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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Marvin K. Peterson Library is the academic center of the University of New Haven, and is dedicated to providing the resources, services, and facilities to fulfill the instructional and research needs of both the faculty and students. Major changes are currently underway at the library and developing the resource and service process has been deemed a top priority. As such, the library is currently in the process of evaluating the feasibility of a number of organizational changes. It is the hope of the Head Librarian, Hanko Dobi, that these organizational changes will benefit the students and faculty alike. An evaluation has thus been conducted to assess the desirability of these changes.

The focus of the evaluation is to assess the current resources offered by the Marvin K. Peterson Library as well as the desirability of projected resource innovations. The focus was approached with the following goals in mind:

- To assess faculty perceptions of the quality of students’ work
- To assess the adequacy of resources currently offered by the library and its staff
- To assess the desirability of resource innovations currently under consideration at the library

One method of data collection was utilized in evaluating the aforementioned goals. One survey was administered to collect data from faculty members.

The overall findings suggest that while the faculty perceives the quality of students’ work as good in general, a large number of those surveyed perceive students’ information literacy skills as somewhat weak. In line with previous surveys conducted on behalf of the library, there is an overwhelming desire on the part of the faculty to have access to a greater amount of reference materials, particularly e-resources. The data also reveal a desire for a greater degree of communication between the library and both the faculty members and students of the University of New Haven. Faculty members give full support for the proposed changes in library resources,
including Blackboard integration, library involvement in FE001, a federated search engine, and faculty collaboration with the library.

Due to the level of support given for the prospective expansions in library resources and services on behalf of the faculty members surveyed, it would be wise to pursue any or all of the proposed innovations. With the exception of a federated search engine, these innovations require the cooperation of the faculty and administration of the University of New Haven. It may not be necessary to assess student need before going forward with these changes, as they pertain to initiatives in the interest of strengthening the academic integrity of the University. Although student interests overlap with some of the concepts assessed within the evaluation, their needs are somewhat different than the faculty. Gaining insight into more technologically-focused prospects from students regarding resource development is the next logical step in evaluative terms.
INTRODUCTION

The Head Librarian of the Marvin K. Peterson Library at the University of New Haven, Hanko Dobi, feels that the time has come to implement structural changes to the resources currently offered at the library. The focus of past evaluations at the library has been on the processes currently in motion at the library. The data generated from previous evaluations have been useful in making improvements to the library as a whole. With that said, the overall mission of the library has by and large been neglected in previous evaluations. For one, data have not been gathered to evaluate whether or not students are information literate. Furthermore, previous evaluations have determined that a number of faculty members are not satisfied with resources provided by the library, but these evaluations have remained one-dimensional, failing to generate definitive opinions as to just what the library can do to improve its resources.

An evaluation in the form of a needs assessment has been conducted regarding the prospects for implementing new and innovative resources offered by the Marvin K. Peterson Library. The focus of this evaluation is on the University of New Haven faculty. These innovative practices may potentially involve a collaborative effort on their part and is of absolute importance that faculty opinions on library resource development be analyzed before any concrete changes are made. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess what improvements can be made to make the library more accessible to both the student and faculty populations of the University of New Haven. The data gathered as a result of this evaluation will aid the Head Librarian in the decision making process, disseminated to any associated stakeholders she deems integral to bringing about the proposed library resource innovations. The evaluation focuses on the following key questions:

- To what extent does the faculty think students meet information literacy standards?
- What are faculty opinions of the resources that are currently available to students through the library?
• How willing is the faculty to collaborate with the library staff on improving student resources available through the library?
• What can the library do to facilitate better research on the part of students?
• What can the library do to increase faculty utilization of resources available at the library?

The key evaluation questions have held up throughout the course of the evaluation. No additions or subtractions were made to the evaluation questions, as they provide a comprehensive framework for assessing faculty perceptions of the library and the potential for resource expansion.
METHODOLOGY

Considering that a comprehensive needs assessment regarding resource expansion requires a variety of perspectives, including those of the student populations at the University of New Haven (both graduate and undergraduate), the initial intent of this assessment was to include these populations in the data gathering process. There were two factors which went into consideration against including these populations. The first factor was time. This evaluation did not take form until mid-April, and this may have impacted the response rate of the undergraduate population. The second factor involved skepticism over whether or not students would even be willing to take a survey regarding library resources. The library had collected a satisfaction survey from graduate and undergraduate students a short time before this assessment had gotten underway. The evaluation sponsor – the Head Librarian of the Marvin K. Peterson Library – felt that this also would have impacted the response rate. As such, the decision was made to delay data collection from these populations until the 2010/2011 academic year.

