

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

2012

Faculty Perceptions of the Value of Academic Libraries: A Mixed Method Study

Kelly L. Heider

Indiana University of Pennsylvania - Main Campus, kheider@iup.edu

Sandra Janicki

Indiana University of Pennsylvania - Main Campus, cspslj@iup.edu

Joann Janosko

Indiana University of Pennsylvania - Main Campus, janosko@iup.edu

Blaine Knupp

Indiana University of Pennsylvania - Main Campus, beknupp@iup.edu

Carl Rahkonen

Indiana University of Pennsylvania - Main Campus, rahkonen@iup.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Heider, Kelly L.; Janicki, Sandra; Janosko, Joann; Knupp, Blaine; and Rahkonen, Carl, "Faculty Perceptions of the Value of Academic Libraries: A Mixed Method Study" (2012). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 909.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/909>

Faculty Perceptions of the Value of Academic Libraries: A Mixed Method Study

Abstract

This article details the findings of a year-long study at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) Libraries which examined IUP faculty members' perceptions of the value of library resources and services to both their research and teaching. Through a mixed-method study, which included an online survey and follow-up focus groups, the researchers found that faculty were dissatisfied with IUP Libraries' marketing initiatives but satisfied with its small embedded librarian program. As a result, marketing and growth of the embedded librarian program became the two main focus areas for improvement in the next academic year.

Introduction

Demands for accountability in education originated in the late 1990s and gained momentum when President George W. Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* which holds states and public schools more accountable for student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). *NCLB* began a ripple effect that has recently begun to extend into higher education, prompting policy makers to pressure colleges and universities to evaluate their performance—especially as it relates to accreditation, finance, scholarly productivity, college rankings, governance, tenure, and standardized tests (Lederman, 2009). In addition, the challenges of financing higher education in the current economic climate have administrators examining the impact departments and divisions have on a college or university's overall performance. As a

result, many academic libraries are being asked to assess the value of their resources and services to teaching, learning, and research. According to Besara & Kinsley (2011), sharing assessment data with administration can leverage funding and resources for new initiatives.

Background

The research detailed in this article grew out of discussions among the library deans and directors of Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education Library Cooperative (SSHELCO). SSHELCO is comprised of all the libraries serving the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), the fourteen state-owned universities of Pennsylvania. Like many college and university libraries around the country, the SSHELCO libraries have been facing decreased support from the state and increased competition for scarce resources. As a result, the SSHELCO deans and directors have been looking for ways to demonstrate the value of their services to their respective institutions. One way they decided to do this was to focus on assessment activities and create standard methods for gathering assessment information from the member libraries. To accomplish this, the SSHELCO group asked individual members to research assessment tools for various clientele (undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, alumni, etc.). The Dean of the Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) Libraries volunteered IUP to examine the faculty user group.

In the fall of 2010, the IUP Libraries Dean created an ad hoc internal assessment committee consisting of six faculty librarians, two library support staff members, and one library manager with the charge of examining the value of IUP Libraries resources and services to its faculty users. The committee met frequently and regularly to establish how it would meet its charge.

One of the first things the assessment committee decided to do was to treat the assessment problem almost as a strategic planning exercise. Gathering assessment data is very similar to the internal and external scan activities of standard SWOT (Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats) Analysis used in strategic planning. For the internal scan, committee members inventoried existing statistical and textual reports for data that would provide insight into faculty use of IUP Libraries. Surprisingly, quite a bit of data was already available to the committee for analysis such as: faculty circulation statistics (1996-2011), interlibrary loan statistics (2006-2011), reference desk statistics (2005-2010), library instruction statistics(2006-2011), faculty publication lists (2006-2011) and faculty data and comments from the 2004, 2006 and 2009 LibQUAL (a commercial survey of user perceptions of library quality, marketed by the Association of Research Libraries) surveys. All of this data gave the committee significant insight into the habits and feelings of IUP faculty concerning the library, but there were still holes in the picture. To begin to fill those holes, the committee members performed an external scan, or a literature review, to see how other libraries handle assessment activities and determine best practices.

