

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, 2014
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.

- 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.

- 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.

It is a little early to precisely state what impact this project has had. Based on our early findings that we have 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%.

We have been rethinking the timing of our beginning 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.

Another benefit has been that for subject liaisons who mostly concentrate on the needs and practices of selected departments, this work offers a broader perspective on user needs.

- 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.

- 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.

II. IS YOUR PROJECT COMPLETED? Yes__ No_X_

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

It took longer to do the data gathering than we anticipated, so we need more time to complete the data analysis.

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).

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, and have one upcoming with staff from UCLA Capital Projects. I spoke at the ARLIS/NA conference in May about what we had done and learned so far. I will also be talking about our work at the ARL Library Assessment Conference in August. We have submitted an article about the early stages of the project to *Portal*. Another article with results of our more recent work is planned once we have completed the data analysis.

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
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	\$ -
Statistical data processing	\$ 700.00	\$ 700.00
TOTAL	\$ 9,708.80	\$ 5,783.72