Survey construction took place over the course of three weeks, undergoing three edits. The initial survey was considerably lengthier, as the evaluator felt it was necessary to obtain in-depth data regarding faculty perceptions of information literacy skills. These questions dealt with the Five Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education as outlined by American Library Association. After careful consideration and discussion with the evaluation sponsor, these items were removed and reduced to one question regarding faculty members’ general impressions of students’ information literacy skills.

After construction of the survey was completed, it was submitted to the Institution Review Board (IRB) on May 4, 2010, with the application being for exempt status. The application was approved on May 5, 2010, attaining the status of exemption from IRB jurisdiction. The survey was finalized through http://www.surveymonkey.com (SurveyMonkey).
The medium of an online survey seemed most fitting considering the ease of access it carries regarding data collection. It must be noted that a few questions were altered in the final version of the survey developed through SurveyMonkey. This was due to an unforeseen limitation on multiple open-ended responses per survey item. This was most problematic for one question, in which faculty members were asked to provide information about research resources used outside of the Marvin K. Peterson Library. Skip Logic was implemented to get around this unforeseen obstacle; however, the impact on the data is notable. Faculty members were allowed to bypass providing specific information about online database use, resulting in less-robust (but still sufficient) data than desired.

The online survey was released to faculty members via email by the evaluation sponsor, Hanko Dobi, on May 11, 2010 and remained open for over four weeks. A follow-up email was sent on May 26, 2010, in an effort to boost the response rate. The survey closed at midnight, June 10, 2010. See Appendix A for a copy of the final version of the survey.
RESULTS

Of the one-hundred and one respondents that began the faculty survey, eleven participants dropped out without completing the entire document, resulting in an 89.1% completion rate. There was a total of twenty-five items, including five questions pertaining to demographic information (see Appendix B for demographic results). All questions were optional, meaning that participants were not required to answer them before proceeding within the survey. One item utilized “Skip Logic,” enabling respondents to skip over questions which do not pertain to them. This method was applied to Item #16.

When asked “How would you rate the quality of students’ research papers?” 40.6% of the respondents reported that they would rate the quality of papers as either excellent or good, while 37.6% of the respondents regarded the quality of papers as fair or poor. 11.9% of participants maintained a neutral position, while 9.9% reported that they did not know what the quality of students’ research papers is (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: How would you rate the quality of students’ research papers?](chart)

Of the 100 respondents who answered the question: “How would you rate the quality of distance learners’ research papers?” 1% of the respondents regard the quality of papers as
excellent, 8% reported the quality as good, 3% reported a neutral opinion, and 9% reported the papers as being fair. 12% of the respondents do not know about the quality of research papers, while 67% do not teach online courses.

Regarding the question, “How would you rate the quality of students’ information literacy skills?” respondents had a negative rating overall. When split between positive and negative perceptions of information literacy, 41% had a negative opinion (29% “Fair” and 12% “Poor”), while 37% had a positive opinion (3% “Excellent” and 34% “Good”). 19% of participants had a neutral opinion, and 3% were unfamiliar with the term “information literacy skills.” See Figure 2 for a complete breakdown of responses.

![Figure 2a](image)

Based upon the assumption that information literacy skills are theoretically related to the overall quality of a student’s work (i.e. research papers), a correlational analysis was run to test if there is a relationship between the two from the standpoint of the faculty participants of the survey. It must be noted that these data exclude one participant who did not provide a response regarding information literacy skills. The results show that there is a moderate, positive
correlation of 0.397 between perceived quality of students’ information literacy skills and the quality of on-campus students’ research papers (see Figure 2b). This is to say that as ratings of students’ information literacy skills increases, perceived quality of papers increases; as information literacy skill ratings decreases, perceived quality of research papers decreases. The results also show that there is a non-significant, weak correlation of -0.054 between perceived information literacy skills and distance learners’ research papers. This is most likely so because there are not enough conclusive data regarding distance learners for an adequate discussion.