Literature Review

The articles cited in this review date back no further than the 1990s, when two important developments occurred that shifted the focus of library assessment. The first was the corporatization of educational institutions which pushed libraries toward a business model of evaluating effectiveness. The second was the advent of the Internet and the wide-spread availability of electronic databases and e-journals.

A good starting point is Wallace's (2001) literature review of outcomes assessment in library literature in the 1990s which does an excellent job of explaining the shift in library assessment from inputs (collections, staff, equipment, physical plant, and budget) and outputs (services and use statistics generated by the library) to outcomes and impact (which measure results).

Wallace refers to outcomes as *micro*, looking at how services and programs affect individuals, and impact as *macro*, looking at how services and programs affect the goals of the institution. She came to the conclusion that a methodology for determining library outcomes and their impacts was needed but did not offer a model.

More recently, Koltay and Li (2010) published a SPEC (specification) Kit for the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) entitled *Impact Measures in Research Libraries* that covers impact assessment goals, library value calculation, and user surveys that can be used by libraries in devising their own assessments. In 2011, Guthrie and Housewright examined the Ithaka S+R Faculty Survey 2009, the fourth iteration since 2000 of this survey of faculty members at colleges and universities across the United States. They found that faculty attitudes toward the library have been greatly influenced by new technologies. Where before, "traditional research practices relied on access to physical materials held in a library and locally implemented library-provided tools for discovery of these materials (e.g. books, journal articles, manuscripts)," today, "there are numerous alternative avenues for information discovery" (p. 80). In a time when users can access information without visiting the physical library, faculty see the library as losing its role as a gateway to resources but still value its purchasing and archive functions. The authors conclude that, "as scholarly resources become available in digital form, users want to

use them in that form, and they will use whatever tools are most convenient to get to them” (p. 102).

By far, the greatest number of articles on the value of academic libraries to faculty focuses on the importance of libraries’ collections, both print and electronic. There are a variety of ways the use and importance of an academic library’s collection can be assessed. Wilson and Tenopir (2008) examined cited references from faculty publications at the University of New South Wales, downloaded from *Web of Science*, and journal impact factors from *Journal Citation Reports*. They found that the library “plays an important role in the research life of the academic staff in all faculties. Reading for research and citations relies heavily on journals made available through the library’s e-collection. It is essential to scholarship that there is continued access to scholarly articles either provided through journal subscriptions or other means, such as institutional repositories” (p. 1407). Zipp (1996) also examined cited references, making a correlation between titles cited in theses and dissertations with those cited in faculty publications. She discovered that “theses and dissertations citations can be reliably used as a surrogate for faculty publication citations in evaluations of the research portion of library collection use” (p. 335).

King, Tenopir, Choemprayong, and Wu (2009) looked at information-seeking and reading patterns of faculty at five U.S. universities and concluded that there is “abundant evidence of the continued substantial usefulness and value of scholarly journals and articles” (p. 142) and that “the library is the main source for electronic articles” (p. 143). Hart (1997) surveyed faculty at the State University of New York (SUNY), College at Fredonia, a comprehensive college

where faculty tend to be less involved in research and more involved in teaching and service. He found that, in general, their information-seeking behavior is similar to faculty at major universities but was surprised to find that the faculty made use, not only of their own library, but libraries of various types and from a wide geographical range. Jankowska (2004) describes the use of a web-based survey done at the University of Idaho Library to determine faculty usage of information and communication technologies (ICTs) for research and teaching. She found that the faculty's main message throughout the survey was for the library to "keep up your current good services but improve and expand access to e-collections and e-services" (p. 63). She also found that faculty rely on library e-services and resources and warns that "university administrators should not evaluate financial needs of libraries from the decreasing quantitative statistics on user services; rather they should consider the increasing expectations from academic faculty and the increasing costs of ICTs" (p. 63). Washington-Hoagland and Clougherty (2002) examined a faculty and staff needs assessment conducted at the University of Iowa Libraries that was developed in an environment of cutbacks and shrinking budgets to garner empirical support to justify requests for increased fiscal allocations. The assessment also sought to measure current user satisfaction and pinpoint the resources and services that faculty and staff expect from the library. They concluded that "faculty tend to be unaware of the range of information products and services already available in or provided by their institution's library," and the library still has an important educational role to play in making faculty aware of both print and electronic resources and services (p. 4-5). And finally, Dewald and Silvius (2005) surveyed business faculty at the Pennsylvania State University about their research. They claim that faculty felt the Web was easier to use; however, overall satisfaction

with the information located through library databases was greater. This study also indicated that opportunities exist for librarians to increase faculty satisfaction by marketing the library's databases, as well as making faculty aware of the availability of instruction on how to use the databases.

