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I. Survey Report Introduction

A. Survey Goal
To measure the user perceptions of undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral scholars of the value, impact, and service quality of the services provided by Iowa State University Library.

B. Background
The results of the survey provided the University Library (Library) with an increased understanding about specific library users and comparative data obtained with comparisons with the previous 2012 Fall Library User Survey. The 2016 user survey was based on a streamlined version of the 2012 survey. The survey was sent to selected Iowa State University undergraduate and graduate students and all Post-Doctoral Scholars (who are also referred to as Postdoctoral Research Associates). The survey was created during the spring of 2016, and sent to participants in April 2016.

C. Survey Report Participants
Authors Linda Anderson, Michael Belding, Greg Davis (Principal Investigator), and Olivia Madison
Feedback/Analysis Library Cabinet, Library Management Team, Library Advisory Committee, and M. Monica Gillen
Graphs & Charts Linda Anderson
Editorial Jodi Hilleman and M. Monica Gillen

D. Survey Report Description
The following 2016 Survey Report includes three sections: User Survey, Survey Results, and Summary of Written Survey Comments. The report concludes with four appendices, which include the user survey’s coding manual and the email invitation and reminder correspondence.

1. User Survey
This section describes the design of the survey instrument, which was planned to obtain longitudinal information from all students and Postdoctoral Scholars (postdocs) about the perceived quality of the broad range of services, discovery tools, collections, and facilities provided by the Library. The section also describes the process, college-based sampling methodology, and the survey response rate data.

2. Survey Results
This section provides in-depth data-based survey results, typically broken down by undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdocs. While the majority of the facilities and services data is derived from use of the Parks Library, the section also includes selective comparative data for the Design Reading Room, Veterinary Medicine Library, and Parks Library.

3. Summary of Written Survey Comments
This section discusses the written comments and provides summary analysis for the following four open-ended questions:
- Finding information if Quick Search is never used (Q21)
- Improvements for the overall library website (Q40)
- Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources (Q69; Additional comments or suggestions about library resources or services (Q75)
II. User Survey

A. Survey Tool
Qualtrics was the online assessment instrument used by the Iowa State University Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM) to create the electronic survey.

B. Survey Designers and Administrators
Survey Team: Linda Anderson, Michael Belding, Greg Davis, and Olivia Madison
Feedback: Library Cabinet and Library Management Team
Paid Services: Janice Larson, CSSM

C. Survey Foundation, Design and Participants
The 2012 Library User Survey provided the structural framework for the 2016 Library Student and Postdoc Survey. In turn, LibQUAL+® provided the framework for the 2012 Iowa State University Library User Survey. LibQUAL+® is utilized within the international library community to seek, comprehend, and utilize user feedback on minimum, perceived, and desired service levels using gap analysis. The Library administered LibQUAL+® surveys biennially from 2001 to 2009 provided a board overview of our user’s needs. The 2012 Library User Survey was designed to provide more in-depth information about specific needs of library users as the Library was beginning a new strategic and operational planning process. The users surveyed were faculty, professional and scientific staff, undergraduate students, and graduate students.

The 2016 Library Survey was designed to obtain information about the perceived quality of library services for all students and longitudinal comparative data utilizing selected 2012 survey questions. The survey was also sent to all postdocs. The Library had never surveyed the postdoc employee group, and the Survey Team believed it was important to begin a continuing longitudinal assessment of their library research needs and perspectives.

Postdocs represent a growing employee group. They support vital and strategic disciplinary research programs including the biological and agricultural sciences, engineering, physical sciences, social sciences, and veterinary medicine as well as several institutional and regional research institutes, and national facilities (e.g., the Ames Laboratory, a U.S. Department of Energy research facility). Therefore, library research collections and services are key to their collective success.

D. Survey Methodology and Assessment Instrument
This is a mixed method survey, measuring satisfaction levels and usage. The survey included 14 question sets, depending on the user group, and more than 75 sub-questions. The rating scale for questions that measured satisfaction had a 4-point scale that used the terms low, medium, high, and don’t use. The usage questions used a 6-point scale. The questions focused on the library website. The survey also included four opened-ended questions. CSSM used Qualtrics as the online assessment instrument to create the electronic survey.
E. Process

The Survey Team prepared three samples for survey administration, and unique Case IDs (survey user name) and assigned passwords to each sampled individual. The postdoc sample was limited in the information it utilized, which included only name, email address, and department were available. As a result, CSSM assigned colleges to postdocs based on their department and added two questions (gender and residency status) to the survey for postdocs only.

The survey questions were programmed for online administration, and CSSM tested them for accuracy using Qualtrics software. CSSM staff and the Survey Team cooperatively developed email notifications and reminders. 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.

As an added incentive for completing the ISU Library Student and Postdoc User Survey and to help increase survey response, the Survey Team incorporated a gift card drawing as part of the final survey questionnaire. This drawing was announced in the email invitation and reminder notifications. Each survey respondent who completed the survey and elected to be entered as part of the drawing (see Q76) was eligible for a chance to win one of fifty $20 gift cards, redeemable at the Bookends Café in Parks Library or any other campus dining location.

Initial email invitations were sent on April 6, 2016; reminder notifications were sent to non-responders on April 12, 2016, and April 18, 2016. Each invitation/reminder message explained the overall purpose of the survey, outlined a general time commitment for taking the survey (8 to 10 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 a link below the message. Completed surveys were received from April 6 to April 22, 2016. Following the survey closure on April 25, 2016, final data (including open text) was downloaded, cleaned, and prepared using Microsoft Excel. Fifty partially completed surveys with responses through at least Q24 were included in the data file. An additional 66 surveys that were accessed but exited prior to Q24 were removed from the data file. A corresponding data code manual was developed in Microsoft Word, and frequency response tables were run in SAS and finalized in a Word document.

F. Sampling

The Survey Team created the survey with primary input from the Library Administrative Cabinet and Library Management Team. Greg Davis, Assistant Director for Library Information Technology Services, obtained approval to conduct the survey from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which is responsible to review and approve all ISU research involving human participants. After obtaining an IRB exemption, the Survey Team continued to work closely with CSSM.