<p>| Figure 2b Correlations: “Quality of research papers” &amp; “Quality of information literacy skills” Ratings |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of students' research papers?</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Rate quality of information literacy skills?</th>
<th>Quality of distance learners' research papers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of students' research papers?</td>
<td>1 .397**</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate quality of information literacy skills?</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of distance learners' research papers?</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A cross tabulation analysis between perceptions of information literacy skills and quality of on-campus students’ research papers reveals that the rating of quality between the two questions is somewhat incongruent at the lower levels (“Neutral,” “Fair,” and “Poor” – see Figure 2c). Generally, participants who rate students’ papers as “good” feel that students have good information literacy skills. Those who have a “neutral” opinion of students’ information literacy seem to diverge from their impressions of students’ research papers, with stronger inclinations toward rating research papers as “good” and “fair” over “neutral. Those who rate information
literacy skills as “fair” tend to have a more positive impression of research papers, with a number of responses rating papers as “good” or “neutral.” Similarly, those who perceive information literacy skills as “poor” tend to have a more positive outlook of students’ papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate information literacy skills?</th>
<th>Rate students' research papers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with ILS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked the question: “Do you request librarians to run classes on research during class time?” it has been found that this service is by and large underutilized. Nearly half the number of respondents is unaware of the service, 42.6%. Of those who are aware of in-class research tutorials, 33.7% opt not to run such classes. 23.8% report enhancing their classes with librarian tutorials (See figure 3).
When asked to rate the current, subject-specific online resources available through the Marvin K. Peterson Library website, ninety-nine participants responded in total. The majority of faculty members held favorable opinions of these guides: 42.5%. Only 12.1% regard the online resource guides as unfavorable. 17.2% of participants responded neutrally, while 28.3% of respondents are unaware that this resource is even available (See Figure 4).

With regard to curriculum enhancement through resources available at the Marvin K. Peterson Library, it seems the faculty is not utilizing these resources to their fullest potential. Overall, twenty-four participants (24.7%) of the faculty surveyed do not enhance the curriculum with resources available at the Library. Of those who utilize resources in the courses they teach, 48 respondents use e-journals, the most widely-used resource among faculty. The remaining resources within the item showed weak rates of usage: twelve participants utilize e-books, twenty-nine participants utilize course reserve, eleven schedule library tours, eleven respondents enhance the curriculum with digital images, seven with digital sound, and eleven with digital
video. A total of fifteen respondents reported other means of enhancing their curriculum with library resources. 5 respondents noted that they encourage book and periodical use but do not use course reserve *per se*. Three respondents noted utilizing in-class, librarian-run tutorials. Two respondents reported incorporating databases into their curriculum. The remaining “other” responses include statements of interest in learning about these resources, with some giving sentiments of being dissatisfied with the resources available. One respondent cited “websites,” which is not considered a library resource (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5](image)

What library resources do you currently use to enhance the curriculum?

Analyzing the response patterns of those who do not utilize the resources of the Marvin K. Peterson Library may provide insight as to why these resources are not being used. A cross tabulation analysis of whether or not faculty members have in-class research tutorials and whether or not they enhance the curriculum with library resources reveals that 62.5% of participants who do not enhance the curriculum with library resources are also unaware that a service such as in-class tutorials even exists (see Figure 6a).
A cross tabulation analysis of faculty impressions of the online resource guides available to students and whether or not they enhance the curriculum with materials from the library reveals that nearly half of the participants (45.4%) are unaware of these resources are available, nor do they enhance the curriculum with library resources (see Figure 6b). These findings indicate that there may be a communication gap between the faculty and the library. If unaware of exactly what resources are available to them, the likelihood of their utilizing these resources is lessened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request librarians to run classes on research?</th>
<th>Do Not Enhance</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Service</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate subject-specific online resource guides?</th>
<th>Do Not Enhance</th>
<th>Enhance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Resource</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked how helpful integrating general library research guides into Blackboard would be to students, an overwhelming majority of faculty members foresee such a resource
innovation as benefitting students. At that, there were zero responses which indicated a negative perception of expanding library resources into Blackboard Academic Suite. 40.8% foresee integrating general library resource guides into Blackboard as being very helpful, while 42.9% report Blackboard integration as being helpful. The remaining respondents report a neutral opinion on the matter, 16.3% (see Figure 7a).

