

CSI LIBRARY SATISFACTION SURVEY



2009/2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	METHODOLOGY	1
III	PARTICIPANTS	2
IV	COLLECTIONS	2
V	SERVICES	5
VI	LIBRARY INSTRUCTION	9
VII	TECHNOLOGY	12
VIII	ENVIRONMENT	16
IX	SOUNDING OFF	18
X	SURPRISES AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE	22
XI	CONCLUSION	25

CSI Library Survey: 2009/2010

I. INTRODUCTION

The CSI Library conducted a survey to solicit feedback from faculty and student concerning their usage and satisfaction of resources, services, and facilities provided by the CSI Library. This report provides the self-reported result data collected over a four-month period, from November 30, 2009 to March 10, 2010.

II. METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument was designed by the three librarians¹, with 75% of the questions based on previous surveys conducted in 2005 and in 1999. The questionnaires are listed as Appendix A (for students) and Appendix B (for Faculty). The survey was designed for delivery via the Internet using an online survey delivery platform (SurveyMonkey). The questionnaire for students consisted of 21 items including 18 multiple choice questions and three open-ended questions and the survey for faculty consisted of 20 multiple choice questions and three open-ended questions. Questions were categorized into the following areas: Background, Access to the Library, Resources, Library Instruction, Technology, Environment, and Future Needs. To ensure a robust return, the surveys were sent out twice (4 weeks apart) via email to the students via the Office of Student Affairs and to the faculty via the Office of Academic Affairs. In addition, an incentive of pens and mini-staplers were offered to students who agreed to take the

¹ The survey was designed by Jonathan Cope, Joseph Deodato, and Wilma Jones.

survey in the Library. The results of these responses will be reported as percentages along with charts and examples of open-ended answers.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Six hundred and five (605) participants responded to the survey, including 513 students (approximately 5% of the fall 2009 student FTE) and 92 full-time and part-time faculty members (18% of the fall 2009 faculty FTE). The majority of student respondents (86%) were undergraduates and the majority of the faculty respondents (74%) were full-time faculty members. This participation far exceeded the response rate for the 2005 library survey (LibQual+) which accounted for 1.44% of the student population and 14.21% of the faculty population. However, it should be noted that of the 513 student respondents that began the survey, only 393 (77%) completed the survey; similarly, of the 92 faculty respondents who began the survey, only 80 (87%) completed the survey.

IV. COLLECTIONS

As is often the case, student responses differed significantly from faculty responses. For example, 41.6% of the student respondents stated that they primarily used the library as a place to study and 24% for use of computers and laptops, but 67.5% of the faculty responded that they primarily used the library to find books and articles for their research.

Overall, respondents were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with research collections in the library which included databases (78% faculty, 85% students); reserve items (50% faculty, 68% student); circulating books (40% faculty, 69% students); reference books (44% faculty, 72%

students); and print periodicals (35% faculty, 63% students). On the other hand respondents shared similar views in having “no opinion” on Microform collections (72% faculty, 45% students) and Archives/Special Collections (65% faculty, 41% students). Four databases ranked amongst the most used by both faculty and students. They include: Academic Search Complete (47.5% faculty, 61.9% students), JSTOR (63% faculty, 38.4% students), Lexis-Nexis Academic (34.2% faculty, 21.4% students), and Catalogs (53.4% faculty, 41.8% students). Catalogs aside, these same databases rated among the top 5 most accessed databases for full-text retrieved by CSI users in 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. Other databases that were heavily used by students and faculty, ranked as follows:

Student Respondents, n=443

19.9% -- New York Times Historical
 19.6% -- MLA Bibliography
 17.2% -- Oxford English Dictionary
 14.4% -- PsycArticles/PsycInfo
 13.5% -- Staten Island Advance
 13.1% -- MedLine/PubMed

Faculty Respondents n=73

31.5% -- ScienceDirect
 30.1% -- ERIC
 26% -- SpringerLink Journals
 24.7% -- New York Times Historical
 24.7% -- Project Muse
 23.3% -- TurnItIn

In response to the open-ended question of suggesting needs for future features or services, both faculty and students’ responses indicated a strong interest in “More databases, e-journals and e-books” (67.6% faculty, 48.5% students) and a “single search interface to find books and journals” (60.3% faculty, 42% students). (See Figure 1 and Figure 2)




Figure 1. Responses from **students** about features and services needed in the library.




Figure 2. Responses from **faculty** about features and services needed in the library.