Kaufman (2008) evaluated the usefulness of the library's collection on a broader level at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign by focusing on the return on the university's investment (ROI) in its library, developing a quantitative measure that recognizes the library's value in supporting the university's strategic goals by examining grant income generated by faculty using library materials (particularly electronic resources). Tenopir (2010) employs this same method in an international study by using the ROI formula developed by the University of Illinois, once again focusing on how e-journals have transformed the way faculty do research. Tenopir suggests that a future study will broaden the focus to examine other functional areas including all aspects of research, teaching, learning, and social/professional areas. Tenopir (2012) divides methods used to measure the value of library products and services into three main categories: implicit value (downloads or usage logs), explicit value (qualitative interview techniques), and derived values (ROI) and discusses the difficulty of showing the "value beyond usage" (purpose, satisfaction, or outcomes) of implicit value and how this can be overcome with assistance from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funded Lib-Value Project (<http://libvalue.cci.utk.edu/>) which "is broadening the focus of value studies beyond collections by looking at multiple values of the university libraries, multiple ways that the library provides returns on investment and value, and multiple measures" (p. 12). Price and Fleming-May (2011) look at the complexity of using electronic database usage as an assessment

measure, particularly in understanding user motivation. They point to the Lib-Value Project as a “multifaceted approach to the evaluation process in order to demonstrate the true value—monetary and otherwise—of investment in library resources and services, including focus group input, data gleaned from cross-institutional cooperative assessment projects, and user motivation assessments in order to gain a more complete understanding of use in the digital age” (p. 198).

A standardized means of evaluating academic libraries began in 1999 following the introduction of ARL’s *New Measures Initiatives*. One of the five projects of the *Initiatives* was the use of a modified SERVQUAL survey (normally used to evaluate businesses) to study of the utility of service effectiveness measures. In 2000, ARL was awarded half a million dollars by the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for the *Service Effectiveness in Academic Research Libraries* (later coined LibQUAL+). Since then, LibQUAL+ has been used to measure the expectations and perceptions of students, faculty, and staff in the areas of (1) affect of service, (2) information control, and (3) library as place. Edgar (2006) examined the use of LibQUAL+ to determine its effectiveness and concluded that “libraries are not businesses, despite the enormous pressures they now face for immediate accountability” (p. 15). He emphasized that libraries cannot just focus on *customers* because libraries provide intellectual value now and into the future, strengthening the societies they serve. Self (2008) used the LibQUAL+ survey to study University of Virginia results compared to results of ARL institutions between 2004-2006, focusing particularly on question IC-8 (print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work) and concluded that faculty, even in large research institutions, are not happy with the journal collections in their own libraries.

“When it comes to libraries, journals are the most important item for faculty, and the source of their greatest dissatisfaction” (p. 3).

Two peripheral areas that can be used to assess the value of academic libraries and faculty satisfaction are faculty space within the library and value-added services. Engle and Antell (2004) investigated the use of “faculty spaces” (individual, enclosed, lockable carrels or studies) through a series of interviews at the University of Oklahoma and a survey of ARL libraries. They concluded that faculty spaces are heavily used and highly valued and that many faculty continue to view the library building as the primary place for doing research. “This study shows that, at least for faculty members who use faculty spaces, the academic library facility in itself retains value as a place for ‘the life of the mind’—quiet reflection, sustained concentration, productive research effort, and high-quality writing” (p. 18). Pritchard (2008) looked at ‘deconstructing’ the library, particularly in the digital environment, to recombine resources, staff, and facilities in various new ways to acquire and provide information and to differentiate the library through unique, customized, and value-added features. She found that, “librarians and library staff must be the focus, not the overly vague word ‘library,’ because it is the people who are designing and providing the services that are now key” (p. 223). This includes the use of social media, embedded librarians, and partnering with IT/administrative offices, as well as developing virtual services and remote storage of little-used materials to free up space for new uses.