When asked how helpful integrating course-specific research guides into Blackboard would be to students, responses were nearly to when asked about integrating general library resources into Blackboard. Overall, respondents were slightly less neutral, showing even more support for Blackboard integration. 43.3% of respondents perceive blackboard integration specific to courses being taught as very helpful. 43.3% also reported this innovation as helpful, and 13.4% remain neutral on the foreseen benefits of Blackboard integration (see Figure 7a).
Faculty members for the most part are not familiar with the library resource guide libguides.com. 75.8% of respondents do not claim familiarity with this resource development tool. 20.2% of respondents reported having a positive impression of the site (17.2%: Good, 3%: Excellent), 2% have a neutral impression of the site, while 2% report an unfavorable, poor impression of libguides.com. Although faculty members are generally unfamiliar with library collaboration tool, a large majority would be willing to collaborate on a resource development project. Of the 92 respondents, 68.5% are willing to collaborate with library staff to build resource guides for students, while only 5.4% are not. 26.1% of the responding faculty members are unsure (See Figure 7b). Crosstabs analysis reveals that the majority who reported familiarity with libguides.com is willing to collaborate on developing such course-specific resources (See figure 7c).

![Figure 7b]

**Figure 7b**

*Would you be willing to collaborate with library staff on developing resource guides specific to a given course you are teaching?*

![Figure 7c]

**Cross Tabulation:**

“Would you be willing to collaborate with the library?” & “Impressions of LibGuides.com?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your impressions of LibGuides.com?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you be willing to collaborate with the library to build resource guides?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked their opinion incorporating library tutorials into Freshman Experience (FE001), support for such an endeavor is highly positive. 41.8% of faculty members surveyed believe expanding library instruction in this context would be very helpful. 38.8% believe incorporating tutorials into FE001 would be helpful. 15.3% are neutral regarding the prospect of expansion, while 4% feel expansion in this context would not be helpful (2%: unhelpful, 2% very unhelpful).

Of the faculty members surveyed, when asked the question “Do you think it is likely that students would attend non-required, out-of-class library seminars?” a majority of respondents are doubtful that students would attend. 56.7% of respondents responded negatively. 19.6% of respondents reported a neutral opinion on the likelihood of students attending such seminars. 23.7% of respondents responded positively (See Figure 8).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8**

Do you think it is likely that students would attend non-required, out-of-class seminars for research strategies?
When asked how helpful an option to access all materials available in the Library from one, federated search, responses were almost entirely supportive. 67.7% of respondents foresee a federated search being very helpful, while 27.3% foresee such a search engine being helpful. The remaining respondents report being neutral on the matter: 5% (See Figure 9).

![Figure 9](image)

When participants were asked whether or they are pursuing independent research, 75.5% report that they in fact are. 24.5% report that they are not pursuing research at this time.

The response matrix regarding how often faculty members surveyed utilize resources at the Marvin K. Peterson Library provides a wealth of information regarding what resources are utilized. The results of this portion of the survey reveal that resources at the Marvin K. Peterson Library are underutilized on the part of the faculty. What is particularly noteworthy is the number of respondents who are unaware that a variety of electronic resources are available. The percentage of respondents who showed a lack of awareness of digital formats ranged between 17.5% and 19.5%. Furthermore, a number of respondents reported not knowing that e-books are an available resource within the Marvin K. Peterson Library. These digital formats – digital
images, digital sound, digital video, and e-books – account for the least-utilized resources for research purposes aside from Microform. Microform is rarely or never used by survey participants at a rate of 81.5%. 3.7% report using this resource either always or often, while 11.1% report using it sometimes (see Figure 10a).

The resources that are most-used by participants are: print materials, e-journals, and commercial databases. E-journals are the most widely-used resource of the participants, with usage being: 23.3% always, 24.4% often, 20% sometimes, 14.4% rarely, and 15.6% never. 2.2% report being unaware that e-journals are available. Regarding commercial databases, 21.8% of respondents reported always utilizing these databases for research, 21.8% use this resource often, 13.8% sometimes, 9.2% rarely, and 27.6% never. 5.7% of respondents report being unaware that this resource is available. Regarding print materials, 9% of respondents report always using this resource for research, while 14.6% often, 24.7%, 24.7% rarely, and 27% never (see Figure 10a).
Figure 10a
Please tell us how often you utilize the following resources at the Marvin K. Peterson Library for your research:
Further analysis of resource utilization shows that the majority of respondents who are currently pursuing research are more inclined to utilize the resources at the library either always or often (see Figure 10b). With that said, the resources that are being underutilized (e-books, digital media) still remain grossly underutilized by faculty members currently pursuing independent research. The percentage of respondents in this population who are unaware of these resources is nearly the same as that of the entire number of faculty members surveyed. As one would expect, commercial databases are more widely-used by the population of faculty members currently pursuing research than those who are not pursuing research interests. Additionally, e-journals are more likely to be used by respondents who are currently pursuing independent research (see Figure 10c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently pursuing independent research?</th>
<th>Utilize Research: All Categories</th>
<th>Unaware of Resource</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes Count</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Count</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages and totals are based on responses, not respondents.