Three samples were used for the 2016 Library Student and Postdoc Survey. Graduate and undergraduate student samples were obtained from the Registrar’s Office, which drew the samples as requested by CSSM. Students eligible for the survey included those enrolled in the spring of 2016 on either full-time or part time basis. Non-degree special students and distance-only students were excluded. The Registrar’s Office also excluded students with no information release holds. Prior to drawing the samples, the Registrar’s Office sorted
each frame by gender and residency (Iowa, non-Iowa US, International) so they would be represented proportionately. The postdoc sample was obtained from the Office of Human Resources; it was a census and included all postdocs employed in spring 2016.

The percentage of students sampled varied by college. Table 1 below shows the number of students in the eligible frame by college, the percentage requested from each college and the number sampled. It also includes the number of postdocs by college. The final sample of 6,723 included 2,952 undergraduate students, 3,451 graduate students, and 320 postdocs.

Table 1. Eligible frame and sample by college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Postdocs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame N</td>
<td>Sample %</td>
<td>Sample N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4020</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7140</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>4050</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>5866</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Undeclared Graduate Students</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26,963</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>4,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The project sample design called for 50% of the Engineering College graduate students to be included in the sample; however, 100% were included in error – this was discovered after the survey was in progress.*
G. Survey Response

The overall survey response appears in Table 2 below. Of the initial sample of 6,723 students and postdocs, 37 emails were undeliverable. Two of these emails, both postdocs, were no longer listed in the ISU Directory and therefore were not considered eligible for the survey. This resulted in an eligible sample of 6,721. The other 35 undeliverable emails were individuals still listed in the ISU Directory (0.5% or 35/6721). Active refusals were received from 36 individuals; 34 of them used the “opt out” link in the email invitation/reminders and 2 contacted CSSM by email to refuse (0.5% or 36/6721). There were 66 surveys that were too incomplete to be included in the final data (1.0% or 66/6721), and no response was received from 4856 individuals (72.3% or 4856/6721).

Complete, or sufficiently complete, surveys were received from 1,728 individuals, for an overall response rate of **25.7%** (1,728/6,721) with postdocs having the highest response rate. Response rates were calculated as the ratio of surveys (complete and partial) to the eligible sample.

Response rates for the three sample groups are:

- **Undergraduate Students:** 16.7% (494/2952)
- **Graduate Students:** 32.4% (1,117/3,451)
- **Postdocs:** 36.8% (117/318)

Table 2. 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><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>2952</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Eligible</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Sample</strong></td>
<td>2952</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>6721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invalid email addresses</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refused</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partials removed</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Surveys</strong></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSE RATE</strong></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARGIN OF ERROR</strong></td>
<td>±4.4%</td>
<td>±2.5%</td>
<td>±7.2%</td>
<td>±2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Survey weights

Weights were calculated to adjust the response demographics to reflect the demographics of the population, by type (undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdocs), college, and gender. Percentages and means in the report are adjusted by these weights. Gender was not included in the weighting for postdocs.
III. Survey Results

A. Overall Satisfaction with Parks Library

Note: These graphs do not include responses for the Veterinary Medicine Library or Design Reading Room. They were calculated on the subset of respondents who did not mark “Don’t Use” for each service or resource. For example, 80% of grads/postdocs who did not mark “Don’t Use” on the Circulation/Help Desk satisfaction question rated their satisfaction as “High.”

95% error bars are included in the graph. These were estimated using the number of respondents who use each service/resource. A table of the count of respondents who use each service or resource follows on the next page. This complete subset (represented by the Total column) was used in estimating the variance and confidence limits for the satisfaction levels percentages for the subpopulations of graduate students/postdocs and undergraduate students, using domain analysis in SAS proc surveyfreq.
Counts of respondents who use each service/resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Grads/Postdocs</th>
<th>Undergrads</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookends/Fireplace RR</td>
<td>646.0</td>
<td>370.0</td>
<td>1016.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circ/Help Desk</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>1087.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative space</td>
<td>639.0</td>
<td>432.0</td>
<td>1071.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/printers</td>
<td>709.0</td>
<td>428.0</td>
<td>1137.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Reserves</td>
<td>460.0</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>645.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group study rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>291.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides</td>
<td>522.0</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>759.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Chat/email</td>
<td>514.0</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>675.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL/Doc Del</td>
<td>672.0</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>841.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual space</td>
<td>761.0</td>
<td>432.0</td>
<td>1193.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC Help Desk</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>472.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Center</td>
<td>346.0</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>541.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia prod studios</td>
<td>298.0</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>472.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlets/chargers</td>
<td>709.0</td>
<td>436.0</td>
<td>1145.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of lighting</td>
<td>852.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>1300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote access</td>
<td>1002.0</td>
<td>346.0</td>
<td>1348.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research study rooms</td>
<td>380.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>380.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve space</td>
<td>455.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>719.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanners</td>
<td>622.0</td>
<td>317.0</td>
<td>939.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec Coll/Archives</td>
<td>366.0</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>531.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>467.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>467.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Satisfaction Comparisons for Parks Library, Veterinary Medicine Library, and Design Reading Room

All respondents except those from the College of Veterinary Medicine were asked to rate their satisfaction with the services provided at Parks Library. Therefore, respondents from the College of Design were asked about their satisfaction with services at Design Reading Room and Parks Library. Only respondents from the College of Veterinary Medicine were asked only about satisfaction with services at Veterinary Medicine Library.

The services targeted by the survey that were in-common for all locations were collaborative study space, computers/printers, individual study space, outlets/chargers, quality of lighting, scanners, and staff assistance. Respondents could indicate their level of satisfaction with these services at the location they identified as “most used”. The rating of “high” was the highest rating a respondent could select. Other choices for satisfaction level were “low”, “medium”, or “don’t use”.
The following table compares the percentage of high satisfaction responses for each targeted service for each location by the respondents associated with that location. Again, these percentages are of respondents who did not mark “Don’t Use.”

