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Introduction

In 2019 the Iowa State University Library contracted with Iowa State University’s Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM) to conduct an online survey with ISU students and postdocs. The goals for this year’s survey were: 1) to obtain helpful input regarding library use, 2) to better understand the importance of and satisfaction with library services provided, and 3) to plan for future enhancements to serve ISU students and postdocs more effectively. The principal investigators for the ISU Library Survey were Greg Davis (Assistant Director of the ISU Library) and Linda Anderson (Library Assessment Specialist, Systems Analyst). This report describes the survey and sample design, the data collection procedures used, and final survey response outcomes.

Sample and Survey Design

Three samples were used for the 2019 Library Survey: graduate students, undergraduate students, and postdocs.

The graduate and undergraduate samples were obtained from the Registrar’s Office, which drew the samples based on specifications provided by Linda Anderson. Students eligible for the survey included those enrolled in the spring of 2019 on either a full-time or part-time basis. Non-degree special students and distance-only students were excluded, as well as students with no information release holds. All US minority students were included in the sample as well as a specified percentage of non-minority and international students that varied by college. A variety of demographic variables were included in these samples along with names and contact information.

The postdoc sample was obtained from the Graduate College. It was a census and included all postdocs employed in spring 2019. The only information they could or would provide was name and email address for each postdoc. Because the survey included specific questions for respondents in the colleges of Design and Veterinary Medicine, CSSM contacted the Design and Vet Med colleges to get a list of their post-docs. The Design College replied with the name of one postdoc. CSSM could not locate anyone in Vet Med who was able to provide the information, but 34 postdocs were identified by searching Vet Med departmental websites. Colleges for a few other postdocs were identified in cleaning as the list was prepared for uploading. CSSM did not look up colleges for the remaining 272 postdocs due to time and budgetary constraints.

Table 1 below shows the number of students in the eligible frame by college and minority status. It also includes the number of postdocs in the frame by college where available. Table 2 shows the number of students sampled in each of the same cells. The final sample of 9427 included 2814 graduate students, 6299 undergraduate students and 314 postdocs.
Table 1. Eligible frame by college and minority status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Postdocs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td>Nonminority &amp; Int'l</td>
<td>Total UG Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; LS</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3956</td>
<td>4369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>4752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>7167</td>
<td>8184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>3795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sci</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>4944</td>
<td>5967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Undecl Grad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames Lab</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>25,087</td>
<td>28,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actual number of postdocs by college is unknown. Numbers that appear indicate what is known.

Table 2. Sample by college and minority status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Postdocs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td>Nonminority &amp; Int'l</td>
<td>Total UG Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; LS</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sci</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Undecl Grad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames Lab</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>6,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actual number of postdocs by college is unknown. Numbers that appear indicate what is known.

CSSM worked collaboratively with the principal investigators to develop the Library User Questionnaire. Most of the questions were based on the 2016 Library User Questionnaire, however, the 2019 version incorporated some significant changes. The number of response options was increased for most of the scaled survey questions. Questions that in 2016 evaluated “satisfaction” with specific library resources/services were redesigned to evaluate both the “importance” of and “satisfaction” with these resources/services. Lastly, several new questions were included to help evaluate how welcome, comfortable, or respected respondents feel when using the Library.
A single survey questionnaire was developed to accommodate all three samples, with routing and skip patterns for specific questions based on the respondent’s sample “Type” (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoc). The survey also included several questions that were specifically tied to a respondent’s college (e.g., the Design College or the College of Veterinary Medicine. The final survey consisted of 102 single-selection questions and 5 open-ended (text response) questions.

As an incentive for completing the ISU Library User Survey and to help increase survey response, the principal investigators included a gift card drawing as part of the overall survey effort. This drawing was mentioned in both the email invitation and reminder notifications, and was presented as a voluntary opportunity. Survey respondents who completed the survey and elected to be entered as part of the drawing (Q75 & Q76) became eligible for a chance to win one of one hundred $10 gift cards, good at any campus dining location, including Bookends Café in Parks Library.

The ISU Library Assistant Director, Greg Davis, submitted the project to the ISU Institutional Review Board for approval on 1/3/2019. On 2/5/2019, the IRB notified Davis that the survey did not meet the definition of human subjects research so approval was not required for the survey to proceed.

Data Collection Procedures

The three samples received were combined into one Excel file and prepared for survey administration, with unique Case IDs assigned to each sampled individual. The postdoc sample was limited in the demographic information it included; only name and email address were available for everyone. Postdocs identified by CSSM as being in the College of Design or in the College of Veterinary Medicine were labeled to ensure that they received the appropriate survey questions for their college. Because the postdoc sample was also missing Gender and Residency information, all postdocs in the sample were asked Q72 (Gender) and Q73 (Residency) as part of the survey process.

The survey questions were programmed for online administration with Qualtrics software and tested for accuracy by CSSM staff. Email notifications and reminders were developed cooperatively by CSSM staff and the principal investigators. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, unique usernames and passwords were assigned to each individual within the sample, with both the survey and the data stored on a secure server. These assigned usernames and passwords were embedded in a unique survey link for each individual, which allowed them to click on the link provided in their email notification to access their personal survey.

Initial email invitations were sent on February 28, 2019, while reminder notifications were sent to non-responders on March 6, 2019, March 11, 2019, and March 26, 2019. Each
invitation/reminder message explained the overall purpose of the survey, outlined a general
time commitment for taking the survey (10 to 12 minutes), reassured respondents of the
confidentiality of their responses, and invited them to participate in the gift card drawing.
Response was voluntary. Individuals could actively refuse to complete the survey either by
replying to the email message or by clicking on the “Opt out” link at the bottom of the
invitation. Completed surveys were received from February 28 to April 1, 2019.

Data collection for the Library User Survey ended on April 2, 2019, which included the closure
of all partially completed surveys that had not been submitted. The resulting data file was
edited and cleaned in Excel. The final data delivery consisted of an Excel data file (including
open text), a corresponding data code manual, a file containing frequency tables for the entire
data set, and a file containing the final sample dispositions of each case in the sample.

On April 4, CSSM randomly selected 100 names from the pool of people who entered the
drawing to receive a $10 gift card. A list of names and corresponding email addresses was
compiled and sent to the ISU Library Assistant Director, who made arrangements for contacting
the winners and distributing the gift cards. Email addresses that were voluntarily entered into
the survey data for the gift card drawing (Q76) were removed from the final data file by CSSM,
to avoid linking a respondent’s identity to their data.

Survey Response

The overall survey response appears in Table 3 below. Of the initial 9427 email invitations sent
for the Library User Survey, 44 resulted in bounce notifications due to an invalid or undeliverable
email address and were considered not eligible for the survey. In addition, 7 invitation
recipients were mistakenly represented in both the graduate and the postdoc samples; their
duplicate listings were classified as not eligible for the survey. Lastly, 2 invitation recipients
contacted CSSM to indicate that they are part of a professional program at another university
and not ISU Library users, while 1 other recipient was identified as recently deceased. The
remaining 9373 students and postdocs comprise what is considered to be the final eligible
sample.