**Figure 10b**
Cross Tabulation: “Are you currently pursuing independent research?” & “All Resources’ rates”

**Figure 10c**
How often do you utilize e-journals for research?
Controlling for “I am not currently pursuing independent research”
When asked about what other locations participants consult for research, the most accounted-for source is online databases. Forty-nine participants report consulting online databases for research (see Figure 11a). When asked a follow-up question regarding what specific online databases participants use, thirty-four respondents provided information. It must be noted that some respondents provided multiple responses, totaling thirty-seven (See figure 11b). As such, the total number of responses exceeds number of respondents. The most-commonly reported sources include: Google (Scholar), JSTOR, ProjectMuse, and resources accessed through UNH (Westlaw and PubMed). Eleven respondents report single, online resources, classified as “Other” (Dun and Bradstreet, AAFS, MedLine, NBER, etc. – see Appendix D for a complete list of item responses). Furthermore, eleven respondents provided either a response of “various,” or provided a list of online databases. See Appendix D for the complete list of item responses.

The second most-utilized alternative sources of information are public libraries and Yale University. Twenty-seven respective respondents report consulting public libraries and Yale University for research purposes equally. Twenty-one respondents consult any of the Connecticut State University System’s resources for independent research. A small number of respondents – four – report consulting Quinnipiac University for research. Three participants report accessing Fairfield University’s resources (see Figure 11a).

Participants were given the opportunity to provide other sources of information that are consulted. Fourteen respondents indicate access to universities not listed in the survey question (Connecticut College, Wesleyan, community colleges, Sam Houston State, DePaul, University of Maryland, and Stony Brook). Three respondents consult personal subscriptions and published materials. “Other” responses account for the exclusive databases available within the College of
Business, and a high school library. It must also be noted that six responses were considered invalid, as they did not provide adequate information regarding other locations sought for research purposes.

Figure 11a
What other sources do you consult for research?

Figure 11b
Online Databases Follow-Up

- Google Scholar: 3
- JSTOR: 5
- ProjectMuse: 2
- UNH Databases: 5
- Other: 11
- Various: 11
When asked what would increase the likelihood of their utilizing the Marvin K. Peterson Library for independent research, seventy-eight participants responded. It must be noted that several participants provided multiple responses, totaling eighty-five (see Figure 12). Forty-two respondents recommend expanding the e-journal library that is currently offered. Of the forty-two responses, fifteen participants specified which journal was deemed most desirable addition to the current e-journal offerings. JSTOR was recommended most frequently, totaling six. Two respondents suggest acquiring ProjectMuse, and two respondents suggest Web of Knowledge. The remaining recommended e-journal databases – IEEE Xplore, CRC Netbase, Lexis-Nexis, MLAIB, and Science Direct – were all suggested once each. Twelve respondents indicated the desire for print materials to undergo expansion and/or be updated. The response “Print Materials” accounts for both reference materials and journals in print form.

A number of respondents indicated a desire to improve the services that the library offers faculty. Six responses indicate a desire for faculty-centered workshops on the resources currently available at the Library. Five participants suggest that communication about the resources available at Library be more open, more informative. Three respondents suggest improving the inter-library loan system for faculty members. This would entail streamlining the inter-library loan system – perhaps even expediting inter-library requests for faculty members (see Figure 12).

Nine responses are classified as “other.” These responses were either unable to be categorized (federated search, quiet space, off-site access, fewer fees, etc.) or not entirely useful for the purpose of the evaluation (“very much,” free time, etc.). Three respondents indicate utilizing the Library for research, thus no recommendations. Two respondents report that they
are not pursuing independent research. Lastly, three respondents indicate “not sure” (see Figure 12).

![Figure 12](image)

What would increase the likelihood of your utilizing MKP Library for research?