Overall, Parks Library had the greatest “high” satisfaction percentage for the service area of collaborative study space. The Design Reading Room had the greatest “high” satisfaction percentage for the services of computers/printers, individual study space, and outlets/chargers. The Veterinary Medicine Library had the greatest “high” satisfaction percentage for the services of quality scanners, staff assistance, and quality of lighting.

Of overall importance, staff assistance received between 65 to 74% high satisfaction at the three facilities. The continuing investments in computers/printers and scanners also received very “high” satisfaction scores at the three facilities – of particularly note that scanners for the vet students received the highest satisfaction level of 82%. Alternatively, the services of collaborative study space and outlets/chargers were the only services with under 50% of respondents not giving a high satisfaction rating for all locations.

Regarding public space specifically, regardless of facility, individual study space received higher satisfaction levels than collaborative space, while Parks Library had the smallest differentiation. As mentioned above, the Design Reading Room received highest satisfaction for individual space (close to 55%), which was lower than for collaborative space (around 42%), and Parks Library received the highest satisfaction for collaborative space. The Veterinary Medicine Library received the lowest levels for both collaborative space (just over 30% and of concern) and individual space (40%).

These questions were compared for both percentages reporting high level of satisfaction and percentages reporting they do not use the service or resource. The percentages reporting high level of satisfaction were calculated on the subset of respondents who did not mark “Don’t Use” for each service or resource.

Several of the questions were worded differently in 2012 and 2016, and of particular note is the difference for Q41. In 2012, the question did not ask about the Circulation Desk. Question texts for each year are in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 question number</th>
<th>2016 question text</th>
<th>2012 UG question number</th>
<th>2012 Grad question number</th>
<th>2012 question text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>Remote (off-campus) access to library materials and services through the library website</td>
<td>Q10l</td>
<td>Q12m</td>
<td>Remote (off-campus) access to library materials and services through the e-Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Assistance or help from library staff through Chat or email</td>
<td>Q10s</td>
<td>Q12t</td>
<td>Librarian assistance through IM, chat or email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Interlibrary Loan and document delivery</td>
<td>Q10q</td>
<td>Q12r</td>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>Library staff assistance at the Circulation/Research Help Desk in Parks Library</td>
<td>Q10r</td>
<td>Q12s</td>
<td>Library staff assistance at the Help and Information Desk in Parks Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>Computers and printers available for public use</td>
<td>Q10t</td>
<td>Q12u</td>
<td>Public computers and multimedia tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>Availability of space to work collaboratively</td>
<td>Q10v</td>
<td>Q12w</td>
<td>Library space for group study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>Availability of space to work individually</td>
<td>Q10u</td>
<td>Q12v</td>
<td>Library space for quiet study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage reporting high level of satisfaction
Excludes those who don't use


Percentage of respondents

Year of survey

Type
Graduate   Undergraduate

95% confidence bands

Percentage reporting that they use resource/service


Percentage of respondents

Q42. Computers   Q46. Collaborative space   Q48. Individual space

Year of survey

Type
Graduate   Undergraduate

95% confidence bands
D. Usage and Satisfaction Levels – Comparing Graduate Students and Postdocs

1. Frequency of Use
The first comparison between graduate students and postdocs was based on frequency of use of the library, library website, and online services and resources.

This algorithm calculated an estimate of monthly frequency of use by the respondents for each resource:

- if usage response = 1 (daily) then usage count is set to 16;
- else if usage response = 2 (weekly) then usage count is set to 4;
- else if usage response = 3 (monthly) then usage count is set to 1;
- else if usage response = 4 (once a semester) then usage count is set to .3;
- else if usage response = 5 (less often) then usage count is set to .2;
- else if usage response = 6 (never) then usage count is set to 0;
Please indicate how often you do the following activities.

- Q2. Go to the library building or reading room that you use most.
- Q3. Use the library website.
- Q20. How often have you used Quick Search, the main search bar on the library website home page, to find library materials?

How often do you use the library website for the following purposes?

- Q25. Use article indexes and databases (e.g. Academic Search Premier (EBSCO), Web of Science, JSTOR, etc.)
- Q26. Find and use electronic journals and/or articles
- Q27. Find and use e-books
- Q28. Find physical items (e.g. books, DVDs, CDs, maps, microforms, etc.)
- Q29. Find materials in Special Collections and University Archives (e.g., manuscripts, rare books, etc.)

An overall score of library usage was created by summing the estimated frequency of use over all of the questions above. The distributions of scores, shown in Figure 1, are skewed, so median scores may be a better comparison. The mean scores were 23 for the graduate students and 19 for the postdocs. The median score for graduate students was 17, while the median for postdocs was 13. A nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test of whether these two samples are from the same distribution showed a significant difference, p=0.04.

The means of the estimated usage for each of the individual questions showed some differences between graduate students and postdocs shown in Figure 2.

The differences between these two user groups indicate that graduate students make more use of library building, website, and Quick Search than postdocs do, and postdocs make more use of e-journals/articles and article indexes and databases than graduate students do. The median estimated usage was the same for each of the questions except library building usage, which was one time per month for graduate students and 0.3 per month for postdocs. Both groups make relatively less use of e-books and physical items, and an extremely low use of Special Collections and University Archives.
Figure 2
Means of estimated total monthly usage counts from Q2, Q3, Q20, Q25-Q29

Because the main difference between graduate students and postdocs appears to be in building usage, another sum was created for all of the questions except Q2, building usage. The median score for graduate students was 14, and the median score for postdocs was 12. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed no significant difference between these two samples (p=0.7).

2. Satisfaction Levels
An average satisfaction score was created for the following satisfaction questions:

- Q23. Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you look for a specific title or author?
- Q24. Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you are exploring general topics or subjects.

How satisfied are you with the following Library resources and services?

- Q30. Remote (off-campus) access to library materials and services through the library website
- Q31. Assistance or help from library staff through Chat or email
- Q32. Reserve a library space (e.g., group study room, multimedia production studio, or to practice a presentation)
- Q33. Research and Course Guides
- Q34. Interlibrary Loan and document delivery
- Q36. Library workshops and seminars supporting your research

Because postdocs use the physical libraries much less frequently than graduate students, their library building-related satisfaction questions were not included in the score.
To calculate the score, responses of ‘Don’t use’ were set to missing, and the remaining responses were set to a scale of 0 to 1, with 0 for low satisfaction, 0.5 for a medium level of satisfaction, and 1 for a high level of satisfaction. The transformed responses to the set of questions for each respondent were summed and divided by the number of non-missing responses to create an average satisfaction score for each respondent.

