Introduction and Background

The Louisiana state website describes LOUIS as “a partnership with academic libraries, state and private libraries, and museums and archives. With a centralized support staff, commonly referred to as “LOUIS" located on the LSU campus, LOUIS combines the collective resources of all members to produce a dynamic library consortium.”

LOUIS reached out to Credo to administer this survey as a way to measure the awareness members have for all LOUIS-facilitated services and technologies, explore how members are using these services and rate their satisfaction, and to identify unmet needs that could be addressed through expanded services.

Data Collection

Credo surveyed 65 LOUIS librarians from 30 different institutions between March 26 and April 7, 2015. Different types of colleges and universities were represented: 34% worked in large four-year institutions, 31% in small four-year schools, 8% in 2-year institutions, 16% in community colleges, and 10% identified as “other.”

Key Findings

This intensive, 68-question survey revealed an overall satisfaction level with the services LOUIS has provided its members, but also several opportunities to build upon or refine those services. For example, 80% of respondents claimed a “Satisfied” or “Very satisfied” experience with EBSCO Discovery Services (EDS), but a majority (52%) listed EDS as the area they would most like to see future trainings.

The survey began by asking what LOUIS meant to those being surveyed. The responses were overwhelmingly positive. “Support” was the most frequently used word, employed in 28% of all comments. 22% of the answers included the word, “Everything,” often followed by an exclamation mark. 30% of responses specifically mentioned the excellent quality of technical support and service. As one person wrote, “I'm relying on LOUIS everyday, and I've considered LOUIS Staff to be my colleagues since 1998.” 20% of responses talked about the financial benefits of sharing resources and collectively bargaining.

Usage and Satisfaction

92% of those surveyed use LOUIS databases, making these the most commonly used service or product LOUIS offers its members. Only 18% said they used Bomgar, which was the least commonly used service or product. 87% of librarians have benefitted from LOUIS-negotiated consortial resources. Additionally, just over three-quarters of respondents had benefitted from LOUIS-negotiated mini-consortial resources.
The survey also identified which resources respondents were unaware of. The majority of services and products were known to those surveyed, with the exceptions of Bomgar (29% of respondents were unaware of Bomgar), Custom Reports and the Custom Reports Webpage (12% were unaware), and LOUIS public Knowledge Base (10% were unaware).

The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with different LOUIS-facilitated products and services. Bomgar was both the least utilized and highest-rated product. 9 people responded with overwhelmingly positive feedback: 8 chose “Very Satisfied,” 1 clicked, “Satisfied,” and one person commented that Bomgar, “Saved my bacon just two weeks ago!”

After Bomgar, LOUIS negotiations for Consortial and Mini-Consortial resources ranked highest in general respondent satisfaction. As a frame of reference, 81% of respondents indicated they were “Very Satisfied” with LOUIS negotiations for consortial resources, 17% were “Satisfied,” 2% were “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,” and no one chose “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied.” By comparison, EDS had responses of 26% “Very Satisfied,” 53% “Satisfied,” 16% “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,” 2% “Dissatisfied,” and 2% “Very Dissatisfied.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Product</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bomgar</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortial Negotiations</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Consortial Negotiations</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FootPrints</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SirsiDynix Symphony</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLiad</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZproxy</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Reports</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Base</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining the satisfaction levels of specific features within each of these products or services also shows a broad base of contentment as well as some opportunities for improvement.

In 22 comments about negotiations for consortia and mini-consortia, there were no negative comments or suggestions, only exclamations of gratitude and appreciation for the skilled and energetic negotiations conducted by LOUIS.

SirsiDynix’s best-ranked component was its Data Management. However, people were neutral toward its ability to integrate with other software. Respondents were also predominantly satisfied with EZProxy, LOUIS Custom Reports, and LOUIS-supported ILLiad software.

EDS was the only product/service to receive “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied” responses in each of the five categories measured. People were most pleased with its ease of use. Troubleshooting, customizations, tools, widgets, API’s, etc., and integration with other software all had a majority of responses that were neutral or dissatisfied.

---

1 Only 9 librarians rated their satisfaction with Bomgar. The other technologies/services all received between 25 and 52 responses.
70% of those surveyed were “Very Satisfied” with FootPrints. However, multiple people used the comments box to express that they felt frustrated trying to communicate the problems they were facing. One person wrote, “Sometimes it's hard to convey the problem via footprint, and it's frustrating trying to figure out what I need to write because I sometimes do not know exactly the issue.”

