to faculty.
Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries	Faculty members elected to serve two-year appointments	Advise and support.	Regular meetings, gathering input and support.
Faculty Senate Library and Information Resources Committee	Faculty appointed to the committee by the Faculty Senate	Advise the library, provide feedback on planned activities, and communicate library activities to the Faculty Senate.	Advise the library and communicate endorsement of planned activities to the Faculty Senate.
Faculty Senate Library Committee	Faculty	Advises University Librarian.	
Faculty Senate Library Committee	Dean of Libraries, library representative, and faculty from across campus	Advisory	
Faculty Senate Library Committee	Faculty members and library administrators	Serve as a channel for regular communication between the faculty and library.	Keep faculty up to date on library issues and challenges; gain support from faculty for library initiatives; improve services based on faculty feedback.
First Year Advisory Board	10 first-year students with diverse demographics, dormitories, and intended majors	Offer ideas and opinions on projects or changes the library is considering. Suggest changes based on their experience.	Helping library to reframe first year orientation. Working with library on planning and presenting a movie on the quad. Participating in renovation planning for library most used by first year students. Added additional whiteboards based on their suggestions.
General Faculty Council Library and Cultural Resources Committee	Faculty, graduate student, and student representation named by the university's General Faculties Council	To advise Libraries and Cultural Resources on needs of academic users.	
Graduate and Professional Student Assembly	Penn graduate and professional students	To represent the concerns and advocate on the behalf of all graduate students at Penn.	Changes to new OPAC design, creation of strategic emphases and initiatives.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Graduate and Professional Student Library Advisory Committee	Graduate and professional students	Advisory on library services and policies, including proposed changes.	Input, reaction, discussion, illumination.
Graduate and Professional Students Council	Five elected officers, elected representatives from all University of Arizona colleges, and two support staff	In relation to the library, GPSC advises us on the needs of graduate students and priorities for use of the student fee.	Support for increases in student library fee (which is bundled with the campus IT fee) and identification of priorities for its use.
Indiana University Bloomington Faculty Council Library Committee	Faculty	Advisory, advocate, evaluator	Ongoing
Institutional Review Board	Faculty from various disciplines across campus	To ensure human subjects are "treated with dignity, adequately protected from risk and harm, and voluntarily give informed consent to participate in research."	Approval to proceed with research projects.
Libraries Committee	Representatives of academic faculty and staff from diverse disciplines/areas	To provide suggestions for initiatives; to provide feedback for ongoing development.	Information is shared with various UX staff to implement or investigate further.
Library Advisory Board	Alumni, donors, members of the community	Advisory council to the Kelvin Smith Library	
Library Affairs Advisory Committee	Faculty, students, administrators	To advise the Dean.	
Library Policy Advisory Committee	Faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate	Advice on surveys, focus group, testers.	Faculty view and input on library matters. Improved services to faculty and graduate students.
Library Student Advisory Board	30–40 undergraduate students and 2–4 graduate students, OIT staff representative, Library Dean, head of Public Services, User Experience team, Circulation representative	To provide ideas and suggestions for both short-term and strategic changes to the library collections, facilities, operations, and services.	Ideas suggested by students on the advisory board often become reality over time. Furthermore, their input can be communicated directly to the library administration (head of Public Services and Library Dean) at Board meetings.
Library Student Advisory Committee	Students of all classifications	Advise the library on policies, procedures, and planning.	Ideas integrated into strategic planning as well as into our foundation work.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Library Student Resource Group	Representative group of students from college, graduate programs, and professional schools	Advise library on user needs and communicate information about library to peers.	Provided input on survey, recommended changes to library renewal policies, etc.
Rutgers University Libraries Advisory Committee	Teaching faculty and administrators from student life, university press, and continuous education	"...to provide advice to the University Librarian to ensure that the programs, services, and collections of the University Libraries meet the research, instruction, and service priorities of the community."	Information sharing and advice.
Senate Committee on Libraries	Faculty and students	Advisory	Supported recommended changes.
Senate Library Committee	12 faculty and professional staff and 4 students	Advisory/consultative	Provide recommendations to the University Senate.
Student Advisory Board	Students, both undergraduate and graduate	Advisory on a variety of library services.	Improved services and user satisfaction.
Student Advisory Board	Open to any interested student	Provide input on programs and services.	Gives students a voice; they have provided valuable perspectives on priorities related to technology and facilities.
Student Advisory Board	Students from various colleges	Provides student input on services, resources, facilities.	Varies depending on input.
Student Advisory Board (undergraduate) - Relates to Activity 1	Approximately 9 students	Evaluation furniture, design	Affirmed that we are moving in the right direction.
Student Advisory Committee	Undergraduate and graduate students	Advisory	Hours changed; furniture changed; vending machines changed.
Student Advisory Group	Students and library staff	Student-driven library concerns are raised.	Hopefully, changes made.
Student Government		The Dean communicates with this group.	
Student Government Association (SGA)	Comprised of elected undergraduate representatives, SGA is the official representative group of all undergraduate students attending UC.	Partnered with the Libraries and UC IT to secure funding for a 24/7 space in the library.	24/7 study/computer space created in the library along with a quiet study area.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Student Library Advisory Board (SLAB)	Ten or more graduate and undergraduate students that broadly represent the academic programs and overall diversity of the UNC student body	Provide feedback and advice on library services and resources in support of both grad and undergrad student study and research needs.	
Student Library Committee	Student representatives from the three major campus student government organizations	Advisory and advocacy	Advise on services and collections.
Student Representative Roundtable	Vice-President Students and Student Representative of the York University Board of Governors co-chair, and they appoint the membership which consists of the Chair of Senate, students, student support providers and reps from student government.	The SRR provides advice, guidance, and information that will assist in the development of policies, procedures, and action plans that promote the engagement of students in the academic and social life of York.	They have provided feedback on 24-hour library service; we have raised awareness of our services and obtained a great volunteer for our LSAG.
Survey Research Centre	See: http://www.src.uwaterloo.ca/	Help design surveys and provide advice on activities such as usability protocol.	Better designed surveys, etc.
The Howard Undergraduate Student Association (HUSA)	Undergraduate students—all levels and disciplines	Comment on library facilities, resources, equipment, and services and suggest changes to the same.	Implementation of several suggestions and the highest consideration of all others.
Undergraduate Student Government	UIC undergraduate students	Represents undergraduate students' interests.	Longer library hours; more computers; improved computer software; Learning Commons planning.
University Committee on Libraries	Elected faculty from the various colleges; graduate student representative; undergraduate student representative	The University Committee on Libraries reviews policies and practices relating to library resources and services and provides oversight of the development of the libraries. The UCL serves as one of the primary interfaces and communications links between the Libraries and other campus units responsible for providing information resources and services and the university community at-large.	

