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Abstract
Objective: How are students using our library spaces?

- Collect evidence to inform future space planning and renovations
- What works? What does not work? What is needed?
- Physical spaces must meet the needs of a 21st century student.

Document Type
Undergraduate Project

Department
Sociology

Professor’s Name
David Baronov

Keywords
library space assessment, library space, space, assessment, library, poster, graphs, charts, data, research

Subject Categories
Sociology

Comments
Poster presented the St. John Fisher College Student Scholarship and Creative Work Symposium on April 28, 2017.

View additional Library Space Assessment presentation here.
**Research Question and Introduction**

**Objective:** How are students using our library spaces?
- Collect evidence to inform future space planning and renovations
- What works? What does not work? What is needed?
- Physical spaces must meet the needs of a 21st century student.

**Methods**
IRB approval numbers: 3626-102016-11 (focus groups & survey) and 3536-021816-08 (seating sweeps)

**Seating Sweeps: Spring 2016**
- 3 times/day, 2 non-consecutive weeks
- Recorded activity and personal items (e.g., cell phone, headphones, talking, group work, etc.)
- Anyone in the library
- Recorded by library staff floor by floor

**Focus Groups: Spring 2017**
- ~1 hour sessions
- 2 sets of questions: undergraduate, graduate
- Student run sessions – no library staff or faculty influence
- Participants (N=41)

**Survey: Spring 2017**
- Development based on common focus group responses
- Gift card incentive
- Created using Qualtrics
- Piloted with small groups of students
- To boost response rate, emails sent through SG
- Anonymity with survey
- Distributed only to undergraduates
- N=2948 (11% response rate, 319 respondents)

---

**Findings and Conclusions**

**Seating Sweeps:**
- Flexible furniture – students sat 1 to a table that would normally sit at least 2
- Technology – multiple, simultaneous device usage – calculators, tablets, laptops, phones, computers; high use of outlets
- Collaborations – group work around one computer, rather than group work stations
- Mix of “settling in” and on-the-go activity

**Focus groups:**
- Most common uses for the library:
  - Studying
  - Computer use/printing
  - Work on group projects
- Services and features that students like about the library:
  - Interlibrary loan
  - Librarians and research desk
  - Group work tables with TV screens
- Services and features that students would like the library to add:
  - Stress relief room
  - Extended hours
  - More study rooms on the quiet floor

**Survey:**
- Monday – Thursday and Finals Week are popular times
- Academic activities are primary focus
- Academic activities are highly tech-oriented or collaborative
- Quiet floor is most utilized
- Lower level (basement) is underutilized
- Popular responses to “I think the library needs...”:
  - More quiet rooms
  - Nap pods/stress relief rooms
  - Outlets
  - Air conditioning

---

**Limitations**
- Seating Sweeps:
  - Multiple recorders’ interpretations
- Focus Groups:
  - Low graduate participation
- Survey:
  - Not a random sample (focus groups target populations)
  - Graduate populations excluded (low participation in focus groups)
  - Excluded demographics (differentiation between commuters/residents)

**Recommendations**
- Small, incremental changes:
  - New, more smaller tables on upper level
  - Updated seating options
  - Promote available spaces
- Large scale changes:
  - Prioritize in Campus Master Plan
  - More outlets (60.7%)
  - New HVAC (57.6%)
  - Grab ’n Go Foods (59.8%)
  - More lighting (natural and task)

**What we learned**
- Research method techniques:
  - Lead focus groups
- Survey design and set-up
- Publication: conference and paper proposal, presentation
- Institutional Review Board/CFIT training
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