Knowledge Base was another example of a service that people were very satisfied with but that had opportunities for improvement. Of the 9 librarians who took the time to comment, 5 pointed out difficulties using the search function. "I sometimes have trouble getting relevant responses to my keyword searches,” wrote one person. “I usually end up browsing categories where I think I might find an answer to my question.”

LOUIS also utilizes listservs and newsletters to communicate with librarians and facilitate discussions between members on myriad issues. 94% of respondents subscribe to the LALINC-L LALINC Louisiana Academic Librarians Discussion List, making it the most subscribed to listserv among those listed in this survey. The next closest was LER-L LALINC Electronic Resources List, with 53%. 92% of those surveyed read the LOUIS Lagniappe, the LOUIS newsletter. 41% of respondents claimed to be “Very Satisfied” with the listservs and newsletter, with another half of those surveyed indicating that they were “Satisfied”; only 8% of respondents felt neutral.

People were almost equally satisfied with the subscription process, frequency of messages, and format. In the comments section one person stated they wished more sites would participate, while another noted that the format was effective but not very modern.

The survey provided an opportunity for respondents to list alternatives to the LOUIS-provided products and services. Only a handful of those surveyed stated they were using non-LOUIS services, ranging from 10 people using alternatives for Interlibrary Loan services to 3 people using alternatives to Bomgar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SirsiDynix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZproxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LOUIS Sirsi or original Dynix (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Millenium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to list services or technologies they would like to see LOUIS incorporate in the future. The most common request (3 of 15 comments) was for usage tracking software; SUSHI was the only product mentioned by name. Two librarians mentioned LibGuides, although one asked for the “full LibGuide platform,” while the other asked for Web pages to replace LibGuides. Two librarians asked for digital technologies to support student research, for example, a way to download eBooks that would more resemble student-familiar products like Amazon Kindle. One librarian requested, “different authority control module and easier global change methods.” One respondent suggested, “The absolute best, vetted, open source options for various applications like PDF creation/edit, screen capture, screen recording/editing, image editing, etc.” It should also be mentioned that one person only wanted to learn more about the current LOUIS services and technologies, and four people submitted positive comments about LOUIS like, “LOUIS keeps us up-to-date with technology and gives us information about the latest services and resources we may need.”

Training
84% of respondents had participated in LOUIS trainings. Of the 16% who had not, 88% said they had participated in other forms of training, most citing webinars. One person commented that they tried to take advantage of any professional development that occurred in their library, while another mentioned a mentoring relationship.

When asked whether they preferred in-person or online training and professional development, the majority of respondents (49%) stated that they did not have a preference either way. 31% were partial to online training and 20% preferred in-person sessions. One librarian asked, “Could we do the sharing sessions in an online/webinar format? That would make it much easier for more librarians from my institution to participate.”

The chart below shows the areas in which respondents wished to receive further training. EDS and SirsiDynix were the most desired trainings with 52% and 50% respectively. One respondent noted, “I know, there has been extensive EDS training, but it's complicated.” Only 20% of those surveyed wanted to receive further ILLiad training. It should also be noted that 0% of respondents selected “Google Scholar” which also appeared on the survey.
Member satisfaction with LOUIS trainings was overwhelmingly positive. 51% said they were “Very Satisfied,” 40% were “Satisfied,” and 9% responded neutrally; no one claimed to be “Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied.”

Site visits were the highest rated form of training with 53% of respondents “Very Satisfied,” followed by Learning with LOUIS (47%) and Sharing Sessions (44%). Training Subscriptions (22%) and Boot camps (20%) were the lowest rated, but even they had no respondents who were dissatisfied in any way.

Multiple people commented that it was difficult to participate as much as they would like due to scheduling concerns. “I wish my work situation allowed me more time to take advantage of the training sessions,” wrote one librarian. Another said, “Haven't been able to do Learning with LOUIS, boot camps, or Mentor yet - time issues here.”

**Daily and Weekly Tasks**

More than half of those surveyed said they didn't know how many MARC records were added per week, and two-thirds did not know how much time was spent per week loading MARC records.

Of the 17 respondents who did provide an answer, 41% said their library added between 15 and 100 MARC records per week, 24% claimed zero, 21% said between several hundred and several thousand, 14% said their number was in the hundreds, and one person responded that their library added 250,000 MARC records per week. Of the 15 people who provided an answer as to how much time their library committed to entering MARC records per week 60% said 1-2
hours, 27 percent said 3-5 hours, and one person apiece said 5-10 hours and more than ten hours.