The majority of research on academic libraries and faculty over the past twenty years centers on topics such as research/publication, instruction/information literacy, distance education,

collection development/liaison activities, and librarian/faculty collaboration. There are far less studies that examine the intrinsic value of the academic library, faculty satisfaction with library resources and services, and ways to assess these. Therefore, IUP Libraries' Assessment Committee decided to make these issues the focus of their study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine current IUP faculty members' perceptions of the value of IUP Libraries' resources and services to both their research and teaching. *The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* (Oakleaf, 2010) published by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) suggests data that may be used to correlate library value to faculty research. For instance:

- Scholarly publications
- Grants (Tenopir, 2010)
- Conference presentations (Patrick & Stanley, 2006)
- Juried exhibits (Kaufman, 2001)
- Citation impact (Australian Research Council, 2008; Wilson & Tenopir, 2008)
- Patents (Australian Research Council, 2008)
- Consultancy/advisory work (Cook, Heath, Thompson & Thompson, 2001)

The ACRL report also suggests a way that academic libraries can correlate their value to faculty teaching. "Faculty can be queried about the impact of academic library support for faculty teaching" (p. 47). Therefore, the assessment committee decided to design a two-phase study that would use mixed methodology to answer the following research questions:

- (1) To what extent are IUP faculty members' research and curricular needs being met by IUP Libraries' digital collections?
- (2) To what extent do IUP Libraries' Reference Services improve the research and teaching of departmental faculty?
- (3) To what extent does library instruction at IUP improve the research and teaching of departmental faculty?
- (4) To what extent do other library services, such as reserve, e-reserve, rush cataloging, library technology, the library technology help desk, the library liaison program, etc., improve the research and teaching of departmental faculty?
- (5) What kinds of new resources and services could IUP Libraries offer departmental faculty that would positively impact their research and teaching?
- (6) What is the role of an academic library today?

Methodology

The first phase of this study was the development of a database usage survey. The focus of this survey was to gauge faculty use of subscribed content and interlibrary loan services versus the freely-available Google search engine. The survey was constructed using Qualtrics survey software, available to all IUP researchers through the Applied Research Lab. Qualtrics was chosen over Survey Monkey since the data was to be housed in an IUP-associated databank that allowed for building the survey, distributing it through a web link, and analyzing the data using Qualtrics tools. In the future, the results could also be exported to SPSS if the need arose.

The survey consisted of two “frequency of use” and two Likert-scale questions regarding IUP databases and the Google search engine. Then there were three open-ended questions about IUP Libraries’ subscribed databases and a “frequency of use” question about the interlibrary loan service at IUP. Next, there followed five demographic questions about the participants. Finally, the last question in the survey was designed to identify faculty who were willing to participate in focus groups.

Both the survey and the focus group portion of the research activities were approved by IUP’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IUP database survey link was distributed by the principal investigator using a faculty-wide email service, so all 753 (676 full-time and 77 part-time) faculty were contacted. IRB concerns of voluntary participation, withdrawal from the study at any time without adverse effects on the individual, and participant confidentiality were addressed in an introductory email that included the survey link. Clicking on the link to the survey served as the informed consent requirement.

After examining the results of the database usage survey, the assessment committee developed five focus group questions (see Appendix A). To prepare for the sessions, an instruction document titled *Ten Tips for Running Effective Focus Groups* (see Appendix B) was sent to the committee to standardize, as much as possible, the procedures that were followed in each of the four focus groups. There were two assessment committee members assigned to each focus group. One served as a facilitator and the other as a recorder. Finally, an eight-slide PowerPoint presentation containing all five of the focus group questions was used to facilitate discussion and to keep the focus groups on topic and within the established time frame.