- Not Pursuing Research
- I Utilize MKP
- Not Sure
- Improve ILL
- Inform Faculty about Resources
- Faculty Workshops
- Other
- Expand/Update Print Materials
- Expand E-Journals

When asked the question “What could the library do to increase the quality of students’ research?” the responses moved away from the need to expand resources as indicated in the responses regarding faculty research. Although there were similar sentiments, as in, expanding resources, the nature of the responses to the student-focused question was more service-based. Seventy-one participants answered the question, providing eighty-four total recommendations for developing the quality of student research. The strongest response trend pertains to developing the workshops and training programs that are a part of the library’s services. Eight participants express general sentiments of a need to develop the training offered by the library. Seven respondents recommend offering small, focused tutorials such as an APA guideline training, training in using PubMed, seminars on information literacy, etc. Four respondents suggest creating a credited, comprehensive course revolving around research and the library. Two participants recommend integrating research training into the undergraduate core curriculum courses (see Figure 13).
As mentioned, some of the recommendations regarding improving student research were similar sentiments to those of aiding the faculty in their research. Fifteen respondents indicated expanding e-journal and database offerings. Thirteen respondents suggest expanding research materials across the boards for students (electronic, print, digital, hands-on supplements). Five respondents recommend increasing publicity of the resources available at the library. Additionally, four respondents recommend offering periodic tours of the library for students (see Figure 13).

A number of participants took the question as an opportunity to vocally support the potential changes about which faculty were surveyed; six total respondents suggest moving forward with these ideas (federated search, FE001 integration, Blackboard integration). Nine responses indicate “not sure.” Two participants note that the faculty is accountable and should take on the task of developing students’ research abilities. Nine participants supplied unclassifiable, “Other” responses. These responses include: target students earlier, offer library training for graduate students, collaborate with faculty, etc (see Figure 13).
DISCUSSION

To what extent does the faculty think students meet information literacy standards?

Although the most common opinion of students’ information literacy skills is “good,” a broader perspective is needed for consideration of the responses as a whole: the majority of opinions are negative. This is to say that a number of faculty members do not believe that students are meeting information literacy standards. Within the context of library resource development and expansion, the insights of faculty members regarding how they think the library can facilitate better research on the part of the students reflects this negative outlook. The most common recommendation of faculty members is to develop the training offered to students. Furthermore, some participants even went so far as to recommend developing students’ information literacy skills: “Get them away from Wikipedia and teach them that anybody can put anything on the web. They must learn to discriminate.”

In consideration of the correlational analyses regarding faculty perceptions of student research papers and perceived level of information literacy skills, those faculty members who reported lower quality research papers also noted lower information literacy ratings. It is important to consider that the majority of participants who recommend developing research training through the library is accounted for by those who perceive students’ information literacy skills as fair or poor (see Appendix C). This specific population of faculty members sees a need for expanding library instruction for students, and an endeavor to develop library instruction may be worthwhile and beneficial to students. While some of these respondents highlight a need for resource expansion (e-journals, print materials), the main concern of the faculty with regard to student performance is ensuring that students receive adequate instruction on research strategies and information literacy.
What are faculty opinions of the library resources that currently facilitate the learning process?

In consideration of faculty perceptions of the resources that the library currently offers to help facilitate the learning process, the strongest trend throughout the survey questions that deal with this subject matter is that the faculty is not utilizing these resources to their fullest potential. Nearly half of the participants in the survey are not even aware that the library offers in-class tutorials on research strategies. Additionally, nearly 30% of faculty members who participated in the survey are not aware that the library offers resources specific to the subject areas that they teach. The trend of underutilization is also apparent in the rates at which faculty members enhance the curriculum. Course reserve is the only resource that a number of faculty members are using regarding their classes – a well-known standard practice in most universities. The more modern educational supplements – e-books and digital formats – are mainly unused, judging by the responses of the survey participants (the exception being e-journals). The responses are accented by one-quarter of the participants reporting not enhancing their courses with any library resources.

It is apparent that there is a communication gap between the library and the faculty regarding what resources are currently available. Considering the rates at which the faculty is not aware of some of the resources offered at the Marvin K. Peterson Library and the explicit desire of some of the faculty members to become more informed about what exactly the library offers them, it seems that increasing awareness about library services geared toward the faculty is the best solution. Greater efforts of publicizing library resources may be in order, be it a semesterly or trimesterly resource list to faculty on behalf of the library would be a sound solution, or even circulating an electronic sign-up system for library tours and in-class tutorials.
How willing is the faculty to collaborate with the library staff on improving research resources available through the library?

Judging by the responses of the survey participants, it is clear that the faculty support a collaborative effort with the library to develop the resources available to students. The most logical step would be to move forward with Blackboard integration of library resources, judging by the overwhelming support expressed for resource expansion in this respect. A collaborative effort may prove beneficial to library resource development beyond Blackboard integration. Referring back to increasing awareness of library resources, a more communicative relationship between the faculty and the library will undoubtedly provide an opportunity for them to become more familiar with what exactly the library offers. Collaboration may then help resolve the issue of resource underutilization.