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
University Council on Research Activities and Libraries	Faculty, Deans, Administrators, including the University Librarian	Advise the President and Provost.	Better communication among key groups on campus.
University Librarian's Student Advisory Committee	Undergraduate and graduate students from all academic colleges	Advisory to University Librarian; communication with broader student body.	
University Library Committee	University faculty and librarians	Advisory to Dean of Libraries	
University Library Committee	Representative with strong representation of faculty	Provide advice to the Dean of Libraries.	Input into decision-making process.
University Library Committee	7–10 faculty appointed by the University Senate for two-year terms	Review strategic directions, endorse major policy changes, discuss new services, and provide general advice to the Dean of Libraries.	Library gains an important perspective from faculty who represent different disciplines. Committee members are able to explain library issues to their colleagues.
University Library Committee	Dean of Libraries (as Secretary), 9 elected faculty representatives from various colleges (one as Chair), graduate student representative, undergraduate student representative, Director of Financial Affairs (Student Services)	The University Library Committee (ULC) reviews, consults, and advises on, plans for, and receives reports and recommendations on the performance of library services, automation, budget, administrative structure, and allocation of resources. Responsibility for keeping the faculty informed of major issues and for creating opportunities for the faculty to discuss priorities also falls to the committee.	
University Senate Library Committee	Faculty, library staff, graduate students, undergraduate students	Advisory	

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
University Senate Library Committee	Committee is composed of a committee chair from the University faculty, 5–6 faculty members and the Dean of Libraries.	The committee is charged with the responsibility for recommending to the University Senate policies to promote the educational interests of the university as a whole with respect to the Libraries. The SLC is responsible for consultation and advising with faculty of the Libraries or the Dean of Libraries, on such matters as are referred to it by the by the Libraries faculty, by the Dean, or by other university personnel, which pertain to improving the effectiveness of the Libraries as a part of the broad academic program of the University of Kentucky.	In the past, the committee has worked with the Libraries in sponsoring and promoting effectiveness efforts and other issues of importance to the research and educational programs.
University Student Advisory Council	Student representatives from each college on campus	Contribute to the central role of the academic experience in the life of the student; consult and advise.	Impetus for Library Use study.
University Students' Council	Executive	Advisory, stakeholders and advocates of appropriate behaviours.	Offering 24/7 library for study during April and December 2010.
UO Student Federation	Student	Representation of students	We introduced group room, calm floor instead of quiet floor, etc.
Vanderbilt Student Government	President and representatives	Advise on needs for library renovation.	More group studies and café and increased power outlets integrated into final plan; students voted special recognition for library and staff by student government.