In addition to ineligible cases, active refusals were received from 152 people who selected the
“opt out” link at the bottom of their email invitation/reminder(s), and 243 people only partially
completed their surveys. After reviewing the content in the 243 partially completed surveys, it
was determined that 98 were too incomplete to be included in the final data, while the
remaining 145 contained enough data to be retained. Of the remaining eligible cases, 7064
provided no response at all.

Complete, or sufficiently complete, surveys were received from 2059 individuals, for an overall
response rate of **22.0%** (2059/9373). Response rates for the three sample groups are **16.7% for
undergraduate students** (1052/6281), **32.4% for graduate students** (902/2786), and **34.3% for
postdocs (105/306). Response rates are calculated as the ratio of surveys (completed and partials retained) to the eligible sample.

Table 3. Survey response for undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdocs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Postdocs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>6299</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>9427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeliverable Email</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Sample</td>
<td>6281</td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5076</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial removed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed + Partial Retained</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE RATE</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlling for Type=Graduate

Residence/ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency/ethnic group</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Not complete</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Non-minority</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlling for Type=Undergraduate

Residence/ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency/ethnic group</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Not complete</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>3226</td>
<td>3835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Non-minority</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>2283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>5247</td>
<td>6299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighting

Aggregate results in this report were weighted so that subgroups are represented in the proportion in which they are found in the population. Most results in this report were weighted by the inverse of the sampling probability. Further analysis for some plots, including comparisons to previous years, uses poststratification weighting to adjust for varying average response rates by gender, college, and race/ethnicity groups, and also by discipline.
Results – User Type Analysis

Usage section

Estimates of per-person monthly usage were calculated by setting a response of daily to 16; weekly to 4; monthly to 1; once a semester to .3; less often to .2; and never to 0. All types (undergraduate, graduate, and postdocs) reported using an external website for their work far more often than library resources. Undergraduates’ next highest usage came from the library building, while graduate students and postdocs use a number of library resources.
Below, the levels of usage from the 2012, 2016, and 2019 surveys are compared by estimates weighted by college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity. The dots represent the median estimates, while the thicker segments represent the 50% uncertainty interval (50% probability the true value is within the thick segment) and the thin segments represent the 90% uncertainty interval.
Open Access

Questions about usage of open access materials for coursework or research showed that “online material discovered by yourself (Q7)” were used most at about 8 times per month for graduate students and 6.5 times per month for undergraduates. This was lower than reported external website usage (Q4 – 12.5 and 11 times per month). Next was “free online material provided by your instructor” and “free online textbook provided by your instructor” at about 4 and 3 times per month.

These levels did not vary much by discipline.
Information Literacy

Graduate students and postdocs who teach undergraduates were asked for their satisfaction on a five-point scale with their students’ performance. The probability of a response of 4 or 5 for undergraduates’ ability to find and use appropriate information was about 30%, a little higher for their ability to ethically use information and less than 20% for their ability to create a standard citation. Postdocs’ ratings tended to be higher than graduate students’. The results in the following two plots were weighted by type, college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity, using partially pooled estimates that shrink group estimates toward the mean, especially for groups with few members, giving conservative estimates of differences between groups.

In the plots, the dots represent the median estimate, the thick segments are the 50% credible interval (50% chance the true value is within this range) and the thin segments are the 90% credible interval. The wider the 50% and 90% intervals, the less certain is the estimate.

When asked about their own ability to find appropriate information for their teaching, graduate/professional students and postdocs had an estimated probability of around 80-85% probability of responding that they are satisfied (4 or 5 on a five-point scale), with Humanities and Arts & Design at 90-95%. For their ability to find information for their research, the estimates were more variable, between 75% and 90%, with postdocs and Humanities students above 90% (see plots on next page).

There was less variation by race/ethnicity and gender, but male students were possibly a bit more confident for the research question.
Likewise, when all groups were asked about their abilities, median estimates of the probability of responding that they are satisfied (with a 4 or 5 on the five-point scale) were almost all above 70% for all questions in each discipline. “Your understanding of plagiarism” was the highest, about 90%. “Create a standard citation” estimates have a wide range of uncertainty, although postdocs were confident in their ability, as were Humanities graduate students. Humanities graduate students were also more satisfied than other groups with their ability to find and use appropriate information for their coursework, as were Arts & Design graduate students and to a lesser extent Humanities undergraduates. Humanities graduate students were also more satisfied their understanding of plagiarism.

The results in the following two plots were weighted by type, college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity, using partially pooled estimates that shrink group estimates toward the mean, especially for groups with few members. Since discipline information was not available for most postdoctoral respondents, their discipline was set to “Postdoc.”

Information Literacy questions

Weighted by college, discipline, gender, race/ethnicity
There was some variation across ethnic groups and gender for “Your ability to identify and find appropriation information for assigned activities or coursework” and “Your ability to create a standard citation.” International students may be a little less confident about their understanding of plagiarism. Students of unknown ethnicity, Asians, and male African-Americans were possibly less satisfied than other groups in their ability to find appropriate information for coursework.
Total estimated uses per month of library resources, mean of importance and satisfaction with Research and Course Guides, and receiving instruction from a librarian in a class (CRI) were included as predictors in a model of the probability of students responding that they are satisfied (4 or 5) with their own ability for the three information literacy questions (Q16, Q17, and Q19).

Students using library resources 4 times per month are about 2% more likely to be satisfied with “your ability to find and use appropriate information for coursework,” compared to students using library resources about 1 time per month, and 4 or 5% more likely for “your ability to create a standard citation”, with little difference for “your understanding of plagiarism.”

For Guides, undergraduates with an average importance and satisfaction of 4 are predicted to be about 1% more likely to be satisfied with their understanding of plagiarism than undergraduates with an average of 2.

Course-related instruction (CRI) by itself predicts little to no difference for Q16 and Q19, but for “Your understanding of plagiarism,” receiving CRI predicts a 4% higher probability of satisfaction. Since the entire 90% credible interval (thin segments) is above zero, there is a greater than 95% probability, given the data, that CRI does predict a higher probability of satisfaction with understanding of plagiarism.

The comparisons for these three predictors adjusted for the other two predictors, sampling stratum, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Average predictive comparisons of input variable for probability of high satisfaction response >= 4
Resource usage 4 times per month vs. 1 time per month, mean importance and satisfaction with Guides, 4 vs. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Usage</th>
<th>Guides</th>
<th>CRI</th>
<th>Your ability to find and use appropriate info for coursework</th>
<th>Your understanding of plagiarism</th>
<th>Your ability to create a standard citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Usage</td>
<td>Guides</td>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median estimates with 50% and 90% credible intervals (thick and thin segments)
Tasks
Grad students and postdocs had a higher rate of having asked a library staff member for assistance in the past year than undergraduates, 54% vs. 39%, while the rate of having received instruction on using library resources from a librarian in one of your classes was about the same, 34% and 38%. Half of grad students/postdocs reported using bibliographic management software.
By Race/ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RaceEthnicity</th>
<th>Q19 (Asked a library staff member for assistance)</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RaceEthnicity</th>
<th>Q20 (Received instruction from a librarian)</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RaceEthnicity</th>
<th>Q21 (Used bibliographic management software)</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Search

Graduate students use Quick Search mostly to search for a specific title or author or to search equally for topics, but only a minority use it primarily to search for topics. This pattern is reversed for undergraduates, where in most disciplines the specific title/author search as a primary reason is the least popular reason.
The estimated monthly usage of Quick Search, calculated from Q22, varies by the primary reason for searching. Graduate students who use Quick Search for both topic and specific searches use it about five times per month on average, more than those who use it to search for topics (2.5 times) or for specific searches (3.5 times). Undergraduates use Quick Search a little more than 1 times per month, on average, for all three reasons.