The mean and median satisfaction scores for graduate students were both 0.67 (on a scale of 0 to 1), and the mean and median scores for postdocs were 0.70. The distribution of scores is shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3](image)

The median number of resources and services used was 4 (out of 8 questions) for both groups.
3. Digital Repository

In mid-2012, the Library implemented a major new discovery and research support tool, the Digital Repository (DR), to serve as a global platform for ISU faculty, staff, postdocs, and students to share their research and scholarship. As an institutional repository for the ISU community, it provides continuing free and open access to scholarly and creative works, research, publications, and reports. All authors are entitled to receive monthly reports as to usage of their works.

Since its inception (with around 60,000 papers), the DR has enabled over 9,000,000 total global downloads of DR content (December 2016). Graduate dissertations and theses are an essential part of its collection with 17,099 dissertations and 5,281 theses (December 2016). The Graduate College requires that all new approved graduate theses and dissertations to be added to the DR. The Library continues to digitize older theses to this important digital collection.

The primary DR users are faculty, staff (including postdocs), and graduate students. Therefore, for the purposes as this survey, only graduate students and postdocs were requested to indicate their familiarity with the DR and its use as a discovery tool, and if they have added their publications to the DR.

While both groups have significant research and scholarly responsibilities, the following chart revealed that a greater percentage of postdocs compared to graduate students were familiar with the Digital Repository (49% to 41%), used it as a discovery tool (35% to 27%) and had added publications to the DR (27% to 11%).
E. Overall Usage - Students: Comparing 2012 and 2016

Average per-person monthly usage counts (calculated by the algorithm on p. 11) across ten broad categories remained generally constant between 2012 and 2016. Graduate students reported the highest usage decline in e-books, physical items, and the library website, with a small decline in abstract and index databases use which was within the confidence limits of the 2012 estimate. Similarly, there was a minor (statistically insignificant) increase in library building use. The decrease in their use of physical items is probably tied to the almost universal electronic access to current journals, and continued major investments in increased journal electronic backfiles. Undergraduate students reported minor changes across the ten categories with continued high monthly usage of the library building.
F. Usage and Satisfaction with Quick Search

The three user groups indicated a strong combined weekly and monthly usage of Quick Search to find library materials. Graduate students had the highest combined usage (58%) and the highest daily usage (13%). Postdocs combined total was 56% with lower daily usage. Undergraduate students reported a combined weekly and monthly usage of 40% and the highest combined total for lowest use (34%), including less often than once a semester or never.

Quick Search offers specific search parameters for author/title and topical searches. All three groups reported primarily using Quick Search for both types of searches, thereby balancing their searching approaches (around 38% to 42%). However, as would be expected given their research approaches, postdocs and graduate students use Quick Search more exclusively for specific title/author searches (44% and 40%) than undergraduate students. Conversely, undergraduate students reported a much higher percentage of primary use of Quick Search for topical searches (37%).
G. Satisfaction with Quick Search - Students: Comparing 2012 With 2016

The following table compares 2016 Quick Search satisfaction related questions:

- Q24. Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you are exploring general topics or subjects?
- Q23. Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you look for a specific title or author?

With 2012 Quick Search satisfaction related questions:

- Overall level of satisfaction with relevance of Quick Search results.
- Overall level of satisfaction with ability of Quick Search to identify library-owned materials that match your needs

Both groups indicated an essentially unchanged high satisfaction level for specific Quick Search searches and a slight decline with general Quick Search searches, particularly for undergraduate students.
H. Use of Building or Website Resources

Only 23 respondents (weighted percentage of 1.6%) indicated they never used any of these resources:

- Library building or reading room (Q2)
- Library website (Q3)
- Library website for article indexes and databases (Q25)
- Library website for e-journals and/or articles (Q26)
- Library website for e-books (Q27)
- Library website for physical items (Q28)
- Library website for materials in Special Collections and University Archives (Q29)

The weighted mean number of resources used at all was 5.5 and the median number was 6.
The weighted mean number of resources used at least monthly was 2.9 and the median number was 3.
The weighted mean number of resources used at all was 5.5 and the median number was 6.
The weighted mean number of resources used at least monthly was 2.9 and the median number was 3.

If we remove Library building or reading room use out of this list, the weighted mean number of resources that were used at least monthly was 2.2 and the median number was 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The algorithm used previously to estimate a monthly frequency of use was employed on these questions (If the response was daily, then set to 16 times per month, if the response was weekly, set to 4 times per month, etc. If the response was missing, the frequency was set to zero.):

For graduate students, the mean monthly usage count was at least one for everything except Special Collections/Archives. For undergraduate students, the counts were lower for everything except the library building, but with the exception of Special Collections/Archives, everything was at least 0.8.

Accordingly, the following three user-based tables provide the monthly per-person usage of external websites, library website, Quick Search, specific discovery tools, electronic or physical materials, library building, and Special Collections/Archives. All three groups are highly dependent on external websites use and reported lower usage of e-books, physical items, and Special Collections/Archives.

With some small variations and discounting use of library building, graduate students and post docs reported similarly higher monthly usage for e-journals/articles, library website, Quick Search, and abstracting/index databases. Undergraduate students report high monthly usage of the library building and similarly much less frequent usage for the library website, Quick Search, abstracting/indexing databases, and e-journals/articles.
The next chart breaks down the undergraduate respondents into lower level (UG12) and upper level (UG34) and includes comparisons with graduate students and postdocs, with 95% confidence limits. There is no discernible difference in usage between the lower level and upper level undergraduate students, with the possible exception of library building usage, where the lower level students have a slightly higher point estimate of usage of 5.6 visits per month vs. 4.3 visits.
The following two charts provide the comparative mean of estimated monthly usage for eight broadly defined disciplines for Quick Search, Abstracting/Indexing Databases, Articles, e-Books, Physical Items and Special Collections. The first table combines monthly usage for graduate students and postdocs and the second table provides monthly usage for undergraduate students.

