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SNELL LIBRARY
ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING

- Read Scale Study
- First Assessment Plan
LIBQUAL
ASSESSMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

- Cooperation between Assessment and the Library Communications Office
- Revamped Library Assessment Team
INFORMAL STUDY SPACE
SERVICES DESIGNED AROUND THE NEEDS OF USERS
FRESH AND ENGAGING
ASSESSMENT: WHAT DID WE WANT TO KNOW?
Assessment Data: Sources and Methods

1. Analysis of comments
2. 2 Town meetings
3. 3 Surveys
4. Occupancy counts
5. Analysis of booking statistics (ongoing)
6. Entrance gate data from swiping university ID (ongoing)
7. LabStat data describing use of software
8. Analysis of use of reference, training and support services
9. Focus groups
RENOVATION/ASSESSMENT TIMELINE

Spring 2012
- Study and seating preferences survey

Fall 2012
- Renovation of level 2, Digital Media Commons (DMC)

Late fall 2012
- Technology survey
- Town Hall
- Comment Analysis

Fall 2013
- Renovation of level 1: Entrance, Reading Commons, group study

Winter 2013
- Space survey
- Town Hall
- Occupancy Study
- Comment analysis
SURVEY #1: SEATING PREFERENCES

• Our initial space survey was done before the creation of the Digital Media Commons

• 25% of students made the suggestion that the library add more tables.

• They also asked for more outlets, better printing and bookable group study facilities.
COMMENT SOURCES

- Whiteboards
- Traditional comment box
- Online form
- Twitter and Facebook
- Staff hearsay
• **Limitations:**
  
  • Difficult to keep up tracking over time
  
  • Were not able to track everything that was said
  
  • Hard to separate “commons” comments from comments on related services and facilities
  
  • No demographics

---

**We want to hear from you!**

Please share any suggestions, questions, or comments you have about the first floor renovations of Snell Library:

If you would like a response, please add your email address:

Alternatively, contact us at library.northeastern.edu/contact

**Thanks!**

Northeastern
COMMENTS: FINDINGS

• Specific problems
  • Cleanliness
  • Marker supply

Overall

• Information gaps: software and hardware availability
• Screens and monitors
• Chair preference
• Design
• Tables
TOWN MEETING: PROCESS

• Student Government

• University leadership Held in early evening so as not to compete with classes.

• Comment cards were provided,

• A transcript was provided to library and ITS staff.

• Visibility
• Reliable printing is a high priority
• Students asked for better management of group study space.
• Access to computers in the Commons
• Quiet space continues to be valued.
• Student involvement in decisionmaking

• **Limitations:**
  • Not statistically valid for analyzing needs or satisfaction
  • Not every student is comfortable with sharing concerns publicly.
SURVEY #2: TECHNOLOGY

• Even in the Commons, which was intended to foreground technology, students complained that they wanted more tables for group work.

• Individual/group? Quiet/Talking?

• Over 80% of students said they brought their own laptop “always” or “sometimes”. 53% of Commons users brought their own laptop to the Commons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software Used</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web browser</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, Access)</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and GIS</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video, Graphics and Design</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 2 RENOVATIONS,
FALL 2013
3-D PRINTING, FABRICATION AND MODELING
What are you looking for when you come to Snell Library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent selecting this answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space free from distractions</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables to spread out</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power outlets</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/7 hours</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A private space to work alone</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group rooms to reserve in advance</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argo Tea (café)</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print books to browse and borrow</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff who can help me with my research</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals and magazines</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Respondents could choose more than one answer.)
Limitations

- Counting requires maturity and attention to detail
- Important to count at non-busy as well as busy times in order to observe seating preferences when a space is empty
- A large sample set may be required if range of counts is large
- The more detail sought, the more intrusive the counting process
In the Digital Media Commons, most students were bringing their own computers.

On quiet floors 3 and 4 (left), tables are used to spread out and “study along”, “alone together”, quietly.

Room booking data shows 80% occupancy in our group studies.
Utilization, Day of Week %, 10/1 thru 10/28

- Sunday: 78.56%
- Monday: 81.24%
- Tuesday: 78.76%
- Wednesday: 77.68%
- Thursday: 77.83%
- Friday: 70.80%
- Saturday: 63.75%
## ENTRANCE GATE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>582252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>194763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Part-time</td>
<td>40353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>22137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Part-time</td>
<td>19059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>860374</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pie chart shows the distribution of students across different categories:

- **67.7%** for Undergraduate
- **22.6%** for Graduate
- **4.7%** for Graduate Part-time
- **2.6%** for US
- **2.2%** for Undergraduate Part-time
- **0.2%** for Law
- **0.0%** for (blank)
ENTRANCE GATE DATA: COLLEGE

- CAMD 5.93%
- D'Amore McKim School of Business 18.27%
- Bouve 11.47%
- Computer Science 25.33%
- Law 0.20%
- University Programs 1.88%
- College of Professional Studies 9.51%
- Engineering 10.16%
- Social Sciences and Humanities 11.79%
Changes and Effects

- Made Digital Media Commons workstations reserveable
- Added printing stations in the second round of renovations
- Did NOT add dual monitors in the second round of renovations
- Advertised what software was available
- Added tables for groups to upper floors of the library
- Promoted and enforced quiet on upper floors of the library
- Provided occupancy counts to Student Government to advocate for more extended hours for on-campus shuttle
- Created a library Student Advisory Council: a monthly forum for consistent, ongoing conversations with students
CHALLENGES
CHALLENGES
THE FUTURE

• Questions for student focus groups:
  • Library role and library as place
  • What research and learning support is best met in the library, and what could be met in other campus places?
  • Why so much printing?
  • Laptops and workstations?
  • Need for quiet? Need for group meeting/talking space?
Sources and Methods: The Future

- Some questions, such as what software do you use, and how long did you work in the Commons, would best be answered by data from LabStat, not surveys.

- We would like to undertake a more comprehensive look at what services are used in the building, the level of demand for those services, and whether those service need to be in-person, and need to be in our building.

- Can a Library Cube approach help us to relate our data to student learning outcomes?