Group 2 N=41

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Administrative Board of the Library	Fourteen members, including faculty, librarians, and graduate/undergraduate students	An advisory board to the University Librarian	
Associated Students of the University of Arizona	Three elected officers and ten elected at-large student representatives	In relation to the library, ASUA advises us on the needs of primarily undergraduate students and priorities for use of the student fee.	Support for increases in student library fee (which is bundled with the campus IT fee) and identification of priorities for its use.
Faculty Academic Senate Committee	Faculty from various disciplines	Advisory	Note: The formation of this committee is underway.
Faculty Senate Committee on University Libraries	Faculty, graduate, and undergraduate student representatives, campus library directors	Advise the library on policies and procedures relating to operations, facilities, and budget of the libraries.	
Friends of Morris Library Board	Alumni and Community	To support the library.	
Friends of the Libraries Executive Committee and Sub-committees	Member of the Libraries Friends	Advisory/consultative	Targeted fundraising for specific collections.
Graduate Student Council	UIC graduate students	Represents graduate students' interests.	Selection of electronic resources; addition of specialized research instruction workshops.
Graduate Student Council	President and representatives	Advise on needs for library renovation.	Changes in cafe hours to favor longer evening hours.
Graduate Students Association (GSA)	All graduate and professional students at Howard	Suggest new resources, equipment, and facilities.	Implementation of several suggestions and the highest consideration of all others.
GWUL Development Advisory Board	Donors, some alumni, some faculty, and library administrators	Advisory to the library administration on fund raising activities.	Identification of new prospects, increased donations to the library.
Learning Studio Assessment Committee	Representatives from the Libraries, Student Success, and IT	Advising, planning	Conducting regular assessment efforts to determine new directions for the Learning Studio.
Library Advancement Council	10–12 current or prospective library donors appointed by the Dean	Fundraising, building external support for the library, providing external perspective for the Dean.	Increased financial support for the library, good alumni relationships.
Library Advisory Council	Faculty, administration, students	Advisory	

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Library Board	Representative group of faculty	Advise library on faculty needs and communicate information about library to other faculty members.	Approved changes to policies (e.g., privacy, fees), advised on budget reduction, and supported participation in Google digitization initiative.
Library Faculty Advisory Board	20–25 faculty representing every college. Representatives from the library include the User Engagement Librarian, the Library Dean, the Associate Deans, the head of the Faculty Engagement Department, and the head of the Scholarly Publishing and Digital Services Department.	The faculty advisory board focuses primarily on the collection (especially the journal collection) and services that faculty tend to utilize most frequently, such as ILL and document delivery processes. The board serves as an advocate on behalf of the library to the Provost and other institute administrators.	Due in part to the faculty advisory board's efforts, the library received special one-time funding from the Provost to purchase a large collection of critical science and technology journals.
Library Student Advisory Committee	Student representatives from the various schools	To provide suggestions for initiatives; to provide feedback for ongoing development.	Information is shared with various UX staff to implement or investigate further.
Library Student Advisory Council	Student library employees	Study library facilities, processes and services and make proposals to the library administration.	Study area in library with piped-in music and other projects.
MBA Marketing Team Composition - Relates to Activity 1	6 teams	Assessed undergrad experience in Libraries; interviewed approximately 1,000 students.	Told us we needed to change our spaces; key driver in change.
Medical Student Association	8 students (2 from each class)	To advise the College of Medicine Dean, Sr. Associate Dean, Health Sciences Library (HSL) Director on student-related matters.	24/7 computer lab space was created for medical students as a result of this group seeing the need and working with the College of Medicine administration and the HSL Director to implement.
Office of Research Ethics	See: http://iris.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/	Ensure that assessment projects comply with ethics standards.	Ethics approval.
One-on-one meetings on ad hoc basis	Dean/Associate Deans of colleges/student groups	To determine how the library can better serve college needs.	Advice and direction.
Planning and Institutional Research, University Administration	Senior Planning analysts	Advising assessment librarian on protocols, policies, methodology; partner in conducting LibQUAL+® and other surveys.	Preparation and implementation of effective survey methodologies and strategies.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Rutgers University Student Assembly	Student leaders	Student government body that represents the undergraduate student population of Rutgers-New Brunswick.	Information sharing and advice.
Student Government Association Library Committee	SGA representatives appointed to the committee	Advisory	Provide general feedback; request new services and enhancements; sounding board for planned initiatives.
Student Government (various committees)	Elected students	Make recommendations to library to support prioritized initiatives.	
Student Government Association	Elected students	Provides student feedback to University Librarian.	
Student Government Association	Students	On an occasional basis, the Libraries have worked with and consulted student government about issues related to library service.	Services and policies relating to students have been addressed. (e.g., extension of hours, food and beverages in the library).
Student Government Association	Elected undergraduate students	Communicate student concerns to be addressed by Dean.	Dean has a platform for speaking to student representatives.
Student Government Association	Elected student representatives	Provide student input on library space, activities, policies, and procedures.	Higher student engagement in library activities.
Student Library Advisory Board	Undergraduate and graduate students	Serve as a channel for regular communication between the student representatives and library administration.	Better understand how the library can serve students at all levels.
Student Library Advisory Committee	Undergraduate students	Advisory on library services and policies that affect undergraduates	Input, reaction, discussion, context
Undergraduate Advisory Board	10 sophomores through seniors with diverse demographics, living arrangements, and majors	Offer ideas and opinions on projects or changes the library is considering. Suggest changes based on their experience.	Lengthened the hours of the library cafe. Creating inspirational quotes for the stairwells. Increased the number of healthy snacks in the vending machines.
Undergraduate Student Libraries Advisory Council	Elected representative undergraduate students in various majors	Meets periodically with the Dean of Libraries to discuss matters involving undergraduates and the Libraries experience.	