**Graduate Students and Postdocs**: Monthly usage for Quick Search, abstracting/indexing databases, and articles have greater variability across disciplinary categories. For e-books, physical items and Special Collections, monthly usage had much less variability and lower usage. Some disciplinary categories had a low number of respondents, resulting in uncertainty in these estimates, particularly for the humanities, where there were only 30 graduate student and postdoc respondents.

**Undergraduate Students**: The point estimates for monthly usage have considerably less variability for undergraduate students than for graduate students/postdocs across discipline categories. However, the humanities and business/economics had higher point estimates of usage for Quick Search, abstracting/indexing databases, physical items, and/or Special Collections. Overall, there should be some reservations with making interpretations given the few respondents for the humanities (59), business/economics (21), and math/computer science (9).
### Estimated usage per month

Mean for each discipline with 95% confidence markers

**Type 2=Graduates/Postdocs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Q20 Quick Search</th>
<th>Q25 AID</th>
<th>Q26 Articles</th>
<th>Q27 e-Books</th>
<th>Q28 Physical Items</th>
<th>Q29 Spec Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Econ</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Comp Sci</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated mean counts**

- ![Graph Data] Estimated mean
- ![Graph Data] Lower confidence limit
- ![Graph Data] Upper confidence limit

### Estimated usage per month

Mean for each discipline with 95% confidence markers

**Type 2=Undergraduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Q20 Quick Search</th>
<th>Q25 AID</th>
<th>Q26 Articles</th>
<th>Q27 e-Books</th>
<th>Q28 Physical Items</th>
<th>Q29 Spec Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Design</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Econ</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Comp Sci</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
<td>![Graph Data]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated mean counts**

- ![Graph Data] Estimated mean
- ![Graph Data] Lower confidence limit
- ![Graph Data] Upper confidence limit
I. Coursework and Information Literacy

The survey included three questions related to level of use of materials for coursework or research for coursework or research. Postdocs were not asked usage of online materials provided by instructor. All respondents reported a high frequency for online materials, regardless of reason, with the postdocs having the highest level at 90% for themselves. Physical items, as demonstrated by other questions, were largely used occasionally or never by all three groups with undergraduate students having a larger never usage (43%).

In Q8, 371 graduate students and postdocs answered that they do teach undergraduate students, and were asked questions 9 through 12. The percentages of graduate students and postdocs who teach are in this table:

<p>| Q8. Do you teach undergraduate students? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9-11 asked instructors, including graduate students and postdocs, to indicate their satisfaction with three broad questions related to information literacy and as part of undergraduate students’ assigned activities:

- Ability to find and use appropriate information
- Ability to ethically use information
- Ability to create a standard citation

The following chart shows that the combined high percentage of instructors who ranked their student abilities as “Medium” to “High” was consistently strong across the three activities, with find/use appropriate information at 68%, ethically use information at 67%, and create citations at 49%. Although 15% to 24% percent of the instructors indicated they were not sure, with the highest being the abilities to create citations.

Q12-Q16 asked the three groups to ranks their satisfaction with own abilities related to information literacy: finding and using appropriate information for their assigned activities, understanding of plagiarism, and abilities to create a standard citation or bibliography.

The following chart shows that all three groups were confident in these abilities, and the respondents consistently ranked their abilities as “high”, with “understanding of plagiarism” garnered the largest “high” percentage of respondents. Postdocs responded with the strongest percentage numbers for high abilities across their four questions (76%-82%) and graduate students had slightly lower “high” satisfaction levels (63%-77%). Undergraduate students’ highest ranked ability was for “understanding plagiarism” with a more mixed ability level for “creating citations.”
The following chart provides longitudinal responses (2012 to 2016) for the percentage of undergraduate and graduate students reporting high levels of satisfaction with their own skills for identify/finding information for courses and/or research, and creating citations. In terms of identifying/finding information, their ranked abilities improved but for creating citations, there was some decrease, particularly for graduate students.
The following chart compares 2016 questions for graduate students teaching undergraduate students:

- Q10. Undergraduate students’ ability to ethically use information for assigned activities
- Q9. Undergraduate students’ ability to find and use appropriate information for assigned activities
- Q11. Undergraduate students’ ability to create a standard citation or bibliography

With 2012 questions:

- Q5g. Undergraduate students’ ability to ethically use information for assigned activities
- Q5e. Undergraduate students’ ability to find appropriate information for assigned activities
- Q5f. Undergraduate students’ ability to use appropriate information for assigned activities
- Q5h. Undergraduate students’ ability to create a standard citation or bibliography

For both surveys, there were low percentages of instructors who highly rated student abilities related to information literacy. The highest longitudinal percentage increase was for the ability to ethically use information for assigned activities, which increased from 23% to 30%. The only decrease was for the ability to create a standard citation or bibliography, which dropped from 16% to 11%. However, both of these changes were within the confidence limits of the 2012 estimate.

Q17-19 asked three groups to indicate whether or not they had asked for assistance from library staff, received instruction on using library resources from a library in one of your classes (students only), and usage of standard bibliographic management software systems (graduate students and postdocs only).

The following chart provides the response breakdown for the three groups.

- Asked for assistance: Graduate students were the most inclined to ask assistance (51%) followed by postdocs (43%). Conversely, undergraduate students were far less inclined to ask for assistance, 63% stated no.
- Received instruction on using library resources: Only students were asked to respond with similar responses of no (61% for undergraduate students and 65% for graduate students).
- Used bibliographic management software: The response was reverse for graduate students (43% yes) and postdocs (54%).
J. Future Initiatives – Graduate Students and Postdocs

The survey asked for specific feedback from graduate students and postdocs on the importance of two potential future initiatives that would include support for graduate and professional students, and postdocs:

- Developing a trusted online data repository
- Provide advisory services for research data management

Both initiatives drew considerable support – 53% of the respondents ranked the data repository as high and 49% ranked the advisory service for research data management as high. Eighteen percent of the respondents said they would need more information regarding both initiatives before indicating their importance to them.
K. Library Contributions to Academic Success

The following chart compares each survey group’s assessment of library contributions to their respective academic success. When combining “Very much” and “Some”, 82% of the respondents indicated the importance of library contributions to their academic success. Graduate students (43%) and postdocs (50%) strongly (i.e., “very much”) recognized the Library’s role in contributing to their academic success. The majority of undergraduate students (57%) indicated that the Library had some role in contributing to their academic success.