Regarding the request for additional databases, 23 faculty respondents requested 22 databases and journal titles, 11 of which were already available in the CSI Library holdings, and several have since been acquired. Unlike faculty, half of the students who responded to this question said in one way or another that they were “satisfied with current databases,” while the other half asked for general resources in their disciplines such as “more financial databases,” “more nursing ones,” “computer programming related,” “neuroscience database,” “more philosophical databases,” “more databases on nursing and music,” “more science related databases,” and “Spanish literature databases.” Except for the neuroscience and Spanish literature requests, all the other requests are represented by at least two or more databases in the library holdings.

V. SERVICES

Major services of the library were described instead of using their proper names to ensure correct responses. These services were listed as follows: Reference Services, “reference assistance (reference desk, email, chat, telephone); Inter-Library Loan Services, “getting books from other libraries”; Circulation/Reserves Services, “checking in/out circulating books or reserves items”; Library Instruction Services, “library instruction on utilizing the online catalog and databases”; Media Services “getting DVDs, VCRs, projectors, laptop delivery and set up”; Special Collections, “utilizing special collections material”; and CELT “assistance with integrating technology.” Faculty and student respondents were primarily “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with all of the services. Three services that received the highest evaluations from respondents include Reference Services, (65% faculty, 69% students), Inter-Library Loan Services (61% faculty, 50% students) and Library Instruction Services (47% faculty, 64% students). See Figure 3 and Figure 4.




Figure 3. **Student** responses concerning library services




Figure 4. **Faculty** responses concerning library services

A question on the student survey about services (question #11) that was not asked of faculty had to do with hours of service, group study rooms, and furniture. This question was designed

specifically to address impact of extended hours of services instituted at the beginning of the fall semester (+ 7 hours during week days and +4 hours during weekend days), as well as the recent acquisition of 240 study chairs, and new policy instituted in the group study rooms to accommodate better access. The results showed that 60% to 75% of the responses would still like to see longer hours on weekdays and weekends, more group study spaces and more comfortable furniture.

In addition, 80 additional comments were made in the “other” category, most of which fell into three areas: access to more computers/laptops, enforcement of the silent study zone policy, and needing longer hours.




Figure 5. **Student** ratings of hours of service, study rooms, and furniture.

Access to more computers/laptops formed the majority of the “other” responses (34%), which had nothing to do with the question asked, but could not be ignored. Comments included: “more computers to use,” *“More computers... Block people from going on facebook or any social network,”* *“More laptops available to borrow,”* “LESS STUDENTS TAKING UP COMPUTER TIME FOR FACEBOOK INSTEAD OF RESEARCH” and *“More computers to work on, especially at the end of the semester because labs tend to be filled.”*

Another 19% of the comments asked more enforcement of the quiet/silent study zones in the library in the following ways: *“More security on the 3rd Floor to make sure that it remains a quiet zone (no talking) which rarely (sic) happens,”* *“where there is no talking; the third floor is now allowed (sic) to whisper softly (i do not understand that); its supposed to be noise free,”* and *“Strict enforcement of 3rd floor quiete (sic) policy.”* These comments reinforce the complaints received by that the library administration from students who were being disturbed by incessant whispers and loud talking in the absence of the peace officer assigned to maintain quiet on the third floor that was designated as the silent floor.

The third category of comments 15% was about longer hours of service and examples of these are: *“I work and take night classes. Later hours would nice,”* *“longer/more hours for archives,”* *“I would like to see the operating hours significantly increase; if possible, 24 hrs, especially during finals,”* and *“Please have longer hours for the library! There should be a spot that is open 24 hours like most college libraries!”* Clearly, better promotion of the library’s extended hours will need to be done in the future as we consider extending hours to midnight everyday of

the week. The remaining comments (32%) were a mix that asked for more group study rooms, more seating, better lighting, and more textbooks.

VI. LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Four questions in the survey were devoted to Library Instruction services, an integral service provided for student success. Surprisingly, sixty-one percent (61%) of the faculty respondents noted that they have not scheduled a library instruction session within the past nine months. Of the respondents who indicated that they had (21%), all indicated that the session did provide students with what was needed to begin/complete their assignment or research. However, of those who elaborated in the open-ended question (n=18) as to what was most useful/not useful to students, 12 were favorable statements, 4 were not so favorable and two were not applicable. Examples of favorable statements include: *"Importance of peer review journals and how to find them," "Navigating census info," "How to conduct literature searches," "Advise students to independently seek library assistance" and "Information on how to use databases to search for appropriate information for their research."*

While the less favorable statements appeared to be negative, they all seem to be saying the same thing, thus leading us to conclude that there needs to be more communication between library faculty and with teaching faculty prior to the library instruction session to establish an assignment for the course and the time needed to cover additional requests. Statements include:

"Sessions often cover too much and are not always tailored to the particular class. Sessions can be generic, which is not useful to students."