Satisfaction with Quick Search on both the specific title or author and the general topics dimensions vary by the primary reason respondents give for using it.

Satisfaction with specific title or author searches (Q24) is higher for respondents who use it primarily for specific searches or equally with general topic searches, a little higher than 3.8 on a five-point scale for graduates, and a little under 3.8 for undergraduates, on average.

Conversely, satisfaction with a general topic search is higher for students who either search for topics primarily or equally with specific searches.
Welcomeness/Inclusiveness

The set of questions asking about feeling welcome at the library, feeling comfortable being myself, feeling respected, and feeling able to get my best work done at the library were rated on a five-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” with a not applicable option (which were set to missing). The average rating in all groups was at least a 4 (agree) and most were higher, 4.3 to 4.5, for the first three questions.

The rating for the fourth question, “I feel able to get my best work done at the library” was a little lower, below 4 in most groups.

These ratings did not vary much across grad/postdoc/undergraduate or discipline groups.
There was no discernible difference between the race/ethnicity groups or between men and women for the average responses to the first three of the four welcomeness questions. For all groups, there is around 90% probability that they will respond “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to the three statements.

These estimates were produced by a multilevel regression model that includes the sampling strata and discipline/undergraduate or graduate type as predictors. The estimates for the gender and race/ethnicity combinations were partially pooled and shrunk towards the mean, producing conservative estimates of differences between the groups, especially when there are few respondents in that group. The estimates were weighted by the population of students in type, college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity combinations.
The number of respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the first three questions were few. Survey indicated 15% of them (weighted proportion), or 26 respondents, were U.S. minorities for the “welcome” and “comfortable” questions. For the “respected” question, the weighted proportion of U.S. minorities was 20%, or 19 respondents, of those who gave it a rating.

For the fourth question, “I feel able to get my best work done at the library,” the probability of responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” is both lower and more variable, with wider and overlapping 50% credible intervals between the groups. International students have possibly the highest probability (~70%) and students with unknown ethnicity (~60%) the lowest, but there is no clear difference, especially between the other groups.
A model of the probability of responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to Q69, “I feel able to get my best work done at the library”, included as predictors the average of the importance and satisfaction responses for the availability of space to work individually and to work collaboratively and access to electrical outlets and chargers; estimated monthly building usage; gender; sampling strata, discipline/student type; and race/ethnicity group. The predictors included responses to questions about the Vet Med Library from Vet Med students.

The collaborative space and individual space predictors included interactions with both graduate/undergraduate type and with gender, to estimate different responses from those two sets of groups, but there were no appreciable differences for these two predictors by gender.

The outlets, collaborative space, and individual space compared probability of a high response to “Able to get my best work done” at an average importance and satisfaction of 4 to an average importance and satisfaction of 3 (five-point scale, with 5 being the highest importance/satisfaction).

Building use of 4 times per month compared to 1 time predicted ~5-6% higher probability of responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”.

The major difference between undergraduates and graduate students is collaborative space, which predicts 3-5% higher probability for undergraduates, but makes no difference for graduates. Individual space predicts 4-6% higher probability for both undergraduates and graduates.

Overall, males were predicted to have 4% higher probability than females of saying there were able to get their best work done at the library.

Average predictive comparisons for the race/ethnicity groups were made to compare the groups while adjusting for the other predictors, using the white group as the baseline. International students are about 8-9% more likely than white students to agree or strongly agree that they are able to get their best work done at the library. American Indian or Alaska Native (3%), Hispanic/Latino (2%), and students of two or more races (2%) might be a little more likely to agree as well, but there is essentially no difference between the other groups (Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Black/African American, or Asian) and white students. Unknown ethnicity students are 6% less likely to agree than white students.

![Graph showing probability of Q69 being >= 4, 'Able to get best work done', at different values of predictors.](image)

*Difference in probability at different levels of each predictor. The outlets, collaborative space, and individual space compared at an average importance and satisfaction of 4 to an average importance and satisfaction of 3 (five-point scale, with 5 being the highest importance/satisfaction).*
Attribution of academic success to the library

Over all respondents, 82% responded that the library’s resources and services contributed to their academic success either very much or some, with 30% saying very much, with fewer among the undergraduates than the grads/postdocs.
From 2016 to 2019, the percentage of respondents who responded that the library contributes “very much” to their success has stayed level. The results in this graph differ from the corresponding graph in the 2016 survey report, where the 2012 and 2016 results were weighted by college and gender, while here, the results were weighted by college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity for all three years. From a spot check, it appears that particularly in 2012 disciplines with a stronger relationship to the library responded at a higher rate and inflated the overall estimate in the 2016 report.

The trends and levels vary by discipline. Differences by year are mostly indistinguishable (within the 50% credible interval (thick segments), although the percentage of respondents who responded that the library contributes “very much” to their success may have gone up since 2016 among Math & Computer Science and Humanities graduate students and Physical Sciences & Engineering undergraduates. The other groups either stayed level or went down (plots on next page).

The estimates by year and gender were partially pooled and shrunk towards the mean, producing conservative estimates of differences.
Q71: To what extent have the Library's resources and services contributed to your academic success?

Graduates, weighted by college, discipline, gender, race/ethnicity

Weighted estimates of probability of responding 'Very much'

Undergraduates, weighted by college, discipline, gender, race/ethnicity

Weighted estimates of probability of responding 'Very much'
The probability of responding “very much” to Q71, “To what extent have the Library’s resources and services contributed to your academic success?” varied somewhat by race/ethnicity group, but usually not by gender.

These estimates were produced by a multilevel regression model that includes the sampling strata and discipline/undergraduate or graduate type as predictors. The estimates for the gender and race/ethnicity combinations were partially pooled and shrunk towards the mean, producing conservative estimates of differences between the groups. The estimates were weighted by the population of students in type, college, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity combinations.

Graduate students were more likely than undergraduates to respond “very much”. Asians, whites, and unknowns may be a little less likely to respond “very much” than the other groups, but the 50% credible intervals (thick segments) are overlapping, so the difference isn’t clear. Black women graduate students are the most likely to respond “very much” at 60%. International women graduate students are also somewhat more likely to respond “very much” than international men, at about 49% to 40%.

A model of the probability of responding that the library contributed “very much” to their academic success (Q71) included as predictors the average of the importance of and satisfaction responses for the availability of space to work individually and to work collaboratively; a sum of estimated monthly usage of various library resources; estimated monthly building usage; gender; sampling strata, discipline/student type; and race/ethnicity.