The following chart compares 2012 results to 2016 results for the Library’s contribution to academic success for graduate and undergraduate students. While both groups reported a decline of respondents providing a “very much” rating, the decline was greater for graduate students (54% to 43%) with a relatively more stable decline for undergraduate (28% to 24%). The 2016 undergraduate estimate is within the confidence limits for 2012.
IV. Summary of Written Survey Responses

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:

- Finding information if Quick Search is never used (Q21);
- Improvements for the overall library website (Q40);
- Suggestions to improve library services, spaces, or resources (Q69);
- Additional comments or suggestions about library resources or services (Q75).

When respondents provided responses to these questions, they often commented on more than one topic. In these cases, the responses were divided into multiple comments, each addressing a topic. This resulted in over 1,500 written comments from the 1,728 survey respondents. Comments provided suggestions for many improvements that would be important to the Library’s continuing processes to improve its website, services, resources, and physical space. The responses also reflected a high degree of satisfaction among undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdocs with their library experiences and the Library’s role in their academic success.

While analysis of the quantitative questions used survey weights to make the proportion of respondents in each group (graduate students, postdocs, and undergraduate students) reflect the proportion in the university population, the counts of comments are not weighted. Higher numbers of graduate student comments reflect the fact that there were many more graduate students in the original sample and in the respondent data set.

A. Alternatives to Quick Search to Find Library Materials (Q21)

As the primary search tool, the Quick Search box is featured on the website front page and can be used as a simple general search tool, similar to Google, or it can be used in a wide variety of search pathways for more precise searching methods (e.g., journal or book titles, authors, subjects, etc.).

Question 21 was filtered by Question 20, which asked respondents if they use Quick Search. If respondents indicated they did not use Quick Search, they were presented with Question 21, which asked them to comment on the search strategies they used instead of Quick Search. For Question 20, 1,556 respondents (422 undergraduate, 1,032 graduate, 102 postdoc) indicated they used Quick Search. One hundred sixty-six (166) respondents (72 undergraduate, 81 graduate, 13 postdoc) indicated they do not use Quick Search. Of these 166 respondents, 104 (62%) provided comments about alternatives to using Quick Search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Many respondents to Question 21 offered replies like “no comment” or “don’t know.” For the purpose of this analysis, this data is not included in the following chart.
For all groups, Google and/or Google Scholar were the clear alternatives for respondents who do not use Quick Search. Graduate students indicated Google/Google Scholar (33) or a database (12) as their primary alternative tools. Postdocs indicated Google/Google Scholar (7) as their primary alternative tools. Undergraduate students indicated Google/Google Scholar (33) as their primary alternative, regardless of the physical location of the searching activity, which included Ames Public Library.

B. 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.), and elicited the highest number of respondents (433) and comments (498). Graduate students provided the majority of the responses and comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions included improvements to the Library’s access/discovery tools (135) and electronic collections (56). Both undergraduate (23) and graduate students (24) offered suggestions related to the library website itself, and graduate students offered many suggestions (29) for improving off campus (i.e., remote) access to online materials.
The need to improve collections was a higher priority for graduate students and postdocs, and access/discovery was a higher priority for graduate students, followed by undergraduate students.

Graduate students (20) and undergraduate students (12) commented on spaces/computers, and both groups expressed almost the same number of comments for more education/help.

Postdocs provided only one comment on the website and no feedback on space/computers, probably due to their much lower use of the physical library.

**Note:** Many respondents to Question 40 offered replies like “no comment” or “no opinion”. For the purpose of this analysis, this data is not included in the following chart.

![Counts Per Theme](chart.png)

Q40: Suggestions to improve the Library’s website
Counts Per Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Access/Discovery</th>
<th>Collections</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Remote Access</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>ILL</th>
<th>Spaces/computers</th>
<th>Need education/help</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Sign in</th>
<th>Chat/Ask Us</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
<th>Don’t use library</th>
<th>Alumni access</th>
<th>Bib Management</th>
<th>Digital Collections</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>More pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
C. Improvements for Library Services, Spaces or Resources (Q69)

Parks Library continues to be used annually by over 2 million visitors with primary focus by undergraduate and graduate students. These student respondents provided the majority of comments related to improving library services, spaces, or resources. This question elicited 427 responses that contained 549 comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks Library Space:** Of the 539 comments, the most frequent related to the amount and type of user spaces in Parks Library – 178 comments or 33% of all comments. Specifically, the respondents proposed more space in general (55), group study space (43), and individual study space (41); additional space designated as quiet space (29); more comfortable spaces (10); and more private space (2).

**Electrical Outlets:** The most frequent specific comment (128 or 19.7%), as it was in past surveys, was the request for more electrical outlets.

**Additional Suggestions:** Other suggestions (with at least 10 comments) included longer hours (22), more technology (e.g., computers, scanners, and printers) (16), better lighting (15), more food choices (13), and cleaner space (10). Examples with fewer suggestions included cheaper printing (8), more space for Bookends Café (8), better scanners (5), and keeping the Design Reading Room (2).

**Note:** Many respondents to Question 69 offered replies like “no comment” or “no opinion”. For the purpose of this analysis, this data is not included in the following chart.
Counts Per Theme (where count > 1)

Q69: Suggestions to library services, spaces, or resources

Type = Undergraduate
- Better wifi
- More tables
- More help about services provided
- More entrances
- More study to reserve spaces
- Microwave
- Long lines in Bookends
- Larger media selection
- Better signage
- Staff training
- Better way to discover media
- Needs to be cleaner
- Cheaper printing
- More space - Bookends
- More comfortable spaces
- Better temperature control
- Better lighting
- All Good
- Longer hours
- More quiet spaces
- More individual seating
- More group study space
- More space
- More outlets

Type = Postdoc

Type = Graduate
D. Additional Comments or Suggestions for Library Resources or Services (Q75)

The survey provided one last additional opportunity for respondents to provide feedback on library resources and services. There were 179 responses, containing 244 comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest number of comments related to one theme to this question. A little over 28% (69) of the 179 respondents indicated they found library resources or services to be “good”. All postdoc comments relevant to the question related to the theme of “good.”