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Undergraduate Student Library Advisory Group	Voluntary undergraduate students	Sounding Board, Advisory	Ongoing
University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs	University faculty, staff, and students	To advise the vice provost and director of libraries on the policies, development, and operation of the university libraries.	
University Libraries Committee	Faculty and a representative from student government	Provides faculty input on services, resources, facilities.	Varies depending on input.
University Library Committee	Faculty and student representatives (appointed)	Advise on policies, services, space.	Perceived as an active committee that makes a difference; members raise concerns and are committed to their role.
University Library Committee	Faculty representatives appointed by Faculty Senate	Advisory and advocacy	Advise on services and collections.
UO Graduate Student Federation	Graduate Students	Representation of graduate students.	We dedicated a full floor to their needs (study carrel with key, nice quiet study room, mentor service, etc.)
Various student associations on campus	Student government representatives	Advising, outreach, assessment support, general sounding-board for gathering ideas and hearing issues.	Mixed, some student associations are more active than others.
York Federation of Students	Undergraduate student union	Advocacy	Collaboration with student union executive on certain initiatives.

Group 3 N=24

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Bamboo Shoots	Library administration, library and university IT support, humanities faculty	Identify ways to improve library support for faculty who want to build collections of digital objects for their research and teaching.	
Dean's Student Advisory Committee	15–18 juniors and seniors who have been selected as residential advisors for first year students	Bring student issues to the Dean's attention; serve as student advisors on specific library projects.	Better and more responsive services for students, particularly undergraduates.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Faculty [Senate] Council on University Libraries	Elected faculty members (voting), representatives from student and staff groups (ex-officio)	Policy issues related to collection development; services; space needs; and budgetary requirements.	Input, support, and advocacy.
Faculty Liaisons	At least one faculty representative from each degree-granting academic department	Inform librarians about departments' needs and participate in the development/review of library collections.	Recommendations drive decisions regarding new purchases, journal cancellations, and service innovations.
Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries	Faculty elected or appointed, university administration, university librarian	Advocacy for the library, to keep faculty informed of developments in library services, budgets, etc.	Improved relations between the library and the faculty, support for additional funds and/or to halt reductions.
Focus Groups of faculty and students	Selected based on assessment topic	Advisory	Opening the Libraries Info Commons, coffee shops, and Undergraduate Virtual Library.
Georgia Tech Student Media	Student Radio Station; Literary Arts Magazine; Student Newspaper; Student Research Journal	The library collaborates with WREK on a weekly library radio show ("Lost in the Stacks"). In addition, the library supports the undergraduate research journal ("The Tower"), and also partners with "Erato" the student literary/arts journal. Through formal and informal contacts, library staff often receive feedback from these students regarding library facilities, services and resources.	The library radio show has allowed the library to simultaneously market the program to a wider student and non-student audience. The partnerships with the undergraduate research journal and the student literary/arts journal have positioned the library as being strong supporters of both the science/technology focus of the Institute, as well as the arts and humanities at Georgia Tech.
Graduate and Professional Student Council	Representatives of the graduate and professional school student body	Offer ideas and opinions on projects or changes the library is considering. Suggest changes based on their experience.	Library creating Responsible Conduct of Research Forums, which all graduate and professional school students must attend as part of graduation requirement. Investigating possibility of dedicated graduate student space in library.
Graduate and Professional Student Organization	Graduate Students	Sounding board, advisory, partner	Ongoing