There were nearly 60 faculty who were willing to participate in the focus group sessions. As a result, six time slots were sent to the faculty who agreed to participate. Based on faculty availability, one focus group was held on December 5, 2011, and three focus groups were held on December 8, 2011 with a total of 17 participants. Since there was a small sampling and the comments fell naturally into groupings, the data were compiled and coded by hand rather than analyzed using a qualitative software product such as Atlas, Nudist or NVivo. The findings of both the survey and focus groups will be discussed in the next section.

Findings

Of the 753 faculty teaching at IUP in May 2011, 135 (17.5%) started the survey and 111 (14.7%) completed it. The majority of the respondents (86%) were seasoned professors who had been at IUP for five years or more. They were fairly evenly distributed across the colleges and departments. The only departments with double-digit numbers of respondents were English (19) and Professional Studies in Education (15).

The first question on the survey was answered by every respondent and dealt with the frequency of use of IUP databases for research and teaching. The good news is that the databases are being used, but the bad news is perhaps not as frequently as IUP Libraries would like. Nearly half of the respondents (48%) use the databases at least once a week, nearly three quarters (74%) use them at least two or three times per month, and 91% use them at least once a month. Only 10% responded that they never use the databases. In comparison, 77% responded that they used Google daily, and 91% at least once per week, and only 3% responded that they never use Google. On the surface, it would appear that IUP Libraries is

losing the information battle to Google. Google gets used more frequently, and, although a small number, three times more respondents never use the databases than never use Google. Also, Google beat the databases by small margins in the statistical mean for “easy to use” (.78) and for “always have the information I need” (.14).

However, the databases showed a small statistical advantage in “supports my research needs” (.34), “is essential to my research needs” (.77), “supports my pedagogy” (.23), and “is essential to my pedagogy” (.46). None of these differences in the mean scores is statistically significant, but the fact that the databases scored higher in all four categories should be considered. The figures are not necessarily surprising, considering that most of the databases cover specific areas of research, and Google is a general service. A faculty member is more likely to turn to a database to solve a specific research problem or a specific problem in teaching. This is proven to a large degree by the listing of “favorite IUP databases” given by the surveyed faculty. They reflect the wide range of specific interests of the faculty, with the exception that EBSCOhost was mentioned frequently. EBSCOhost is not itself a database but a vendor and search engine for a variety of popular databases.

The written commentary to the question, “What do you like least about IUP databases?” provides some general themes for reflection. Several comments mentioned that the databases were not easy to use. They were not “intuitive” (as is Google) and, in many cases, they require specialized knowledge to use and were generally not very user-friendly. Related to this were many comments about the lack of integrated searching. There are too many individual databases that have their own search methods. In some cases, faculty could not even decide

which specific database to use. Many wanted a single, easy way to search appropriate databases simultaneously. There were several comments that not all of the databases provided full-text articles. Some described an involved process to find a copy of an article in one of the databases, or in paper in the serials department, or by requesting it through interlibrary loan (ILL). This was a particular problem with recent articles, which were not yet in any of the full-text databases.

There were also many comments on the difficulty of accessing the databases from remote locations. They mentioned that it is cumbersome for faculty and students to access the databases using a virtual private network. This will increasingly become a problem as portable internet devices become more common. There were fewer, but vehement, comments on not having the exact databases needed for specific research and teaching.

The follow-up question which asked the faculty member to "Name any database(s) you would like to see added to our collection" received the fewest number of survey responses (36%).

The majority of these responses said that they did not have any suggestions for specific databases. The few that were suggested covered a variety of topics.

The responses to Question #8, "How often do you use ILLIAD to request interlibrary loan (ILL) articles?" were somewhat surprising. Almost a third of the respondents marked that they never requested articles, and another third requested an article only once a semester. When those who request articles only 2-5 times a semester are added in, the total accounts for 90% of the respondents. Only 10% of the respondents request articles more than 5 times a semester. At least for articles, this tends to show that ILL is used far less than might have been expected.