When asked “Would you like LOUIS to manage and/or automate loading files of MARC records for electronic resources on an ongoing basis?” 59% responded, “Maybe,” 22% chose, “Yes,” and 20% replied, “No.”

64% of respondents reported that their library had control over their website, as opposed to 24% who said no, and 13% who weren’t sure. 31% of libraries spent 1-2 hours per week on website maintenance and/or updates, 12% spent 2 - 5 hours, 12% reported 5 - 10 hours, and 6% said their library dedicated more than 10 hours per week to the website. It should be noted that an additional 39% responded “NA,” presumably meaning they either didn’t know how much time their library dedicated to website upkeep or that their library updated very infrequently.

The survey asked if librarians would be interested in discussing possible ways LOUIS could assist in managing libraries’ web presence, to which 22% said yes, 33% said no, and 45% said maybe.

The previous two sections on MARC records and website maintenance both show large groups of respondents answering, “Maybe,” to the suggestion of LOUIS offering more support, possibly indicating that many were either not personally responsible for uploading MARC records and website maintenance or were hesitant to signal a willingness to accept that support without knowing more details first. The latter was further supported by the following question: “Are there daily tasks that would save you time if LOUIS facilitated?” Only 16% of respondents said yes, 29% said no, and 55% said maybe. Ten respondents used the comment box for this question, 4 of whom asked for help with usage statistics. Other comments included help with weeding and an appeal for help loading MARC records.

**LALINC Projects**

The Louisiana Academic Library Information Network Consortium allows active students and faculty a system for borrowing materials from academic libraries outside of their own institution. 91% of respondents were aware of the LALINC Card and reciprocal borrowing agreement, and most reported being satisfied with the current reciprocal borrowing services. 29% were “Very Satisfied,” 40% were “Satisfied,” 29% had a neutral opinion, and only one person reported being “Dissatisfied.”

When asked to rate five different aspects of the LALINC project, the overall responses were very positive. Only a handful of people selected “Dissatisfied” (none clicked on “Very Dissatisfied”) and in every category the “Satisfied” and “Very satisfied” answers combined to outweigh the neutral choice. Respondents were most impressed with the borrowing agreement with 62% describing themselves as “Satisfied” or “Very satisfied.” The borrowing agreement was followed in satisfaction by requesting cards, card format, user registration process, and card design (10% of respondents said they were “Dissatisfied” with the card design, the most negative responses for any category).
Seven people utilized the comment box for this question to offer suggestions, five of which were the desire to either automate the process or find a way to make it easier for users. One person recommended allowing students to use their student IDs while others stated they didn’t think students should need to physically come to the library to register. One respondent also wrote that they wished there was a way to negotiate remote access for databases from other schools. When asked in the following question if they would like a more automated approach to reciprocal borrowing among member libraries, 54% of respondents said, “Yes,” 40% were unsure, and 6% said, “No.”

49% of respondents participate in LALINC task forces and/or interest groups, 45% do not and 5% were unaware of the service. 61% stated they were “Satisfied” with these groups, 23% were “Very Satisfied,” and 15% had a neutral reaction. No one selected “Dissatisfied,” or “Very Dissatisfied.”

Ease of participation ranked as the most favorable aspect of the LALINC task forces and/or interest groups with 92% of respondents being “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied.” This was followed by Notices regarding new task forces/interest groups and Method of communication. Activity level was the least favorable. However, its satisfaction levels were still predominantly positive; 62% were “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied,” 31% had a neutral opinion and 8% were “Dissatisfied.”

Regarding LALINC task forces and/or interest groups, one respondent suggested: “I think the LOUIS email lists should be promoted more by member library directors in order to reach more staff members who work in LOUIS affiliated libraries. The participation and awareness might increase. LOUIS does everything it can to promote the task forces and interest groups, but
library directors should help make sure the message is passed down through their library's ranks.”

Four commenters mentioned time constraints being a factor in their ability to participate. As one librarian wrote, “It is hard for me to leave campus because for more than a day without affecting the others who work here.”

**Tutorials**

Only 60% of respondents use online tutorials and videos with students. When asked if they would like assistance in their information literacy efforts through shared instructional materials, including videos, tutorials, and assessments, 34% of those surveyed said yes, 18% said no, and 47% were not sure. Half of the people who commented (5 of 10 respondents) on this question were excited by the possibility. One wrote, “As we are short staffed, this would be very helpful,” and another said, “I can adapt something that is adaptable, but I wouldn't know technologically how to start something from scratch.” Two commenters were opposed to receiving outside help: one from a belief that this information is too specific to each institution and best accomplished in-house, and the other saying, “I would in a different library setting.”