Of the total 244 comments, several reinforced suggestions from the three previous open-ended questions and others provided additional commentary. The most repeated comments included requests for expanded collections (18), more electrical outlets (12), and expanded hours (9), grow awareness of library resources (8), likes interlibrary loan (7), likes online access to materials (7), and welcoming (7).

Examples of topics that generated fewer comments from only graduate students included:
- Like Quick Search
- Loves librarians
- Interest in more Veterinary Medicine Library space
- More technology
- Better website access off campus
- Dedicated graduate study spaces

Examples of topic that generated fewer comments from only undergraduate students included:
- Clean
- Printing too expensive
- Likes Bookends Café
- Likes quiet space
- Likes study spaces

See the following chart for the breakdown of comment themes about library resources or services by each group and the numbers of individual comments tied to each theme.

**Note:** Many respondents to Question 75 offered replies like “no comment” or “no opinion”. For the purpose of this analysis, this data is not included in this chart.
V. Appendices

The following Appendices are included in this survey report:

A. ISU Library Student and Postdoc User Survey – Coding Manual
B. Email Invitation from Beth McNeil, Dean of Library Services
C. Email Reminder 1 from Beth McNeil, Dean of Library Services
D. Email Reminder 2 from Beth McNeil, Dean of Library Services
**APPENDIX A**
2016 ISU Library Student and Postdoc User Survey – Coding Manual

<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 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>ADMIN = Administration</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</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><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td>Respondent’s Degree Program (<em>Graduate students only</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td>Respondent’s Classification Year (<em>Undergraduate students only</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Freshman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Junior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AdmitType</strong></td>
<td>Respondent’s Admission Type (<em>Undergraduate students only</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Direct from High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VARIABLE SURVEY**

**Q1** Which library or reading room do you use most?

1 = Parks Library
2 = Veterinary Medical Library
3 = Design Reading Room
4 = I don’t use any library spaces or reading rooms

**Q2 – Q4** Please indicate how often you do the following activities.

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

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 – Q7** Please indicate how often you use the following types of materials in your coursework or research.

1 = Frequently
2 = Occasionally
3 = Never
4 = No Coursework

Q5. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Online materials provided by your instructor
Q6. Online materials discovered by yourself
Q7. Physical items (books, DVDs, print journals) provided by the ISU library

IF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT (UG), SKIP Q8-12, GO TO Q13.
IF GRAD/PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS/POSTDOCS (G/P/PD), ASK Q8-12.

Q8. Do you teach undergraduate students?

1 = Yes (Go to Q9-12)
2 = No (Go to Q13)

IF Q8 = YES:

Q9 – Q11. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with your students’ performance in the following areas.

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Not sure

Q9. Undergraduate students’ ability to find and use appropriate information for assigned activities
Q10. Undergraduate students’ ability to ethically use information for assigned activities
Q11. Undergraduate students’ ability to create a standard citation or bibliography

Q12 – Q16. Please indicate your satisfaction with your own skills listed below.

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Not sure

Q12. IF G/P/PD & Q4 = YES (Teach): Your ability to find and use appropriate information for your teaching
Q13. IF G/P/PD: Your ability to find and use appropriate information for your research
Q14. IF UG or G/P (not PD): Your ability to identify and find appropriate information for assigned activities or coursework
Q15. ASK ALL: Your understanding of plagiarism
Q16. ASK ALL: Your ability to create a standard citation or bibliography
Q17 – Q19  In the past year, have you participated in the following tasks related to your ISU coursework or research?

1 = Yes  
2 = No  
3 = Not sure

Q17. **ASK ALL:** Asked a library staff member for assistance  
Q18. **IF UG or G/P (not PD):** Received instruction on using library resources from a librarian in one of your classes  
Q19. **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.)

Q20  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 Q20 = 1-5, GO TO Q22  
IF Q20 = 6 (NEVER), GO TO Q21, SKIP Q22-24, AND GO TO Q25.

Q21  IF Q20 = NEVER: How do you usually find the information that you need?  
[Open text response]

Q22  IF Q20 = 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5: What is your primary reason for using Quick Search?

1 = Search for a specific title or author  
2 = Search for topics  
3 = Both of these equally
Q23  IF Q20 = 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5: Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you look for a specific title or author?

1 = Low satisfaction
2 = Medium satisfaction
3 = High satisfaction

Q24  IF Q20 = 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5: Overall, how satisfied are you with Quick Search results when you are exploring general topics or subjects?

1 = Low satisfaction
2 = Medium satisfaction
3 = High satisfaction

Q25 – Q29  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

Q25. Use article indexes and databases (e.g., Academic Search Premier (EBSCO), Web of Science, JSTOR, etc.)
Q26. Find and use electronic journals and/or articles
Q27. Find and use e-books
Q28. Find physical items (e.g., books, DVDs, CDs, maps, microforms, etc.)
Q29. Find materials in Special Collections and University Archives (e.g., manuscripts, rare books, etc.)

Q30 – Q36  How satisfied are you with the following ISU Library resources and services?

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Don’t use

Q30. Remote (off-campus) access to library materials and services through the Library website
Q31. Assistance or help from library staff through Chat or email
Q32. Reserve a library space (e.g., group study room, multimedia production studio, or to practice a presentation)

Q33. Research and Course Guides

Q34. Interlibrary Loan and document delivery

Q35. IF G/P/UG: Course Reserves

Q36. 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.)

IF UG, GO TO Q40.
IF G/P/PD, ASK Q37-39:

Q37 Digital Repository @ Iowa State University provides free and open access to scholarly and creative works, research, publication, and reports by Iowa State’s faculty, students, staff and administrative units.

Are you familiar with the Library’s Digital Repository?