What can the library do to facilitate better research on the part of students?

Regarding the proposed aspects of resource development (Blackboard-based research guides, FE001 integration, and a federated search), each respective idea has received tremendous support from the faculty. Regarding Blackboard research guides and FE001 integration, careful planning of the proposed initiatives’ schematics and gaining the support of the administration would be the next steps. These endeavors seem like a logical progression in resource expansion, as both are working within frameworks already in place at the University. A federated search on the other hand would entail a significant amount of funding, and may take time before it comes to fruition. Regardless if the library chooses to go forward with one or any of the proposed aspects of resource development, the library can do so knowing that there is a significant amount of support from the faculty.
The suggestions provided by faculty members regarding facilitating better research on the part of students indicate a number of possibilities that seem entirely feasible. Referring back to the issue of increased communication, efforts to make students more aware of the resources at the library seems like a simple but effective solution. The only obstacle currently in place is being granted the permission to send out mass-emails to students. This is an administrative issue and is worth inquiring about changing. The results of this survey may provide sound justification for being granted “UNH All” email access. Suggestions such as library tours and developing various training modules for students may also be a worthwhile pursuit. In terms of expanding e-resources and print materials, funding is an obvious issue. Perhaps it may be worth giving consideration to one of the suggested journal databases (particularly JSTOR, judging by the response rate).

**What can the library do to increase faculty utilization of resources available at the library?**

Much like the suggested efforts to increase the quality of student research, there are basic measures that the library can take to appear more accessible to the faculty. A number of faculty members made suggestions that would not necessarily require additional funding, such as informing faculty members of the library’s resources, improving the inter-library loan system for faculty members, and holding faculty workshops. Organizational development in this context may require time and planning, but the actual cost to make these suggestions may be little or none. Once again, communication seems like a recurrent issue with the participants in the survey, and an initiative to open a dialogue between the library and the faculty not only seems plausible but necessary.
Meeting the information demands of the faculty, while clearly an important issue, would require a massive allocation of funds to achieve a substantive change. Resource expansion which gives consideration to the various fields of interest of the faculty may be impossible to address within one initiative. Faculty members have successfully sought alternative means to obtain information – be it through colleagues, subscription services, or otherwise – and are currently subsisting through those alternative means. As this is so, focusing on the service aspects of accommodating the needs of faculty seems like the most logical strategy for the Marvin K. Peterson Library at this time. With that said, the needs of the faculty from a research standpoint are not being met by the University, and this is no fault of the library itself. Accommodating the needs of the faculty would essentially require a major shift on the part of the greater administration, a shift away from campus facility expansion and beautification, toward attending to the academic needs of both the students and faculty. Only then would the library even begin to address the resource gap that has been made apparent by this evaluation.
Spring 2010 Faculty Survey

Section I: The Classroom Experience

The following survey seeks information regarding your perceptions of how the library’s resources fit your professional needs and the needs of students, as well as your opinion of a few innovations in the works at the library.

A few minutes of your time will be of great service to the University. Thank you.

1. How would you rate the quality of students’ research papers?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Neutral
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - Don’t Know

2. How would you rate the quality of distance learners’ research papers?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Neutral
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - Don’t Know
   - I do not teach online courses.

3. Overall, how would you rate students’ information literacy skills?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Neutral
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - I am not familiar with information literacy skills.
4. Do you request school librarians to run classes on effective research during your class time?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
   ☐ I am unaware that these classes are offered.

5. What library resources do you currently use to enhance your curriculum? (Check all that apply)
   ☐ E-journals
   ☐ E-books
   ☐ Course Reserve
   ☐ Library Tours
   ☐ Digital Media (images)
   ☐ Digital Media (sound)
   ☐ Digital Media (video)
   ☐ I do not use library resources to enhance my curriculum.
   ☐ Other
       ____________________________________________________________
6. What are your impressions of the subject-specific resource guides currently available through the Marvin K. Peterson Library website?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Neutral
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - I am unaware that this service is offered.