Respondents to the survey were also given the opportunity to participate in a focus group and 56 faculty members (42.4%) volunteered. Seventeen actually participated (three groups of four and one group of five). Each group was asked five questions over the space of one hour. The commentary from the focus groups, as with the written comments on the survey, covered a wide range of topics, but various themes emerged. A summary of focus group comments can be found in Appendix C. Many suggested that IUP Libraries is an excellent resource for research and teaching; however, some faculty are not aware of this because of poor marketing initiatives. Faculty felt that one of the best ways to publicize resources and services is through personal contact between librarians and faculty. They specifically mentioned the library liaison program and embedded librarians. According to IUP faculty, these programs have provided library users with personal contacts they can go to for help which has resulted in better use of library resources. The role of the librarian has changed from being someone who helps find information to someone who helps evaluate information. This means more specifically-targeted instruction, both for faculty and students. For example, faculty mentioned the need for more instruction on the ethical use of information (e.g. proper bibliographic citation and copyright). Another major theme was access to more resources (such as streaming media and ebooks) online. Furthermore, faculty stressed their desire to be able to use online materials more easily (e.g. discovery search tools, an Amazon-like ebook service, and custom-designed websites to promote and make library materials available). They suggested the integration of these tools into the content management systems (Moodle and D2L) on campus.

Discussion

According to Lin and Miller (2005), “closing the loop” is the last phase in the assessment cycle.

It involves responding to shortcomings that have been identified through assessment data.

“This begins first with making faculty aware of assessment findings and then organizing

discussions around how to make improvements” (p. 41). IUP Libraries Assessment Committee

shared their findings with library faculty at a dean/faculty meeting in the spring of 2012. The

committee then offered some tips for change based on Lin and Miller’s (2005) work:

- Changes should be manageable in terms of available time and resources.
- Don’t make too many changes at once! (Too difficult to manage.)
- Limit changes to, at most, two per year depending on their magnitude.
- Improvements are generally gradual and cumulative in nature rather than all of a sudden, so don’t get discouraged if they don’t happen right away.

To “close the loop,” the assessment committee decided that marketing and embedded librarianship would become the two main focus areas for improvement in the next academic year. Not only were both of these areas mentioned quite often by subject faculty in the focus groups, but these were also areas that could be addressed through the new instructional design center (IDC) at IUP Libraries.

Currently, assessment committee members are working with IDC staff to develop 30-second commercials that advertise IUP Libraries’ resources and services to subject faculty and students. In addition, there are plans to physically embed more librarians in college departments. Currently, IUP Libraries has two very successful embedded librarian programs in the colleges of education and music.

In the fall of 2012, the library will begin an embedded librarian program in the college of business.

Finally, working with the IDC, librarians have begun to digitally embed themselves into online courses

and programs, bringing expertise in information literacy to distance education students when and where they need it most.

Conclusion

Because of the economic climate in higher education today, academic libraries are being forced to compete with academic departments for scarce funding. Because there is so much information available to faculty and students through the Internet, college and university administrators are beginning to question the role of academic libraries. Just as academic departments need to show increased enrollments to justify their existence, academic libraries need to demonstrate their impact on and value to the faculty and students they serve in order to remain relevant.

Much of the current literature on academic library assessment focuses on organizational performance. Bowlby (2011) defines organizational performance assessment as an equation: planning + assessment → impact + value. IUP Libraries Assessment Committee planned the aforementioned research based on Oakleaf's (2010) ACRL report, pre-existing data, and a thorough review of the literature on library assessment. The committee then assessed the value of their academic library to faculty users by designing a two-phased, mixed method study. True to Bowlby's equation, planning and assessment provided committee members with a closer look at IUP Libraries' impact and value. However, planning and assessment also provided the committee with an opportunity to reflect on past performance and create effective strategies for future improvement—two of the most important steps in the assessment process.