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Graduate School and SGA Town Hall Meeting	Graduate school faculty and students	Communicate student concerns to be addressed by the Dean.	Problems are identified and followed up by the Dean.
Graduate Student Association Library Advisory Board	Appointed members of the GSA	Advisory	Provide general feedback; request new services and enhancements; sounding board for planned initiatives.
Graduate Student Libraries Advisory Council	Elected representative graduate students in various fields	Meets periodically with the Dean of Libraries to discuss matters involving graduate students' experiences in the Libraries.	
Health Professions Student Council	Students from the Medical College	Represents medical students' interests.	Longer hours; new seating; safer parking options; additional security in evenings.
LibQUAL+® Steering Committee and LibQUAL+® Theme Teams	Librarians and library staff volunteer	Advise on survey management, marketing, publicity, implementation, analysis, and communications.	Effective survey implementation, outreach, shared knowledge, advocacy for improving services.
Libraries and Academic Resources Committee, New Brunswick Faculty council	Combination of teaching and library faculty	Considers library priorities, collection growth, and needs.	Information sharing and advice.
Library Advisory Council	Business, community and campus leaders	Advisory and advocacy	Increased visibility with those communities and a greater success in fundraising.
Library and Scholarly Communications and Advisory Council	Representative from all colleges on campus	Advise library on issues, assess library programs, and services that affect students, recommend actions that could improve library collections and services.	Input caused library administration to reconsider policy of public access to our library auxiliary storage area.
Open Access Advisory Council	Administrators, research faculty, librarians, and library staff	Advise the Dean of Libraries and her designates on implementation of Open Access.	Ensuring the growth in dissemination of KU research through open access. Ensuring that the institutional repository meets the needs of faculty.
Student focus groups	Students recommended by VSG and GSC members	Advise on need for renovation, and library needs in general.	Studies to determine costs for longer hours for main library, agreements to continue these types of meetings.

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Undergraduate & Graduate Student Advisory Boards	Undergrad board consists of undergrads at University Park Campus; Grad board consists of graduate students at University Park Campus.	Undergraduates provided input on services offered.	Undergrad Advisory Board outcome: The Libraries adjusted service portfolio accordingly; Graduate Advisory Board outcome: Just beginning the process.
Undergraduate Student Government and Graduate Student Senate	Student government leadership	Source of feedback	Suggestions and changes from a student perspective.
University of Arizona Faculty Senate	Elected members from each UA college, 20 at large members, ex officio voting members including the President, the Provost, the Chair of the Faculty, the Vice Chair of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, the chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the chair of the Undergraduate Council and the chair of the Graduate Council, one member representing the Vice Presidents and one member representing the Deans.	The Dean provides annual updates on the library and our services. The Dean also provides and seeks feedback, as needed, on issues such as spending reductions/serials cuts.	Better understanding among faculty of changes in services necessitated by budget cuts or lack of budget increases.
User Feedback and Assessment Committee	8 members and 2 co-chairs comprised of library staff from across the University Library system	Advance the library's goal of solidifying a service culture based on the assessment of library user needs and desires.	Develop staff training and resources to support assessment activities across the library system; track assessment and other research efforts underway in the library; advise library staff and library units who wish to conduct assessment projects; conduct small- and medium-scale assessment projects (e.g., targeted surveys, focus-groups, other methods); and implement, evaluate, analyze, and share findings of large-scale library-wide assessment projects (e.g., LibQUAL+®).

Name of group	Composition	Role(s)	Outcome(s)
Visiting Committee to the Library	Appointed by the Board of Trustees of the University	Serve as advisors and act as advocates for the library as well as act as liaisons to university administration.	Received advice and counsel on programs, collections, and operations, as well as financial support.