As was done for Q69, averages for individual space and collaborative space were compared at 3 and 4, and building use and resource use at 1 time per month vs. 4 times per month.
In contrast to Q69, for Q71 higher importance and satisfaction ratings for collaborative space did little to predict a higher probability of attributing success to the library, even for undergraduates, but importance of and satisfaction with individual space was associated with a 9% higher probability of undergraduates saying the library contributed “very much,” about the same difference as increasing building use from 1 to 4 times per month and slightly less than increasing resource use from 1 to 4 times (for undergraduates).

Again in contrast to Q69, male students were less likely to say the library contributed “very much” to their success.

Averaging over the range of the other predictors, Black or African American students 7-8% more likely than white students to say the library contributed very much to their success, as were international and most other minority groups, while Asian and unknown ethnicities were about the same as white students.
Results – Importance/Satisfaction Comparisons

Importance/satisfaction of Library resources and services

Average satisfaction ratings were plotted against average importance ratings (both on a five-point scale), for those who use the resource or service. The upper right quadrant of each plot shows items with both high importance and high satisfaction, each with the rating averaging 4 or above. The lower right quadrant displays items with high importance but lower satisfaction, which indicates that attention is needed. Color of dot tending towards red indicates a higher number of respondents who use the resource or service.

For library resources and services, there were no items in the high importance/low satisfaction quadrant. For the grads and postdocs, the items that are high importance are also high satisfaction, while for the undergraduates, no resources or services rate either high importance or high satisfaction, on average.
Importance/satisfaction of Parks Library resources

For Parks Library, there are a few items with both high importance and lower satisfaction (rating less than 4). For graduate students/postdocs, they are “Availability of space to work individually” and “Assigned library research study rooms”.

For undergraduates, in order of importance:

- Availability of space to work individually
- Access to electrical outlets and chargers
- Availability of space to work collaboratively
- Reserved group study rooms on third floor

Importance/satisfaction of Design Reading Room resources

Results were similar for the Design Reading Room. For graduates, access to electrical outlets and chargers were a concern. For undergraduates, availability of space to work individually was the most important concern, followed by access to electrical outlets and chargers and availability of space to work collaboratively.
Design Reading Room resources
Mean of individual importance and satisfaction ratings
Five-point scale, don’t use set to missing

Grads/Postdocs
- Scanners Design RR
- Computers and printers Design RR
- Library sta

Satisfaction
- Space to work individually Design RR
- Availability of space to work collaboratively Design RR
- Access to electrical outlets and chargers

Importance

Undergrads
- Scanners Design RR
- Computers and printers Design RR
- Library sta assistance Design RR front desk

Number of respondents who use service
- Access to electrical outlets and chargers Design RR
- Availability of space to work individually Design RR
- Availability of space to work collaboratively Design RR
Importance/satisfaction for Vet Med Library

For Vet Med students and postdocs, there were no items with either low importance or low satisfaction.
Filtered average satisfaction ratings from respondents who rated the item important (4/5) along with selected comments.

**ISU Library resources and services**
Five-point scale, only those respondents with importance rating $\geq 4$
Mean of individual importance and satisfaction ratings

**ISU Library resources and services**
Five-point scale, only those respondents with importance rating $\geq 4$
Mean of individual importance and satisfaction ratings

**ISU Library resources and services**
Five-point scale, only those respondents with importance rating $\geq 4$
Mean of individual importance and satisfaction ratings
Course Reserves/Research and Course Guides/Textbooks

- I feel that there are a lot of resources that the library offers that I am not aware of. I would probably add a tutorial or a resource guide on the website.
- Let course reserves use university login to match people's schedules with course reserved books. Have the address bar display the permalink to opened study document.
- I need 8th edition of Biochemistry book by Berg, for two semesters and it was never available, it would be a good idea to provide more copies as many students will need it in future also.
- My AGRON 342 class has a textbook on course reserve which is helpful because I didn’t have to buy it but frustrating because there are only three copies but 50ish people in the class. I think the copies available should be proportionate to the people in the class OR we should be instructed to purchase it.
- Certain textbooks that professors have written and published themselves are in low supply at both the library and the bookstore, so if acquiring a copy is not possible through the bookstore for reasons of lacking supply, the library would already have the few copies of that particular textbook reserved by other students and the wait time is long when a number of students reserve the textbook in advance of it becoming available again. Perhaps more copies of these rare, ISU specific textbooks would be helpful.
- It would be great if the library could have more copies of graduate textbooks. There are always just 1 or 2 and mostly are issued by others.

ILL/Pick from Shelf

- The Interlibrary Loan hyperlink does not always autofill the form when quick search cannot find an item. If this could be fixed or remedied, that would be amazing!
- It is not designed in a way that is user friendly. Often hard to find things. And the login of accounts is confusing. Why is there separate accounts for my checked out books and ILL requests?
- Quick links to inter-library loan when a searched item is not available via Quick Search
- Please email me when interlibrary loans are solved, because I haven’t received emails for several cases recently.
- I use the ISU library website a lot and I had no idea there was a Pick From Shelf pick up option. Making this service more known would be helpful. I would definitely use it!

Remote Access

- I do not get a "View at ISU" option for journal articles found using one of the search services (Academic Premiere, WoS, Google Scholar, etc) when searching off campus and accessing the search sites via library or accessing search sites via library and using ISU VPN. Back in 2015 this wasn’t a problem, but last couple years I've had no luck. I’ve had to save the citation and then bring computer to campus to get the article.
I used to be able to use google scholar off campus to download paid articles (I signed in using my library account and use google scholar from library website). In the past few years, I cannot download articles with google scholar using off campus service.

Many publication sources (e.g. IEEE, ACM) detect when a computer is from campus and allow showing the article. Unfortunately, this doesn't work when off-campus, even when using the Cisco AnyConnect proxy. This makes it more cumbersome to view articles found via Google or other sources.

When doing research, particularly when off campus, the article indexes can time out quickly. For example, if I'm just diving into a topic and I want to look at 20 articles related to it and open them in new tabs, by the time I have reviewed the first 10 the last articles will force me to log in again, search for the title again, and then review the materials, even if I have remained logged in and active on the site during that time.

My small complaint is that, when off campus, I often have to re-log into sites that have full text. E.g., search in Quick Search, select item, select full text, log in, get redirected to another site, have to find the log in link on that site, log in again, then can download the full text. This lengthy process means that I only do it for sources that I've found through some other means (Google Scholar, etc.) but can't get a PDF for.