References

- Australian Research Council. (2008). *ERA indicator principles*. Retrieved from http://www.arc.gov.au/pdf/ERA_Indicator_Principles.pdf
- Besara, R., & Kinsley, K. (2011). Academic libraries—measuring up: Assessment and collaboration for student success. *New Library World, 112*(9/10), 416-424.
- Bowlby, R. (2011). Living the future: Organizational performance assessment. *Journal of Library Administration, 51*(7/8), 618-644.
- Cook, C., Heath, F., Thompson, B., & Thompson, R. (2001). LibQUAL+: Service quality assessment in research libraries. *IFLA Journal, 27*(4), 264-268.
- Dewald, N., & Silvius, M. (2005). Business faculty research: Satisfaction with the web versus library databases. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 5*(3), 313-328.
- Edgar, W. (2006). Questioning LibQUAL+[TM]: Expanding its assessment of academic library effectiveness. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 6*(4), 445-465.
- Engel, D., & Antell, K. (2004). The life of the mind: A study of faculty spaces in academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries, 65*(1), 8-26.
- Guthrie, K., & Housewright, R. (2011). Repackaging the library: What do faculty think? *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 51*, 77-104.
- Hart, R. (1997). Information gathering among faculty of a comprehensive college: Formality and globality. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 23*(1), 21-27.
- Jankowska, M. (2004). Identifying university professors' information needs in the challenging environment of information and communication technologies. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 30*(1), 51-66.
- Kaufman, R. (2001). Toward determining societal value-added criteria for research and comprehensive universities. *The Center Reports*. Retrieved from <http://mup.asu.edu/kaufman1.pdf>
- Kaufman, P. (2008). The library as strategic investment: Results of the Illinois return on investment study. *Liber Quarterly: The Journal of European Research Libraries, 18*(3/4), 1435-5205.
- King, D., Tenopir, C., Choemprayong, S., & Wu, L. (2009). Scholarly journal information-seeking and reading patterns of faculty at five US universities. *Learned Publishing, 22*(2), 126-144.

Koltay, Z., & Li, X. (2010). *Impact measures in research libraries*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Lederman, D. (2009). Defining accountability. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/11/18/aei>

Lin, R. L., & Miller, M. D. (2005). Analyzing assessment results. Retrieved from <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/pres-provost/irds/assessment/downloads/analyze.pdf>

Oakleaf, M. (2010). *The value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Patrick, W. J., & Stanley, E. C. (2006). Assessment of research quality. *Research in Higher Education* 37(1), 23-41.

Price, A. N., & Fleming-May, R. (2011). Measuring and communicating the contributions of library resources to faculty and student success. *Serials Librarian*, 61(2), 196-199.

Pritchard, S. (2008). Deconstructing the library: Reconceptualizing collections, spaces and services. *Journal of Library Administration*. 48(2), 219-233.

Self, J. (2008). Bound for disappointment: Faculty and journals at research institutions. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues & Actions*, 257, 7-11.

Tenopir, C. (2010). Measuring the value of the academic library: Return on investment and other value measures. *Serials Librarian*, 58(1-4), 39-48.

Tenopir, C. (2012). Beyond usage: Measuring library outcomes and value. *Library Management*, 33(1), 5-13.

United States Department of Education. (2001). No Child Left Behind Act. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>

Wallace, V. (2001). Outcomes assessment in academic libraries: Library literature in the 1990s. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 8(2), 59-71.

Washington-Hoagland, C., & Clougherty, L. (2002). Faculty and staff use of academic library resources and services: A University of Iowa libraries' perspective. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 2(4), 627-646.

Wilson, C., & Tenopir, C. (2008). Local citation analysis, publishing and reading patterns: Using multiple methods to evaluate faculty use of an academic library's research collection. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 59(9), 1393-1408.

Zipp, L. (1996). Thesis and dissertation citations as indicators of faculty research use of university library journal collections. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 40(4), 335-347.

Appendix A

Focus Group Questions

- 1.** Which IUP Libraries services (reference desk, e-reference, reserve, e-reserve, interlibrary loan, rush cataloging, library technology, library technology help desk, library instruction, library liaison program, etc.) have been the most valuable to your teaching and/or research? Why?

- 2.** Question one in our online survey asked how often faculty use IUP Libraries' databases. Ten percent of the participants said that they never use the library's databases. Why do you think this is so?

- 3.** One of the most surprising discoveries we made from our survey is that faculty are unaware of the resources and services that IUP Libraries provides. In your opinion, what is the best way to advertise our resources and services to faculty?

- 4.** How would you define the role of an academic library today?

- 5.** If IUP Libraries could do one thing to surprise and delight you, what would it be?

If you think of anything else you'd like to add, please e-mail Kelly Heider, principal investigator, at kheider@iup.edu.

