

END OF FUNDING PERIOD REPORT

LAUC Statewide Grants, Research & Professional Development Committee

Primary Applicant(s): Allison Benedetti

Campus: UCLA

Email: abenedetti@library.ucla.edu

Telephone: 310-206-8746

TITLE OF PROJECT: North Campus Research Community Study: Phase II

Time Period of Grant: July 1, 2013-June 30, 2015

Amount of Award Received: \$9,708.80

Original Abstract as Submitted:

The UCLA Charles E. Young Research Library recently underwent a multi-million dollar renovation introducing radically new spaces – such as a digital research commons, dedicated reading room, state-of-the-art conference center, and café. This renovation project drove systemic change throughout the library organization, necessitating new staffing patterns and services.

Throughout the 2011-2012 academic year the new spaces and services were put to the test. Predictably, some major challenges emerged, including significant divergence between intended use and actual use of spaces, slow uptake on the part of target users, staffing challenges, and so on. Confronted with these issues, we began to ask questions related to user needs that we did not have the appropriate information to answer. And rather than trying to solve each of the problems reactively, we conceived of the North Campus Research Community Study to assess the strengths and weakness of the newly configured spaces holistically in light of demonstrated and anticipated advanced research needs for the humanities and social sciences. We seek to shape our services and the building's environment to accommodate and encourage this population to use and feel ownership of the Research Library.

We are proposing a multi-phased study to learn more about user needs and behaviors. This study will include an online questionnaire, faculty interviews, observation of user behavior, and focus groups with graduate students. Phase II will be the graduate student focus groups, for which we are seeking funding.

I. ACCOMPLISHMENTS and EVALUATION

- Describe what was achieved during the time period of the grant.

The team conducted 11 focus groups with students (graduate students and some advanced undergraduates) and 12 interviews with faculty, in addition to the 8 interviews from the year before. Transcriptions were completed for all the sessions through an outside service. We contracted with the

UCLA IDRE Statistical Consulting Group to analyze our survey data in SPSS and to give a workshop for staff about using SPSS with SurveyMonkey data. We received qualitative data analysis training from a graduate student in education.

This year, we developed our codebook and hired a graduate student to code the transcripts in Dedoose, an online software for qualitative data analysis. We have just began to write a report and plan for articles to submit for publication.

- What aspects were completed as proposed? If your study could not be completed as proposed, explain how your plans were altered.

The focus groups and interviews were, for the most part, completed as proposed. We had more difficulty than anticipated recruiting students, so the total number of students was lower than we had planned. It also took longer to schedule the groups, so we didn't complete data collection until June, leaving no time for data analysis during this year. We also changed our reference service model, which impacted our ability to hire a student to cover extra hours and free up the research team members' time. We were unable to spend those funds during the first grant year.

This year, we spent part of those funds to hire a graduate student to do the coding of interview and focus group transcripts, but that took longer than anticipated and we are just getting to the writing stages this summer.

- Did the project accomplish what it intended? Did it make a difference? Include any relevant quantitative data, if applicable (e.g. How many individuals have benefited from this project? In what way? This may include various output measures such as circulation, reference transactions, program attendance, survey responses, etc. as appropriate.) Include any anecdotes, if applicable.

Based on our early findings that we shared with colleagues, one of them has developed a new program, a week-long institute focused on teaching graduate students how to teach. Based on behavior observation and survey data, we developed an online reservation system that gives graduate students the ability to make reservations for the group spaces in the Research Commons up to a week in advance. The new system allows us to track the status of those making reservations and assess the impact of the change in reservation policies. Over three quarters of use, we found that graduate student reservations increased 30% and undergraduate reservations 9%.

This year, a colleague launched a program called Dissertation Write Night, prompted by our findings. This program provides a structured time in which graduate students working on dissertations can come together to discuss their work or just write in the same room. We have also created an exhibit space for graduate students to showcase their research and curate exhibits of materials from library collections. This program is still in the initial launch phase, with the first exhibit planned for the fall quarter. Students get training in writing for a general audience and how to make a visual argument or tell a story in a different way from an academic paper.