Reserve a library space

- I am very disappointed with the lack of reservation space available to practice presentations. There used to be a presentation room that I found extremely helpful when preparing for a big presentation, because I could actually simulate the talk with equipment and not worry about being disturbed. When I went to reserve a room to practice a presentation this year, I was told I couldn't as more than one person needed to be in the room to reserve. While yes, I understand that this is the requirement for the group rooms, there is no available space anymore for individuals to practice presentations, which was a very helpful resource for students (especially with high fears and stress of public speaking...). I was rudely dismissed for voicing my concern that there was no longer a space available for that because of the new bathroom installation. For improvement, 1) it would be great to have a space available for students to practice presentations 2) to have staff who will listen to the concerns of students.
- Have less restrictions in number of hours I can reserve library space.
- Allow for room multiple room reservations to be made through a single request so those that need to reserve for multiple days do not have to wait during the load time for each day and to search for each day over and over.
- I would appreciate that if no one is using a study room after the time allotted and reserved you could continue using it

Chat

- ... There needs to be someone working the chat function during weekend hours. ...
- ... Also, it would be nice if the chat feature was available later into the day.
Reserved group study rooms

- More private rooms for groups to work in. I study with a large group and we sometime get loud. We are on the third floor yet people still glare at us like we are doing something wrong. We aren't trying to rude, we just have no where else to go.
- Maintain the rooms just like they are now.
- Group study rooms open PAST midnight. ...
- I wish there were more study rooms open that we wouldn't have to reserve. I always see rooms but they are always closed. When I try to reserve a room online, it is always booked and we can only book it for a max of two hours. Sometimes I want to be in the small rooms alone for more than two hours, but it is not possible.
- Clean the study rooms more often, specifically rooms 306 A-F, they're pretty gross. Also make sure the solstice TVs are available, the one in 306D has been nonfunctional for a week. Allow more than 2 hour max reservations on rooms and give priority to ASC tutors or staff to allow a month and a half reservation. Change the room reservation page so you can select something weekly for a certain location throughout all available points per month. If this were streamlined, I could complete this in a minute, versus 15 minutes.
- More group study rooms or pods, more innovative and adaptable furniture, smaller whiteboards or something like that, more modern and comfortable furniture. The collaboration spaces in the library don't really scream "hey come here to collaboratively work on innovative and modern concepts and designs".
- Better air circulation in the older study rooms.
- Implement booth type seating for students as a substitute for study rooms.

Assigned Library Research Study Rooms

- It would be useful to have access to private rooms for studying without disturbance. It would also be of great value for me if in this room there was a screen where I could connect my laptop in, this way being able to work in a more ergonomic position.
- As a grad student I would really like one of the study/ reading rooms to myself that I can reserve, but I have heard that I will have to share it with someone, so I do not use that service. If I had the option to have the room to myself for a semester I would use the surface.
- Improving the safety of the private graduate students rooms. There had been a lot of reports of missing valuable devices in the library which is a shame specially for the rooms which nobody has access to except the staff. Also the area around some of these rooms are very crowded and noisy which makes the rooms pointless for study.
- The light in the studying room is a little sparkling and uncomfortable for eyes.
- It would be great to have a designated time/space for graduate students writing their theses/dissertations. Just having other grad students in the room also working on this hard document would really help with productivity.
- Study rooms are too cold! When I work in mine, I have to leave the room very often to warm up.
Availability of space to work individually

- Adding more individual rooms that are divided from the open space.
- Making more room for individual study spaces would be nice. It seems like there's a lot of people that use the 4 or 2 person tables for individual work.
- I love working and studying at the library. I often hold tutor sessions at the library which is great because the groups can work collaboratively during the sessions. I sometimes wish there were more individual places to study as the study cubicles on the 3rd and 4th floor fill up very quickly. ...
- There are plenty of individual study spaces available, especially if you take the tiers into account, but I know a lot of people like a little sunlight rather than being stuffed in the tiers. Maybe some more individual study areas not in the tiers would help?
- I have no office, and I prefer not to study in a research space/room, but sometimes I cannot find an individual space to study at peak hours. More individual space please.
- I wish there was more spaces like the little cubicles on the main floors. I like the individual space and being able to get up and look out a window. There's usually always room in the tiers, but it feels gloomy and claustrophobic there sometimes.
- Additional small group rooms would be great, and more quiet individual work areas suitable for managing a few books and a laptop (outlet required!) would be nice.
- More individual desks. All tend to be full during peak times.
- Having individual work spaces that have both a table and outlets (because myself and many others like having beverages while we study, and I personally don't feel comfortable setting that on the floor in case of a spill). I think that naming or coding the group areas would be beneficial, so it would be easier to find other group members when the library is busy.
- The window seats for individuals are great for studying, but it would be nice to see more individual tables. I am sure there are others who prefer to have space to themselves and often individual work areas are taken pretty fast. More round tables would be cool too, especially for group projects or group studying as it is easier to communicate and include all people.
- More outlets and individual TABLES for studying
- It would be nice to have more individualized workspaces. Each floor has plenty of group spaces but they can get loud when trying to work alone. It would also be nice to see an area dedicated to taking a break from working. Maybe something like a lounge with comfy furniture and a TV, some board games maybe. It could also be a place for people to work if they chose, but just something to help people take breaks from focusing on work for long periods.
- I wish there was a better balance of individuals using spaces made for one person as opposed to taking up entire tables by themselves. Maybe if some of these group spaces were designated as “I’m alone but you can come sit with me” versus “I need this whole space to myself”.
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Quiet

- Make more individual cubicle style areas available with mandatory silence.
- I like the quiet room because it's the only place no students are allowed to talk. But the room is normally packed during exam periods. We should have more area like the periodical room for individuals who need quiet place.
- More clarification or indications of how quiet or loud an area needs to be. Easy ways to find a spot for groups to work, without having to reserve a room.
- The desks in the tiers don't all have power outlets, and some that do don't work. I would like more places where talking is heavily discouraged. The tiers are generally quiet, but people having an extended conversation can be very distracting, even if it's quiet. The computers near the main stairwell are fairly slow.
- ... It's quiet most of the time yet having some ear mufflers or ear plugs can help to concentrate better
- ... 4) public areas of the library are too loud, sometimes you can't even hear your own headphones, perhaps Library should clearly designate certain areas as "Collaboration Spaces" where talking is allowed, and other areas as "Quiet Spaces" where silence is expected, and have staff enforce the distinction for a sufficient period of time so that patrons get acclimated to the policy
- I am wondering if you could provide a quiet room equipped with computers. There is no computers available in the current quiet room.
- We need more quiet rooms/spaces. I know there are individual seats in the back on each floor, but when groups within a room speak loudly the quiet spaces do not have any difference.
- Have more spaces for individual, quiet study and better climate control. The only super quiet study room, the Periodical Room on the second floor of Parks Library, is freezing. Most students have to wear coats in there and your hands go cold and numb. It really does not make you want to study there. But it is also the only quiet study space. Also, maybe advice students that the library study areas are not places to come and conduct lengthy phone conversations. Even if it is a group study area, the purpose of it is to get school work done not chat on the phone. Also, the ladies rooms are very dirty. I think there are not enough restrooms for the capacity of people coming to the library.
- Improve amount of quiet spaces or have a quiet hour policy. Its always extremely crowded in the quiet areas which leaves me to go to noisier areas where people are disrespectfully loud and obnoxious and distracting and this serves as a major hindrance for those trying to get work done.
- I think it would be good for, during dead/finals week, to have another mandatory quiet place like the periodicals room, (say, the 4th floor). The periodicals room can get very crowded.
- I'm always shocked at how loud every floor of the library is on a constant basis. Designated quite areas need to exist and they need to be monitored. Are the scanners coming back to the third floor, please?
Availability of space to work collaboratively

- I really love the new space they have for the international students. It spaced very nicely and is very cozy they have good collaborative space and easy access to white boards and game to relieve stress and over I love it. I think cozy study areas like that should be an option for more building not just parks. Thank you for a new study area.
- It's hard to collaborate with teammates when you feel like you're going to disturb the people around you. More secluded areas for collaborative work would be nice. The rooms on the first floor are way bigger than they need to be and I feel like that is wasted space. Maybe designated quiet areas?
- More group study rooms or pods, more innovative and adaptable furniture, smaller whiteboards or something like that, more modern and comfortable furniture. The collaboration spaces in the library don't really scream "hey come here to collaboratively work on innovative and modern concepts and designs".
- More spaces to work collaboratively and individually
- Add more collaborative study rooms with late hours

Mindfulness Room

- Mindfulness room should be in an actual room, not just under the stairs.
- Where is the mindfulness room? Like information on where designated rooms are and what they are for
- ... Also, expand the mindfulness room to serve more students.
- There should be some lounge chairs for students to take a power nap. Students get so exhausted working and a cat nap can get good results. For the nap, it is so hard to find space, even if it is in the meditation room, it does not look good to lie down and look like the odd person. But lounge chairs or large bean sacs would be a good thing for everyone generally.