7. How helpful would integrating general library research guides into Blackboard be to students?
   - Very Helpful
   - Helpful
   - Neutral
   - Unhelpful
   - Very Unhelpful

8. How helpful would integrating course-specific library resource guides into Blackboard be to students?
   - Very Helpful
   - Helpful
   - Neutral
   - Unhelpful
   - Very Unhelpful

9. What are your general impressions of the resource collaboration site libguides.com?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Neutral
   - Fair
   - Poor
   - I have never used this service.
10. Would you be willing to collaborate with library staff on developing resource guides specific to a given course you are teaching?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure

11. How helpful would incorporating in-class research tutorials into FE001 (a one-credit course required of all freshmen) be to students?
   - Very Helpful
   - Helpful
   - Neutral
   - Unhelpful
   - Very Unhelpful

12. Do you think it is likely that students would attend non-required, out-of-class seminars for research strategies?
   - Very Likely
   - Likely
   - Neutral
   - Unlikely
   - Very Unlikely

13. How helpful do you think an option to access all materials available at the library (stack locations, e-texts, digital media, government documents, etc.) from one search engine would be to students?
   - Very Helpful
   - Helpful
   - Neutral
   - Unhelpful
   - Very Unhelpful
14. Are you currently pursuing independent research?
   - Yes
   - No

15. Please tell us how often to you utilize the following resources at the Marvin K. Peterson Library for your research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>I am unaware that this resource is available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media (images)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media (sound)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media (video)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What other sources do you consult for research (either through electronic databases or access to stacks)?
   (Check all that apply)
   - Public Library
   - Connecticut State University System
   - Yale University
   - Quinnipiac University
   - Fairfield University
   - Online Database
   - Other

35
17. How have you obtained access to these alternate sources of information?
You indicated that you use alternative online databases. Care to share?

18. To which online databases are you referring?
Section IV: Open-Ended Responses

19. What would increase the likelihood of your utilizing the Marvin K. Person Library for your own research?

20. How can the library facilitate even better research on the part of students?
21. Department:
   - [ ] Tagliatela College of Engineering
   - [ ] College of Arts and Sciences
   - [ ] College of Business
   - [ ] Lee College

22. What is your current title?
   - [ ] Assistant Professor
   - [ ] Associate Professor
   - [ ] Professor
   - [ ] Adjunct
   - [ ] Lecturer
   - [ ] Other

23. At what level do you teach?
   - [ ] Undergraduate
   - [ ] Graduate
   - [ ] Both

24. For how many years have you been employed by the University?

25. Please provide your e-mail address if you would like to be entered into a drawing for a $25 Visa gift card for completing this survey. Your e-mail address will be kept confidential and will only be used for this drawing. You will not be contacted for any reason other than if you have won the drawing.

Thank you for completing the survey! Your input is valued and appreciated.

Please click "Done" to finalize your responses.
# APPENDIX B
## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

### Department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tagliatella College of Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your current title?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### At what level do you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For how many years have you been employed by the university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Employed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C
### CROSS TABULATION RESPONSE:
#### QUALITY OF ILS & FACILITATE BETTER STUDENT RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate quality of information literacy skills?</th>
<th>Expand E-Journals and/or Databases</th>
<th>Develop Library Curriculum</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Increase Publicity of Resources</th>
<th>Library Tours</th>
<th>Comprehensive Library Course</th>
<th>Expand or Update All Resources</th>
<th>Integrate More Tutorials Into Core Courses</th>
<th>Small, Specific Tutorials</th>
<th>Faculty is Accountable</th>
<th>Move Forward with Survey Ideas</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar with ILS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
ONLINE DATABASE RESPONSE ENTRIES

Response Text: “To which online databases are you referring?”

- NHTSA database
- JSTOR
- British library has everything one can possible ask for
- Pro Quest; Gale; Psychological Abstracts
- Georef
- Google Scholar
- Google Scholar
- Access government sources, NBER papers
- I_matrix, Compustat, Cresp, King of Pension Fund, ...
- Medical research
- JSTOR
- Jstor,
- too many
- I forget at the moment. FirstSearch or whatever that currently is.
- www.shrm.org, commonwealth fund, ebia.org, workforce.com, airsnwes, infolaw, etc.
- science direct
- College Music society, Journal of the Audio Engineering Society, SEARCH journal for new music (free),
- various
- project muse
- JSTOR
- Questia.com and Auonline
- Jstor, BLAST, Science, high wire, wormbase
- Pub med, MD Consult
- MedLine
- AAFS
- Dun & bradstreet
- Westlaw
- Google
- Westlaw
- Society of American Fight Directors (SAFD.com), School of Theatrical Combat, Academy of the Sword websites
- projectMuse
- CUNY System