OTHER OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

30. Please briefly describe examples of new or innovative outreach measures your library has employed to seek input from existing or potential users relating to library services, resources, facilities, and/or technology. N=38

At present our methods are fairly standard surveys, suggestion box comments, and informal feedback from conversations with students in the library and student government feedback that varies with the interests of the SGA presidents. We also had a major space study done by which involved interaction with focus groups including a student group. This interaction carried a lot of weight with our Dean and brought about some changes as well as many of the ideas mentioned previously in this survey. We are exploring social media communications for further outreach.

At the time we created them, many of the methods used in the undergraduate research project were innovative, e.g., mapping and photo diaries. These methods have been adopted by dozens of libraries across the country.

Box on website asking for input, Facebook, Twitter.

College and Interdisciplinary Teams (CITs). Reorganized library staff that work with various campus departments and programs into teams. "Faster" initiative to shorten time from order to desktop. VITL (Visual, Information and Technology Literacy task force), campus group focusing on broad-based literacy programs.

Conducting faculty lunches through the Center for Teaching Excellence to gather input from faculty. Interacting with Student Senate for an organized input mechanism from student representatives.

Created a renovation LibGuide that includes a form for sending comments or questions.

Design charettes for planning an undergraduate space. Cafe naming contest. E-ssential – online newsletter for faculty. Facebook. Clickers in instruction to assess learning. LibGuides. Webinars sponsored by Continuous Education that featured librarians.

Direct feedback from users of our group study rooms, both first-come, first-served and reserveable rooms. The results of LibQUAL+® and analysis of questions, complaints, and feedback from customers identified access to and use of group studies to be of particular interest to students. We hope to better understand their experience and needs to inform potential changes or improvements in the way in which we provide access to these rooms.

During the fall of 2009, student workers in the library surveyed other students about their use of the library. If the respondents reported using the library, they were asked why they came to the library and what they did in the library. If the respondents reported not using the library, they were asked why not. The findings informed their development of an ongoing advertising campaign that includes posters, blog postings, and videos.

Each week, members of the library staff interview Georgia Tech students, faculty, and staff about their research and library-related issues on a radio show called "Lost in the Stacks." The User Engagement librarian periodically visits

student organization meetings to solicit feedback from students about library facilities, resources, and services. Visits have also included ethnic student organizations (India Club, for example), as well as activities-based organizations (literary/arts journal, video gaming club). A proactive approach to engaging users via social media such as Twitter and Facebook. Specifically, the User Experience department follows student time-lines on Twitter and searches for mentions of the library or library-related discussion on Twitter.

Engage students in charrettes; engage students in the design of furniture, e.g., study carrels and chairs and based design on their feedback; work with System Design classes so that the students use the library as a “client” for some of their course work; inviting e-comments from students on various issues and posting them (anonymously) for the entire community to see; a series of “quick polls” on our home page intended to get feedback while also educating students about some of our services.

For all new initiatives announced on our website, we provide a link for users to “Send us feedback.” Also, we have plans underway to begin hosting online forums via Facebook and Twitter later this spring. Via these forums, users will be able to offer us suggestions as well as share best practices related to their library experiences.

In addition to all the traditional methods we use (a/b testing, log analysis, usability, participatory design, ethnographic research methods, space design, etc.) we also like to mine social networking for reactions and to help us build use cases. Last fall we also had a UX photo booth at a new student orientation party where we asked students to pose for pictures with a sign they filled in “My ideal library _____.” We are also trying to integrate a new tool for staff (and maybe the public in the future) to submit UI requests.

In planning the Libraries’ new and forthcoming Knowledge Commons, a variety of measures were employed to gain user feedback relevant to new and existing library services. Students helped test and provide feedback on new technology for the Knowledge Commons, including collaborative computing solutions. Similarly, undergraduate students helped test furniture designs for the Commons, providing feedback on optimal workspace layout, types of chairs and tables, location of desktop computers, etc. Several architecture students conducted a study of an existing computer lab in the Libraries and their recommendations (utilization of “green walls,” quick, stand-up computer access areas) were also integrated into the final plans for the new space.

Last year I began making visits, with the head of reference and the liaison librarian, to department chairs to have conversations about library services which have been a great way to gather information. We revamped our suggestion/comment mechanism by starting a suggestion blog where we now post all suggestions and responses - not innovative but new for us. During a project to gather feedback about our physical space we put poster boards on easels around the library and other locations on campus with different questions about the library. We are soon going to implement the Counting Opinions LibSAT which will be an ongoing satisfaction survey integrated into our website.