Electrical outlets and chargers

- I wish there were more outlets by the window individual desks/chairs, but overall, I love going to the library to study!!
- ... Lastly, I am very happy about the extra outlet towers that were added this year. Although they were a great addition, more outlets never hurts.
- More outlets and functional charging stations.
- I think adding the outlets was a real winner amongst the students, but it would be best to ensure all tables that do not have ease of access to outlets get them.
- MORE OUTLETS AND MORE SEATING WITH OUTLETS!!!!!!!!!
- It would be nice if there were more outlets in the Periodicals Room.
- The power outlets sometimes don’t work
- It would be helpful if power outlets could be made available to tables throughout the library instead of mainly along the walls.
- Outlets in stacks
- Outlets at every table on the third floor would be great. Maybe more whiteboards.
- Provide more outlets at tables. I also like the adjustable tables.
Tech Lending
- Since the semester break is longer maybe allowing 1 week of that break where people can still check out tech (ex: laptops)
- Get more laptops to rent out for the week. I know many students that use it because they cannot afford a laptop
- ..., Lendable phone chargers and over the ear headphones. Access to computers with multi-monitor capabilities.

Media Center
- The media room where the DVDs are located is difficult to navigate. I almost did not use it again because of how confusing it is.
- Sometimes the quick search will say there is a movie in stock by when I go down to the media center to find it, it is missing. Maybe someone has just moved it by accident.
- More focus on media center.

Special Collections and Archives
- Just make it more known. I loved the day I went and read archives.
Selected Design Reading Room comments

- ... More chargers in Design Library. A second printer in Design Library would be nice.
- Spaces that are bolder and more modern, encouraging creativity, especially the design reading room it often seems like it has been left behind.
- Add more outlets in the Design Reading room, especially by the study desks in the back.
- The scanners are an important resource in the Design Reading Room space. However, a higher quality scanner in addition to the flatbeds for scanning imagery is probably necessary for the College of Design. I recently had to take a task of scanning photos elsewhere because the scanners are really only best for books.
- Circulation desk attendants have been nice, but a little clueless about the design reading room’s materials, books on reserve, and general library policies. Maybe I caught a wave of new trainees, but I want library staff to know more than me about the space, even if they’re new. I have wanted to study there, but find the seating and desk options awkward. They’re too rigid, too close together... something. I do like that it’s a small space, though. I also hesitate to study there because you never know what sort of an environment it will be—quiet, loud, packed, empty... once I settled into a desk just as an undergrad started tearing into a bag of chips behind me. I guess I view it as less of a reading room and more of a resource center. I use the scanners, printer, and stacks, but never stay.
- For the design reading room I really enjoy that they added tables so there could be collaborative work occurring but it also is just so quiet that I don’t believe people know they can use this resource and not a lot of people use it because I don’t think they really know the benefits because I just started using it a lot more recently in my upperclassmen years.
Vet Med

**Vet Med Library resources**

Five-point scale, only those respondents with importance rating >= 4

Mean of individual importance and satisfaction ratings

- Scanners Vet Med
- Library staff assistance Vet Med front desk
- Computers and printers Vet Med
- Availability of space to work collaboratively Vet Med
- Access to electrical outlets and chargers Vet Med

Number of respondents who use service
Summary of Written Comments

In addition to the regular survey questions, the survey included four thematic open-ended questions that provided respondents with opportunities to provide written responses regarding:

- Improvements for the overall library website (Q40);
- Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources (Q65);
- Suggestions to improve inclusion and sense of belonging at the library (Q70);
- Additional comments or suggestions about library resources or services (Q74).

Many comments were submitted that were often “no comment”. These comments were removed from the comment data set and are not included in the comment counts or percentage calculations that follow.

Three qualitative themes were developed to group the comments. The themes were: sentiment, type, and category. Sentiment choices were positive, negative, or neutral. Type choices were concern, criticism, praise, or suggestion. Category choices were food, interlibrary loan/circulation (Ill/Circ), Quick Search, library services, library spaces, library technology, library website, welcomeness of the library, or no comment. Each comment was assigned a specific sentiment and type, but it was possible for a single comment to be classified into multiple categories.

The analysis of the quantitative questions used survey weights to make the proportion of respondents in each group (graduate students, undergraduate students, and postdocs) reflect the proportion by college and the substrata US Minority/Other in the university population. The counts of comments are not weighted. 150 more survey responses were received from undergraduates compared to graduate students, and 56 more comments were received from undergraduate students compared to graduate students.

Overall, graduate students and postdocs tended to comment more on virtual space related services (Quick Search, Ill, Website) while undergraduate students tended to comment more on physical space issues.

Sections A, B, C, and D below provide more detail on the frequencies comments appeared in the different groups within each theme. The corresponding respondent summary charts for each question are provided in Appendix E.
Library Website Improvements (Q40)

This open-ended question asked for feedback on improving the library website (including Quick Search, functionality, ease of use, services, online collections, etc.). 323 comments were submitted for this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentiment:** Sentiment scores for comments from this question were predominantly neutral (287, 89%). 5% (15) were considered to be negative, and 6% (21) were considered to be positive.

**Type:** 55% (176) of the comments were judged to be suggestions, 10% (32) were marked as concerns, 22% (73) were considered to be criticisms, and 12% (39) contained praise.

**Category:** The category receiving the most comments was service (153, 33%). There were 125 (27%) comments related to Quick Search and 89 (19%) comments related to the library’s website. Both undergraduate (45, 16%) and graduate students (37, 22%) offered comments related to the library website itself. Postdoc comments were often related to library services (12, 41%), the library website (7, 24%), and Quick Search (5, 17%).

![Q40: Suggestions to improve the Library's website Counts of categories](chart.png)
Improvements for library services, spaces or resources (Q65)

Parks Library continues to be used annually by over 2 million visitors with primary focus by undergraduate and graduate students. These students provided the majority of comments related to improving library services, spaces or resources. This question elicited 348 responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentiment:** 1.5% (5) of the comments were judged to be negative and 5% (17) were judged to be positive. The remaining 93.5% (326) of the comments were judged to be neutral. Many of these were in the form of suggestions.