We have been rethinking the timing of our start of term outreach, and placing a heavier focus on marketing our services and resources. All of these initiatives are works in progress, but we feel they will have a positive impact. We have also started further discussions with a variety of stakeholders about

solutions for better spaces for student working on intensive research projects, though any changes in that area take time and money.

For subject liaisons who mostly concentrate on the needs and practices of selected departments, this work offers a broader perspective on user needs. Our library is in the midst of a strategic planning process and our findings are proving very useful in the discussions about research, teaching, and outreach.

- What would you do differently next time, if anything?

Next time, I would coordinate the focus groups in a different way, trying to take advantage of known free blocks of time and do more follow up to ensure attendance. I would also probably use NVivo instead of Dedoose; there is a larger user base for that system and I think it is slightly more powerful for analysis. In addition, I think it would be useful to be more familiar with software that researchers are commonly using.

- What advice do you have for others applying for LAUC research grants?

Give yourself more time than you anticipate to conduct the research. There are inevitable snags that delay things. Also, set a schedule for analysis and writing; that helps to provide benchmarks to maintain forward momentum.

II. IS YOUR PROJECT COMPLETED? Yes__ No_X_

If No, what is needed to complete the project? Is more time needed? Or more funds?

More time, we have just begun to write a report and to research possible publication venues.

III. FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Please explain how the funds received were spent. Attach your original budget and indicate how well your estimates matched with actual expenditures. Receipts are not necessary.

We spent less than anticipated on transcription, salaries, and supplies. We managed to find relatively inexpensive snack options and advertising methods. Incentives/gift card expenditures were as expected and an upfront cost. We were not able to recruit as many students as we hoped, so cards will need to be returned for credit. Transcription costs were lower, also based on difficulties with recruitment of students and faculty, but also because we found a reliable service at a slightly lower rate. We intend to use some of the unspent funds for help in the analysis phase: student time and subscription to analysis software (web-based, project based usage costs).

This year we used the funds to pay for the Dedoose software and to pay for a graduate student to code the transcripts. That work took fewer hours than we anticipated, so there are still funds remaining. We intend to use the remaining monies to hire students in the fall to help with some projects that will give us more time to work on writing and preparing articles for submission.

IV. SHARING YOUR PRODUCT/RESULTS

What are your plans for disseminating the results of your work? If it will be a web page or product, or published article or book, when will it be available to the public? Include citations/URLs if known.

We have done a few local presentations at UCLA about our work, including one with staff from UCLA Capital Projects. I spoke at the ARLIS/NA conference and the ARL Library Assessment Conference last year about what we had done and learned so far. We submitted an article about the early stages of the project, but it was not accepted. We are working on editing it for resubmission elsewhere, as well as planning other articles with the results of our more recent work. We are also working on a report to use locally to share our findings and make recommendations for future initiatives.

V. NOTE

Information included in this report may be reprinted or posted on the web for dissemination to UCOP, other UC Libraries, and future potential LAUC grant applicants.

Item	Estimated cost	Actual cost - year 1	Actual cost - year 2
Transcription services (~\$150/hour – 40 hours)	\$5,250.00	\$3,803.62	
Recruitment advertising (bookmarks, flyers, etc.)	\$350.00	\$-	
Focus group incentives (\$20 gift cards)	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	
Supplies, refreshments, etc. for focus groups	\$400.00	\$50.00	
Student assistant to operate video camera (40 hours)	\$398.80	\$230.10	
Graduate student assistant to cover reference hours (10-12 hours/week for 1 quarter)	\$1,610.00	\$-	\$639.46
Data coding software			\$369.87
Statistical data processing	\$700.00	\$700.00	
TOTAL	\$9,708.80	\$5,783.72	\$1,009.33