1 = Yes
2 = No

Q38 IF Q37 = YES: Have you used the Digital Repository to search?

1 = Yes
2 = No

Q39 IF Q37 = YES: Have you added your publications, presentations, research, or thesis to the Digital Repository?

1 = Yes
2 = No

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]
Q41 – Q54  Please indicate your overall satisfaction with each of the following resources provided by Parks Library.

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Don’t use

Q41. Library staff assistance at the Circulation/Research Help Desk
Q42. Computers and printers available for public use
Q43. Scanners available for public use
Q44. Quality of lighting
Q45. Access to electrical outlets and chargers
Q46. Availability of space to work collaboratively
Q47. IF UG: Reserved group study rooms on third floor
Q48. Availability of space to work individually
Q49. IF G: Assigned library research study rooms for private research
Q50. Multimedia production studios and equipment (Learning Connections Center)
Q51. Learning Connections Center Help Desk for technology assistance
Q52. Parks Library Bookends Café and Fireplace Reading Room
Q53. Special Collections and Archives
Q54. Media Center

IF DESIGN COLLEGE, ASK Q55-61:

Q55 – Q61  Please indicate your overall satisfaction with each of the following resources provided by the Design Reading Room.

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Don’t use

Q55. Library staff assistance at the front desk
Q56. Computers and printers available for public use
Q57. Scanners available for public use
Q58. Quality of lighting
Q59. Access to electrical outlets and chargers
Q60. Availability of space to work collaboratively
Q61. Availability of space to work individually
IF VET MED, ASK Q62-68:

Q62 – Q68 Please indicate your overall satisfaction with each of the following resources provided by the Veterinary Medical Library.

1 = Low
2 = Medium
3 = High
4 = Don’t use

Q62. Library staff assistance at the front desk
Q63. Computers and printers available for public use
Q64. Scanners available for public use
Q65. Quality of lighting
Q66. Access to electrical outlets and chargers
Q67. Availability of space to work collaboratively
Q68. Availability of space to work individually

Q69 What suggestions do you have to improve library services, spaces, or resources?

[Open text response]

IF G/P/PD, ASK Q70 & 71:

Q70 – Q71 The Library wants to ensure that its services support graduate/professional student and postdoc success. How would you rate the importance of the following future initiatives for graduate students, professional students, and postdocs?

1 = Low importance
2 = Medium importance
3 = High importance
4 = Need more information

Q70. Develop a trusted online repository to store and provide continuing access to data created by graduate and professional students and postdocs
Q71. Provide advisory services for research data management
Q72 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 Q73-74:

*Q73 What is your gender?

1 = Male
2 = Female

*Q74 Are you from...

1 = Iowa
2 = Another U.S. state
3 = Another country (International)

Q75 Please record any additional comments or suggestions about ISU Library resources or services in the space below.

[Open text response]

Q76 Would you like to be entered into the drawing for a $20 gift card for any ISU on-campus dining location? (50 gift cards will be awarded.)

1 = Yes (Go to Q77)
2 = No

**Q77 IF Q76 = Yes: Drawing winners will be notified electronically.
Please enter your preferred email address:

[Open text response]

**Q77 variable removed from the final dataset in order to protect confidentiality.
From: Beth McNeil, Dean of Library Services
Subject: Feedback on ISU Library services

Dear [Name],

Iowa State University Library is conducting an online survey of graduate/professional students, post-docs, and undergraduate students regarding its services and collections. The Library will use the information generated from this survey to plan future enhancements and identify ways the Library can serve ISU students and post-docs more effectively.

You are invited to provide your personal feedback by completing this survey. I assure you that your name and answers will be treated confidentially. All results will be reported in summary form only without identifying any individual’s response.

Everyone who completes the survey will be eligible for a drawing to win one of 50 $20 gift cards good at the Bookends Café in Parks Library and all other on-campus dining locations.

Please click on the customized link below to begin your survey. It should take about 8-10 minutes of your time. Your cooperation and participation in completing it as soon as possible is greatly appreciated.

Survey link:
<<Link>>

If you experience technical difficulties or have questions related to the survey, please reply to this e-mail for assistance.

Thank you very much for helping your Library plan its future!

Sincerely yours,

Beth McNeil
Dean of Library Services
From: Beth McNeil, Dean of Library Services
Subject: Feedback on ISU Library services

Dear [Name],

You were recently contacted about an online survey of graduate/professional students, post-docs, and undergraduate students that the Iowa State University Library is conducting regarding its services and collections. The information generated from these surveys will be used in planning future enhancements and identifying ways the Library can serve the university more effectively.

As of today, we have not received any information from you. I invite you to complete this survey and share your personal feedback. Your name and answers will be treated confidentially, and all results will be reported in summary form without identifying any individual’s response.

Everyone who completes the survey will be eligible for a drawing to win one of 50 $20 gift cards good at the Bookends Café in Parks Library and all other on-campus dining locations.

Please click on the customized link below to begin your survey. The survey should take about 8-10 minutes of your time. Your cooperation and participation in completing it within the next week is greatly appreciated.

Survey link:
<<Link>>

If you experience technical difficulties or have questions related to the survey, please reply to this e-mail for assistance.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Beth McNeil
Dean of Library Services
From: Beth McNeil, Director of Library Services
Subject: Feedback on ISU Library services

Dear [Name],

Earlier this month we contacted you about an online survey of graduate/professional students, post-docs, and undergraduate students that the Iowa State University Library is conducting regarding its services and collections. We have not received any information from you yet and would greatly value your input.

Please click on the customized link below to begin your survey. It should only take about 8-10 minutes of your time.

Survey link: <<Link>>

Everyone who completes the survey will be eligible for a drawing to win one of 50 $20 gift cards good at the Bookends Café in Parks Library and all other on-campus dining locations.

Information from these surveys will be used to plan future enhancements and ways that the Library can serve the university more effectively. Your name and answers will be treated confidentially, and all results will be reported in summary form only.

If you experience technical difficulties or have questions related to the survey, please reply to this e-mail for assistance.

Thank you very much for helping your Library plan its future!

Sincerely yours,

Beth McNeil
Dean of Library Services