**Type:** 85% (295) of the comments were judged to be suggestions, 8% (26) were marked as concerns, 4% (14) were considered to be criticisms, and 3% (11) contained praise.

**Category:** 60% (242) of the comments received were related to library spaces. 2% (5) of these comments were considered to have a negative sentiment. The rest (343) were positive or neutral.

14% (56) of the comments received were related to library services. 1.5% (5) of these comments were considered to have a negative sentiment. The rest (343) were positive or neutral.

Similar to library services, 13% of the comments received were related to library technology. 1.5% of these comments were considered to have a negative sentiment. The rest (343) were positive or neutral.

Other comment categories with at least 10 comments included welcomeness (7%, 27) and food (3%, 12).
Q65: Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources

Counts of categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill/Circ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts

- Neutral
- Positive
- Negative

Q65: Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources

Counts of categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill/Circ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts

- Neutral
- Positive
- Negative

Q65: Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources

Counts of categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill/Circ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts

- Suggestion
- Concern
- Criticism
- Praise
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Suggestions related to inclusion and a sense of belonging in the library (Q70)

The survey asked for suggestions to improve inclusion and sense of belonging at the library. There were 188 comments submitted for this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentiment:** 8% (15) of the comments were judged to be negative, while 15% (29) were judged to be positive. The remaining 77% (144) of the comments were judged as neutral.

**Type:** 61% (110) of the comments were scored as suggestions, 3% (5) were marked as concerns, 12% (22) were considered to be criticisms, and 24% (42) contained praise.

**Category:** The categories with the most comments were space (32%, 92), service (29%, 83), and welcomeness (28%, 81).
Q70: Suggestions to improve inclusion and sense of belonging at the library

Counts of categories

Values

Counts

Neutral  Negative  Positive

Suggestion  Criticism  Praise  Concern
Additional comments or suggestions for library resources or services (Q74)

The survey provided one last additional opportunity for respondents to provide feedback on library resources and services. There were 140 comments submitted for this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentiment: 7% (10) of the comments were judged to be negative, while 42% (58) were judged to be positive. The remaining 51% (72) of the comments were judged as neutral.

Type: 46% (64) of the comments were scored as suggestions, 6% (8) were marked as concerns, 8% (11) were considered to be criticisms, and 40% (55) contained praise.

Category: The categories with the most comments were space (34%, 58), service (19%, 33), Ill/Circ (13%, 23), and collections (10%, 18). 11 comments (6%) were tagged as welcomeness.
Recommendations

Following the completion of the data collection phase of the project, summary results were shared with the Library’s management team. Management team members were invited to meet with the project’s principal investigator and provide feedback and recommendations related to the survey results. The following list, in no particular priority order, was generated from these meetings.

- Continue to add more electrical outlets and/or power options
- Develop more quiet study space designed for individual study
- Replace worn furniture and/or acquire better furniture
- More group study space: the need for group study space steadily increases during the day into the evening
- There is a need for better environmental controls in the library
- Do a better job of informing patrons about gender inclusive restrooms
- Do a better job of informing patrons about the mindfulness room
- Do a better job of publicizing the artwork throughout the library
- Consider revising the binary gender question in future versions of this survey
Appendices

The following Appendices are included in this survey report:

A) ISU Library User Survey – Coding Manual
## VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SAMPLE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CaseID</td>
<td>Respondent’s Case ID#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Survey Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Survey Completion Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Graduate Student, Undergraduate Student, or Postdoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G = Graduate/Professional Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG = Undergraduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD = Postdoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Respondent’s College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A = Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ames Lab = Ames Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C = Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E = Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H = Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S = Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U = Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V = Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Respondent’s Department (ISU abbreviations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Respondent’s Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F = Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>Respondent’s Residency Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Respondent’s Age (Not available for postdocs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceEthnicity</td>
<td>Respondent’s Race / Ethnicity (Not available for postdocs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FullPart</td>
<td>Respondent’s Full or Part-time Status (Students only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Respondent’s Degree Program (Graduate students only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Respondent’s Classification Year (<em>Undergraduate students only</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AdmitType</th>
<th>Respondent’s Admission Type (<em>Undergraduate students only</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Direct from High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LearningComm only</th>
<th>Learning Community participant (<em>Undergraduate students only</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SURVEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Which library or reading room do you use most?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Parks Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Veterinary Medical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Design Reading Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = I don’t use any library spaces or reading rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 – Q4</th>
<th>Please indicate how often you do the following activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Once a semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Less often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Go to the library building or reading room that you use most
Q3. Use the Library website
Q4. Use an external website (e.g., Google, Google Scholar, Bing, YouTube, etc.) for your work
Q5 – Q9

Please indicate how often you use the following types of materials in your coursework or research.

1 = Daily
2 = Weekly
3 = Monthly
4 = Once a Semester
5 = Less Often
6 = Never
7 = No Course Work

Q5. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Free online textbook provided by your instructor (e.g., OpenStax Astronomy)

Q6. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Free online course material provided by your instructor (e.g., PhET Simulations)

Q7. Online materials discovered by yourself

Q8. Textbook checked out from the Library (not in course reserves)

Q9. Other physical items (books, DVDs, print journals) provided by the ISU library

IF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT (UG), SKIP Q10-15, GO TO Q16.

IF GRAD/PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS/POST-DOCS (G/P/PD), ASK Q10-13.

Q10

Do you teach undergraduate students?

1 = Yes (Go to Q11-13)
2 = No (Go to Q14)

IF Q10 = YES:

Q11 – Q13

Please indicate your overall satisfaction with your students’ performance in the following areas.

1 = Low
2 =
3 = Medium
4 =
5 = High
6 = Not Sure

Q11. Undergraduate students’ ability to find and use appropriate information for assigned activities

Q12. Undergraduate students’ ability to ethically use information for assigned activities

Q13. Undergraduate students’ ability to create a standard citation or bibliography
Q14 – Q18  Please indicate your satisfaction with your own skills listed below.

1 = Low  
2 =  
3 = Medium  
4 =  
5 = High  
6 = Not Sure

Q14. IF G/P/PD & Q10= YES (Teach): Your ability to find and use appropriate information for your teaching

Q15. IF G/P/PD: Your ability to find and use appropriate information for your research

Q16. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Your ability to identify and find appropriate information for assigned activities or coursework

Q17. ASK ALL: Your understanding of plagiarism

Q18. ASK ALL: Your ability to create a standard citation or bibliography

Q19 – Q21  In the past year, have you completed or participated in the following tasks related to your ISU coursework or research?

1 = Yes  
2 = No  
3 = Not sure

Q19. ASK ALL: Asked a library staff member for assistance

Q20. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Received instruction on using library resources from a librarian in one of your classes

Q21. IF G/P/PD: Used bibliographic management software provided by the library or other resources to manage your sources (e.g., EndNote Web, cite features in databases, Zotero, etc.)

Q22  How often have you used Quick Search, the main search bar on the Library website home page, to find library materials?

1 = Daily  
2 = Weekly  
3 = Monthly  
4 = Once a semester  
5 = Less often  
6 = Never
IF Q22 = 1-5, GO TO Q23
IF Q22 = 6 (NEVER), SKIP Q23-25, AND GO TO Q26.