Marketing department advertises everything from individual instruction opportunities. They use banners and table tents and several video monitors throughout the library to advertise events, services, and resources. In the latest campaign, they are making short videos of the reference librarians called “meet your personal librarian.” The library home page currently advertises the library mobile website.

One new outreach measure includes the introduction of online and physical suggestion boxes as a forum for patrons to express feedback, one-off problems, requests and/or compliments. The presence of the physical and virtual suggestion boxes communicates to patrons that their feedback is valued and strengthens the library’s commitment to assessment and improvement. Additionally, beyond existing users, the library is also committed to reaching potential users. All of the surveys the library conducts go out to the entire university population (not just existing users) in an effort to better understand who does and does not use the library, and how the library can best serve the entire UIC community.

Online card sorting to help test terminology and groupings of subject areas on the website. Individual interviews with faculty regarding their research process (not directly asking about the website). Helpful in understanding which resources and services should be more prominent.

Online questionnaires have been tried over the years including the customer satisfaction survey.

Other than outreach and liaison services, we have not pursued situations where we are asking faculty/students to participate in these types of discussions.

Pizza with the Dean Late Night at the Library for incoming freshmen Stress-free Zone during finals week. Reception for International Students.

Simple web survey on the homepage of the library's website. Informal surveys on Facebook. Paper surveys at service points with raffle prize at completion. Student competitions to rethink or redesign something.

Strategic Planning Focus Groups; Furniture trials; Ongoing library instruction session assessments that assist university in evaluating and assessing the core curriculum.

The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre: advisory group (campus and community) advises on services offered by the IKBLC. IKBLC website and newsletters also ask for feedback. Asian Library and Xwi7xwa Library reach out to their distinct communities in unique ways.

The Library Dean and the Director for Library Instruction and Campus Partnerships meet with about 3,000 freshman parents during the summer and share information about the library and what it can do for their daughters/sons and solicit their perspectives and expectations. The Director for Instruction and Campus Partnerships meets with all 100 faculty involved with First Year Programs to share information about library resources and services and to get their input. She also meets with the 56 Freshmen Interest Group (peer) Advisors several times during their training sessions to discuss library resources, facilities, and services. The Director for Library Instruction and Campus Partnerships attends and serves as a judge for the International Projects Fair. In this capacity she interacts with 20 internationally oriented students about how they used the libraries' resources and what would have made things better for them. The library is presenting a poster session during an upcoming on-campus Undergraduate Research Symposium.

Two ethnographic studies of library use and student information seeking behaviors. Plasma screens with promotional audio and video. Library Student Advisory council survey. Track Google alerts and how we are portrayed on blogs, Twitter, etc. Comment books for all library exhibits. Feedback from large (500) student employees. Feedback on Facebook page.

Two other committees of interest are the Research Commons Advisory Committee and the Data Services Advisory Committee. Both have a mix of library staff, students, and faculty.

We aggregate data from our social media accounts, send it to the AUL for Public Services, and then distribute it to the appropriate group for action. For a project to redesign a room as a graduate student space, we interviewed grad students individually while walking around the room rather than doing a design charrette or focus group. To attract users to participate in a usability study, we put an ad in our rotating banner on the library home page. That was very effective.

We are currently conducting a study on PhD humanities students with Cornell. This is our first grant-funded, full-scale collaborative assessment project.

We are creating a new personal librarian program for outreach to first year students planned to launch in fall 2011. We're exploring technology to enable persistent feedback on library web pages via Disqus or similar tools.

We have an active Twitter account and social media campaign. We have gotten our Graduate Student Association to post short surveys to their website, which graduate students are more apt to answer. Additionally, there is an outreach table once a week in the student center that captures feedback from users.

We have interviewed library users to develop and refine a set of “personas” originally created by Johns Hopkins University; we use these personas as “stand-ins” for our users when making initial design decisions for physical and virtual spaces. We also allowed library users to evaluate and suggest changes to furniture being considered for our new Mansueto Library, which resulted in changes to design and lighting fixtures.

We monitor Twitter to follow comments about our library; it’s quite effective in identifying immediate concerns from our users, primarily students.

We routinely solicit input via Facebook, Twitter, and our blog. We conduct programs to bring our rare materials to people in a non-library setting; librarians hold office hours in their departments. We conducted LibQUAL+®.

We use standard tools to reach potential users: surveys (including LibQUAL+®), interviews, focus group interviews, observation, object analysis (web logs, questions asked), etc.