Appendix B

Ten Tips for Running Effective Focus Groups

1. Welcome the participants personally as they arrive. (It's probably a good idea to stand in the hallway outside of the conference room, since participants may have never been inside the library's administrative suite.)
2. Name tags will be provided for each session. Please make sure moderators and participants wear them.
3. Allow participants to grab some refreshments before you begin, but try to start on time. You only have an hour to get through five questions. All participants have been asked to arrive early.
4. One of the moderators will act as a facilitator, the other as a notetaker. The facilitator should introduce himself/herself and the other moderator first. Then, ask the participants to introduce themselves.
5. Confirm the purpose of this focus group—a follow-up to the faculty survey they took over the summer. We are trying to measure perceptions of faculty regarding the value of IUP Libraries' resources and services to faculty teaching and research.
6. Thank the participants for giving up an hour of their valuable time to participate in this focus group session. Let them know that 132 faculty members completed our survey and 56 faculty members expressed an interest in participating in a focus group.
7. Tell participants that we will be looking for feedback on five questions. (Click to that slide on the PowerPoint.) Give them a chance to briefly review all of the questions.
8. Remind the participants that there are no "wrong" answers and that they may disagree with other participants if they wish.
9. Click to the first question and read it aloud. Allow for adequate discussion. Move on to the next question when everybody has had a chance to speak and nobody has anything new to share. As a facilitator, you need to draw people out to engage with one another without leading the conversation.
10. Try to leave a few minutes at the end of the group for last remarks, recapping what has been said, and allowing each participant to have a final word. At the end, thank members and emphasize how useful the session has been. Keep your ears open at this stage—often choice tidbits of information get dropped at the very end of the group after people think the "real" discussion is over!

Appendix C: Summary of Focus Group Comments

Question	Positive	Negative	Suggestions
1	online resources (Films on Demand), instruction at branch campuses and centers, reference desk, library liaison program, training liaisons to use GOBI, embedded librarian in COE, library as space (nice learning environment), library technology helpdesk	copyright issues (e-Reserve), use course management software instead of e-Reserve, need multiple copies of books for graduate students, non-engaging bibliographic instruction, student workers who can't answer questions	direct link to ILLIAD from databases, librarians embedded into online courses, in-depth collaboration with instructor in preparation for bibliographic instruction, online citation practice
2	faculty who don't use the library's databases are not staying current in the field and not doing research, GAs may be doing a lot of the research, "Select a Topic" feature on library webpage, "People don't realize how fantastic the library is."	overwhelmed by amount of information on database page and constant change, library doesn't have a tool that searches all databases, databases can be hard to navigate, research being done in journals the library doesn't provide access to	5-minute instruction, librarians attend faculty meetings, discovery search
3	new faculty orientation, "people are the library's best resource"	poor marketing, don't like format of library's webpage (not user-friendly), e-mails get lost	marketing has to be tailored to departments, short videos (30-second commercials), use YouTube, flyers, use IUP Daily, librarians attend faculty meetings, e-mails to liaisons and chairs, button on homepage (What's new at the library?), use Facebook, want to be able to customize library's webpage
4	"The role of the library hasn't changed. The role of the librarian has." "What's absolutely critical is the work you do in information literacy." "core place where information literacy standards are kept and taught," likes 24/7 access, library as a social place, still like print collections, great place for quiet study	"librarians still fit, but in a technology role," "students are good at doing Google searches but poor at evaluating that information," not convinced about library as a social place	more collaboration between library and IT, institutional repository, library needs to be more involved in teaching, begin looking at what the next generation will be doing (foreword thinking), quick access to resources, e-book expansion
5	"This is the best library I've worked with." "What surprises and delights me right now is what you're able to do with the budget you have." "It's much easier now to review literature."	want to use book money for journals, more money for videos	Amazon-like book service (downloadable to tablet or PC), 1-credit library course should be mandatory, monitored test center, how-to videos (commercials), expert in APA, highlight collections w/guest speakers, readings in Java City, different theme each month (like Constitution Day), information literacy simulations, post-tenure faculty orientations, more embedded librarians, resources available to students after graduation, GA training