Respondents were next asked to list the most important topics for which they would like to have videos or tutorials. 24 individuals responded, each with between 1 and 5 topics they would like to see added to their video and tutorial library.

51 topics were listed, which this evaluator then broke into the following categories: Information Literacy Skills, Databases, General Library Information, and Tutorials for Faculty and Staff. Almost half of the listed topics (22) were focused on teaching general information literacy skills to students; 11 of the topics in this category were specifically about effective search strategies. The next largest category was Databases (12), followed by General Library Information (10), and Tutorials for Faculty and Staff (7).

Topics suggested in the category of Information Literacy Skills included, listed from most to least frequently mentioned: effective online searching, database searching, what is information literacy, copyright and plagiarism, evaluation of sources and resources, different types of information, searches using library databases versus the open web, when to use which resources, how to save search results.

In the category of Databases, respondents listed: using EDS (this accounted for 6 of the 12 responses in this category), database access and use, using eLibrary.

General Library Information topics included: using the catalog/OPAC, library tour/orientation, tutorials for distance learners, using interlibrary loan, writing tutorials.

Recommendations for tutorials relating to Faculty and Staff: What LOUIS does for libraries and how to take advantage of it, overview of tutorials geared to departments, Training for student
workers in how to use wizards in Workflows, metaliteracy, threshold concepts, how IL will be changing.

**Recommendations and Next Steps**

- Explore technology and services related to usage statistics tracking, as respondents throughout the survey indicated that this is a need for them.
  - The Statistics Task Force just completed their charge. A report is forthcoming. It is expected that other specific task forces will result from the report.
- Offer more trainings on how libraries can get the most from EDS and SirsiDynix. Possibly on-demand tutorials for library workers would be one way members could see and review materials at their own pace or refresh their knowledge of particular features without having to register for in-person or live webinar trainings.
  - We have sent out surveys on both services, plus ILLiad to gauge needs and interest in various learning and sharing formats. Reports are forthcoming.
- Bomgar, Custom reports, and ILLiad were the three least-utilized technologies/services referenced in this survey. However, the satisfaction levels reported from those who did use them were very high. There is an opportunity to increase awareness about the benefits of these three, which may help increase usage.
  - LOUIS actively pushes these services and each was listed on the surveys LOUIS put out. We hope to raise awareness via the surveys and follow up as needed.
- Write up proposals for how LOUIS can offer more assistance with MARC record uploads and website upkeep, and then allow members involved with these processes to review. Those surveyed showed strong levels of curiosity with regard to these topics but were unwilling to commit without seeing what additions would look like.
  - LOUIS has announced to SAs that we will help with any marc loads and has been proactive when we see the needs via FootPrint incidents.
  - LOUIS has a consortium discount for LibGuides that has been sent out. We have made the offer to help those who use LibGuides CMS with their website. To date, we have not had any site ask for help.
- Investigate ways to streamline or automate the LALINC registration process. Questions should include: does LALINC need its own physical, separate card, and should users be able to register online rather than coming to the library?
  - The Resource Sharing Task Force is working on the fields that would be used to automate this process. This is an active TF.
- There were seven different comments in the questions relating training sessions, task forces, listservs and committees that time constraints prohibited individuals from participating as much as they would like to. Respondents mentioned either not having enough time to participate or not being able to negotiate coverage in order to attend a meeting. Work with library directors to explore ways to incentivize participation.
  - I imagine this could be shared with the directors/deans for their attention.
- Begin a program to offer information literacy tutorials to member libraries. This could be approached on two levels: 1) production and distribution of general information literacy/research skills instruction that would be applicable to most students regardless
of institution and 2) a process to identify, plan, and produce customized videos for specific institutions to address their unique needs.

- The Information Literacy Interest Group could work with Credo on defining some of the tutorials and share with the consortium.

**Closing Comments Provided by Respondents**

“LOUIS is the best resource Louisiana academic libraries have.”

“I love LOUIS. I wish every state and institution of higher education had the benefits and expertise of a consortium like LOUIS.”

“Thanks for asking these questions! I appreciate the efforts by LOUIS to be of service and relevant to libraries. LOUIS staff are always the best to work with!”

“LOUIS, please keep up your truly most outstanding work!!!”

“I appreciate all that the LOUIS staff does to try to make our job easier so that we can spend time helping our students become better learners.”

“Keep up the good work, y'all! :-)”