"Most useful is when the librarian follows the guidelines I offer...not useful is when the librarian explains more than what I requested, overwhelming students with information and leaving insufficient time for students to search on their own."

"Work on actual topic. The long introductions to the library are helpful, but students don't seem to retain too much."

"In general I am happy with the library instruction, especially the introduction to research methods. Here are two issues that the instructors often fall down on: I always request a full explanation of plagiarism, what it is and how to avoid it. This isn't addressed fully enough and is a rapidly growing problem among our students. Also I've specifically requested an explanation of why doing a good search is not a good approach to research and this is fully explained to the students. The library's excellent on-line resources need to be explained in differentiation from wiki & other even more dubious sites. What in fact research is and the pleasure of it."

In total, 94 (23%) students responded to this question about library instruction. Eleven respondents (12%) indicated that they had not attended a library instruction session at all. Of the 83 respondents that reported attending a library instruction session, 76 (89.4%) identified something that was useful to them in the instruction session or otherwise expressed a positive view of their library instruction experience. Seven of the responses were outright negative and two were impossible to interpret. Of the 69 positive responses, 37 students indicated that they found instruction on the use of the library's databases the most useful. Typical positive responses are as follows: *"How to use the databases that the library has to offer," "How to find newspaper articles online for my research paper."* *"How to access the databases and how to get the best out of my research (which database best served my needs and how to accurately get all the information I needed and more),"* *"How to better your search in various databases was the most useful."* Respondents also mentioned citation styles and finding books as the most useful aspect of their instruction sessions.

Of the seven negative responses, three mentioned the repetition of similar sessions as their main complaint. These respondents expressed frustration with what they viewed as the repetitive

nature of attending multiple library instruction sessions beyond the one they had most recently attended. Notably, four of the 87 respondents indicated that they had been to multiple library instruction sessions with similar content. Still, two of the five respondents who lodged this complaint had an overall positive opinion about the session. Since 11 respondents (12%) reported having not been to a session, this indicates that a few students attended multiple instruction sessions—hence, their feeling that the content was repetitive—during the course of their studies, and several still had yet to attend one. Indeed, a majority of students are freshman and have yet to attend the library instruction sessions that are a required component of the English 111 and 151 freshman composition courses. An example of one of the comments about having had multiple library sessions:

“It’s all very basic... once in awhile we will be told of a new resource we did not know about as History majors, but most (sic) we learn in our hst 200 class yet repeat about 4 other times in other courses.”

Other negative responses:

“Since the session is before you begin, you do not know what to ask. It would be more helpful to have a way to send an email to someone to get future answers. Or perhaps have in house people help.”

“To (sic) much info in the session. Understood at time, but when trying to apply these searches, I am having a hard time using the database.”

Only one of the seven negative responses expressed dissatisfaction with the librarian teaching the session. Although the total of negative responses is small (8.9%), it seems that one thing the CSI Library Instruction program could focus on in the coming years is creating a greater distinction between the content being taught in upper level courses and that being taught in the required English composition courses in order to minimize the repetition of content.

VII. TECHNOLOGY

Regarding computer needs in the library facility, which solicited answers on a 5-point scale from “strongly agree” to “no opinion,” this subset of questions included the adequacy of computers, network printers, power outlets for laptops, reliable wireless service, and photocopiers. Student respondents checked “agree” more times than any of the other scales, ranking from 37% - 47%, in all of the categories, except for the question that asked whether the library “offers plenty of computer workstations,” in which most disagreed. This question, however, could be considered skewed as students may not distinguish between computer workstations managed by Office of Information Technology in the computer labs and the ones the library manages in the rest of the 1L library building. On the other hand, faculty respondents checked “no opinion” more times than any of the other scales, ranking from 53% to 64% in all of the categories, except in the category of “offers plenty of computer workstations” where the majority of the faculty selected “agree” (33%).

One question that appeared in the faculty survey, but was omitted in the student survey, had to do with the use of the Center of Excellence in Learning Technologies (CELT). Of the 80 respondents who answered this question, 44 (55%) of them had “never visited CELT.” The remaining respondents revealed that they heavily used CELT for BlackBoard support (53.2%) followed by scanning of documents (11.3%), website development (8.8%), and digitizing slides/audio/video (6.3%), and PowerPoint presentation development (5.0%). See figure 6.