We’ve conducted online surveys about the library using a laptop at the student center. We conduct mini “guerilla” surveys in which small feedback/comment cards are distributed throughout the library to students for quick responses on, for example, the laptop borrowing program. We regularly host a table at the student center to market the library and gather student feedback. In this context, we’ve conducted quick online surveys using a laptop computer at the student center.

Welcome Week activities: tables at all undergrad orientation sessions and at the library to answer both student and parent questions regarding library services. Also informs students and parents how they can provide support for the library: parents’ committee, Student Advisory Board, Friends of the Library.

When we introduced iPads, students had an opportunity to “test drive” and blog about their impressions; this visibility generated much interest and discussion in the broader campus community.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

31. Please enter any additional information that may assist the authors’ understanding of your library’s user experience activities. N=20

Anticipate assigning more specific responsibilities for user experience to other position(s) in the near future.

Assessment is a substantial part of our current strategic plan. We have created a new position (Coordinator of Assessment and Training) and the Assessment Steering Committee to lead and give meaning to the library’s assessment activities. The strategic vision statement focuses on improving user services and assessment is one way we intend to do this.

Biggest successes have been versions of usability testing. The libraries’ web pages have consistently been based on user input.

Please understand we have just recently begun discussions around organized efforts at assessing user experiences, so our experience is quite limited.

Since we now have a new department for User Experience, we will be conducting more frequent ethnographic and observational studies, beginning in the spring of 2011.

The associate librarians and librarians who function as instructional librarians, consultants, bibliographers, and guides are directly involved in nurturing the library users and providing informative programs and useful services. The reference technician and student workers in Founders also promote engagement.

The UX Team grew out of a grass roots community and became a semi-formal structure with the creation of a five-member team to work on specific projects. The library is currently in the throes of a major reorganization, and though the UX Team has been recognized as valuable, we do not yet know where, or whether, it will end up in the final structure.

Yes, we are doing other kinds of assessment about our services so that we can improve them and the experience. But I would say we are embarking on a broader initiative to better understand what it means to design and implement a user experience as a holistic environment in which every touch point is important to the totality of the library experience. This is much different than holding a focus group about the library website. Those types of assessments are important to create incremental change within unique parts of the library operation, but I think we are going for something that will help us to redefine what the library is for our user community and the experience we want them to have when they use all the difference things that make up our library environment.

There are many ways that we engage our user base in continuous quality improvement. The Dean and University Librarian and our College and Departmental Libraries have advisory groups comprised of faculty and students. We try to employ a variety of methods to elicit feedback from our users and we also try not to over survey the same users.

We are a team-based, customer-focused organization that is designed around the needs of our customers. We regularly employ more than a dozen assessment tools including LibQUAL+®, usability studies, and action gap surveys to better understand the expectations and needs of our customers, to measure their satisfaction, and to identify areas in need of improvement. We develop and use performance measures and quality standards at the library level, the team level, and the personal level to support progress toward the library's and the university's goals.

We are in the process of hiring a user experience director to centralize and rationalize these activities.

We are still largely getting started in the UX area. A LibGuide for the UX office was recently created, and that will help showcase the activities of the office and solicit feedback from users. We brought in Nancy Foster in January, to teach ethnographic skills to staff, and Steven Bell is coming in April to teach his approach to designing better libraries.

We conduct ongoing research on major interfaces (track log file use and searches) and we conduct usability tests. This has become embedded in the organization. We also are looking to expand with a new program for a student panel that will help recruit testers and we hope help design some fun outreach activities.

We have installed a technology "sandbox," where students can experiment with a range of new technologies and provide feedback. This will inform future purchases and technology plans. Much of our current user experience activities are focused on space/service needs for a new facility that will open in 2013. In addition, two proposed Fellows projects (one for graduate students and one for undergraduates in the fields of engineering and textiles) will examine what students feel they need to know about the library.

We see user experience activities as the natural outgrowth of public services and see no reason to uproot them from their home in order to stand alone.

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Boston University
Boston College
Brigham Young University
University of British Columbia
University of Calgary
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Santa Barbara
Case Western Reserve University
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado at Boulder
Columbia University
Duke University
University of Florida
George Washington University
University of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Guelph
Howard University
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Indiana University Bloomington
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Library of Congress
Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
McMaster University
University of Manitoba
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of Miami

University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
National Archives and Records Administration
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
University of Notre Dame
Ohio University
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Ottawa
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rice University
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
University of Saskatchewan
University of South Carolina
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Texas at Austin
Texas Tech University
University of Utah
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington State University
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
Yale University
York University