Q23  What is your primary reason for using Quick Search (the main search bar on the Library home page)?

1 = Search for a specific title or author
2 = Search for topics
3 = Both of these equally

Q24  Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you look for a specific title or author?

1 = Low satisfaction
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = High satisfaction

Q25  Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you are exploring general topics or subjects?

1 = Low satisfaction
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 = High satisfaction

Q26 – Q30  How often do you use the Library website for the following purposes?

1 = Daily
2 = Weekly
3 = Monthly
4 = Once a semester
5 = Less often
6 = Never

Q26. Use article indexes and databases (e.g., Academic Search Premier (EBSCO), Web of Science, JSTOR, etc.)
Q27. Find and use electronic journals and/or articles
Q28. Find and use e-books
Q29. Find physical items (e.g., books, DVDs, CDs, maps, microforms, etc.)
Q30. Find materials in Special Collections and University Archives (e.g., manuscripts, rare books, etc.)
Q31 – Q39  For each of the following ISU Library resources and services, please indicate how important it is to you and how satisfied you are with the resources or services provided.

1 = Low  
2 =  
3 = Medium  
4 =  
5 = High  
6 = Don't Use

- Remote (off-campus) access to library materials and services through the Library website  
  Q31a. Importance  
  Q31b. Satisfaction

- Assistance or help from library staff through Chat or email  
  Q32a. Importance  
  Q32b. Satisfaction

- Reserve a library space (e.g., group study room, or to practice a presentation)  
  Q33a. Importance  
  Q33b. Satisfaction

- Research and Course Guides  
  Q34a. Importance  
  Q34b. Satisfaction

- Interlibrary Loan and document delivery  
  Q35a. Importance  
  Q35b. Satisfaction

- Pick from Shelf (service to pull materials for pickup at desk)  
  Q36a. Importance  
  Q36b. Satisfaction

- IF G/P/UG: Course Reserves  
  Q37a. Importance  
  Q37b. Satisfaction

- IF G/P/PD: Iowa State University Digital Repository (Research and scholarship by Iowa State's faculty, students and staff)  
  Q38a. Importance  
  Q38b. Satisfaction
• **IF G/P/PD:** Library workshops and seminars supporting your research (e.g., bibliographic management tools such as EndNote, funding resources, using the Digital Repository, etc.)
  
  **Q39a. Importance**  
  **Q39b. Satisfaction**

**Q40** What suggestions do you have to improve the Library’s website, including Quick Search, functionality, ease of use, services, online collections, etc.?

[Open text response]

IF P (VET MED), SKIP Q41-58 AND GO TO Q59-64.
IF UG/G/PD, ASK Q41-52

**Q41 – Q52** For each of the following Parks Library resources, please indicate how important it is to you and how satisfied you are with the resources provided.

1 = Low  
2 =  
3 = Medium  
4 =  
5 = High  
6 = Don’t Use

• Library staff assistance at the Circulation/Research Help Desk
  
  **Q41a. Importance**  
  **Q41b. Satisfaction**

• Computers and printers available for public use
  
  **Q42a. Importance**  
  **Q42b. Satisfaction**

• Tech Lending (laptop and other equipment checkout)
  
  **Q43a. Importance**  
  **Q43b. Satisfaction**

• Scanners available for public use
  
  **Q44a. Importance**  
  **Q44b. Satisfaction**

• Access to electrical outlets and chargers
  
  **Q45a. Importance**  
  **Q45b. Satisfaction**

• Availability of space to work collaboratively
Q46a. Importance
Q46b. Satisfaction
• **IF UG:** Reserved group study rooms  
  Q47a. Importance  
  Q47b. Satisfaction  

• Availability of space to work individually  
  Q48a. Importance  
  Q48b. Satisfaction  

• **IF G:** Assigned library research study rooms for private research  
  Q49a. Importance  
  Q49b. Satisfaction  

• Special Collections and University Archives reading room  
  Q50a. Importance  
  Q50b. Satisfaction  

• Media Center  
  Q51a. Importance  
  Q51b. Satisfaction  

• Mindfulness Room  
  Q52a. Importance  
  Q52b. Satisfaction  

**IF DESIGN COLLEGE, ASK Q53-58:**  

**Q53 – Q58**  
For each of the following Design Reading Room resources, please indicate how important it is to you and how satisfied you are with the resources provided.

1 = Low  
2 =  
3 = Medium  
4 =  
5 = High  
6 = Don’t Use  

• Library staff assistance at the front desk  
  Q53a. Importance  
  Q53b. Satisfaction  

• Computers and printers available for public use  
  Q54a. Importance  
  Q54b. Satisfaction  

• Scanners available for public use  
  Q55a. Importance
Q55b. Satisfaction
• Access to electrical outlets and chargers  
  Q56a. Importance  
  Q56b. Satisfaction  

• Availability of space to work collaboratively  
  Q57a. Importance  
  Q57b. Satisfaction  

• Availability of space to work individually  
  Q58a. Importance  
  Q58b. Satisfaction  

IF PROF STUDENT (VET MED), ASK Q59-64:

Q59 – Q64 For each of the following Veterinary Medical Library resources, please indicate how important it is to you and how satisfied you are with the resources provided.

1 = Low  
2 =  
3 = Medium  
4 =  
5 = High  
6 = Don’t Use  

• Library staff assistance at the front desk  
  Q59a. Importance  
  Q59b. Satisfaction  

• Computers and printers available for public use  
  Q60a. Importance  
  Q60b. Satisfaction  

• Scanners available for public use  
  Q61a. Importance  
  Q61b. Satisfaction  

• Access to electrical outlets and chargers  
  Q62a. Importance  
  Q62b. Satisfaction  

• Availability of space to work collaboratively  
  Q63a. Importance  
  Q63b. Satisfaction  

• Availability of space to work individually  
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Q64a. Importance
Q64b. Satisfaction
Q65  What suggestions do you have to improve library services, spaces, or resources?

[Open text response]

Q66 – Q69  Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree  
6 = Not Applicable

Q66. I feel like I am welcome at the library.
Q67. I feel comfortable being myself at the library.
Q68. I feel respected at the library.
Q69. I feel able to get my best work done at the library.

Q70  What suggestions do you have to improve inclusion and sense of belonging at the library?

[Open text response]

Q71  To what extent have the Library’s resources and services contributed to your academic success?

1 = Very much  
2 = Some  
3 = Very little  
4 = Not at all

IF POSTDOC, ASK Q72-73:

*Q72  What is your gender?

1 = Male  
2 = Female

*Q73  Are you from...

1 = Iowa

*Postdoc responses to Q72 & Q73 were integrated into the corresponding Gender & Residency variables that appear toward the beginning of the dataset. The columns for Q72 & Q73 do not appear in the final data.
Q74 Please record any additional comments or suggestions about ISU Library resources or services in the space below.

[Open text response]

Q75 Would you like to be entered into the drawing for a $10 gift card for any ISU campus dining location?

1 = Yes (Go to Q76)
2 = No

**Q76 IF Q75 = Yes: Drawing winners will be notified electronically. Please enter your preferred email address:**

[Open text response] **Q76 variable removed from the final dataset in order to protect confidentiality.**