Figure 6. **Faculty** responses regarding their use of the Center for Excellence in Learning Technologies (CELT).

In general, comments given by 17 respondents in the open-ended form were favorable.

Examples include: *“CELT is great,” “CELT resources need to be better publicized among faculty and staff. There are great resources there,”* and *“A true center for teaching and learning where faculty can gather to discuss innovative pedagogy, new uses of instructional technology, and support each other in refining the craft of teach.”* Indeed, except for assistance with SPSS, CELT currently provides every suggestion made by respondents, namely: poster productions, workshops on RefWorks, creating tutorials, and SmartBoard assistance, and assistance with scanning documents. However, reduction of staff due to attrition by a rate of 50% over the past 18 months has impeded productivity and workshops offerings by the Center.

A corresponding question for students (not present in the faculty survey) was one that solicited the frequency of activities that students perform on computers in the Library. Combined percentages of responses that centered on using the computers in the library “daily” and “several times a week” are expressed in below and the total numbers are illustrated in Figure 7.

- 68.7% -- "Print assignments, syllabi, class readings, etc."
- 60.9% -- "Check e-mail"
- 56.3% -- "Access Blackboard"
- 51.5% -- "Search the catalog for books or databases"
- (48.5%) -- "Type a paper or create a power presentation"
- 34% -- "Personal use (MySpace/FaceBook, IM, etc)" and
- 18% -- "Scan a document"




Figure 7. **Student** responses regarding activities performed on computers in the Library.

An observation noted in the responses regarding technology revealed that students had a stronger reaction than faculty about the adequacy of computer workstations. In response to question #17, 75% of the student respondents would like to see “*more computer workstations*” in the Library, and in question #20, 53% “*disagreed*” or “*strongly disagreed*” that the library offered plenty of

computer workstations. In contrast, only 38% of faculty respondents selected "more computer workstations" in the library as a top priority. See Figure 8 and Figure 9.




Figure 8. **Student** responses regarding computing needs in the Library




Figure 9. **Faculty** responses to computing needs in the Library

Additionally, students desired an improved, easier to use website, live online reference assistance, online tutorials, and a variety of software that includes Photoshop, AutoCad, Visual studio, MatLab, MiniTab, etc. at similar rates (59% to 87%).

VIII. ENVIRONMENT

Regarding facilities, students appeared to be more lenient in selecting favorable responses than faculty members, however they were more critical about the environment, which mainly included hours, lighting, restrooms, study tables and chairs, and computer workstations. In the choices that were given, the majority of student respondents (50 - 53%) of agreed that the facility was safe and had adequate signage, whereas faculty respondents agree with 42-49%. Both groups had a significant number of respondents who had “no opinion” about “easily accessible for persons with disability (faculty, 75%, students 30%).

With regards to lighting, furniture, and cleanliness of the facility, which solicited answers on a 5-point scale of “strongly agree” to “no opinion,” student respondents checked “agree” more times than any of the other scales, ranking from 42% to 68% in all of the categories whereas faculty respondents also checked “agree” more times than any of the other scales, ranking from 38% to 55% in all of the categories. See Figure 10 and Figure 11.




Figure 10. **Student** responses to questions about the facility.




Figure 11. **Faculty** responses to questions about the library facility

IX. SOUNDING OFF

The last question of the questionnaire in each survey was an open-ended question that solicited feedback regarding future needs of the library. This question was answered by 165 students and 37 faculty and the comments were categorized as follows: 13% were about the collection; 14% were about services, 33% were about technology and 40% were about the environment/facilities.

Collection (13% responses to open-ended last question)

Thirty-six percent (36%) of the respondents requested the need for more books/e-books, 21% asked for more databases, and 18% specifically asked for more textbooks. In response to these suggestions, the Library is currently investigating appropriate e-books and e-textbooks for purchase and continues to advocate for additional funding to augment its base budget to meet the current needs of the expanding curriculum. In addition, four databases mentioned by faculty that the Library did not own were evaluated and acquired.

Services (14% responses to open-ended last question)

Fourteen percent (14%) of the statements made by students and faculty, combined, were about services provided by the CSI Library. The dominant statements were categorized as follows: 15% complimented the “great” to “excellent” service provided by librarians and staff, while 8% asked for better service; 15% of the respondents asked for longer loan periods for books; and 10% of the respondents (mainly faculty) requested training workshops on research databases. It should be noted that the nature of the question was designed to invite criticism; therefore, critical responses were to be expected. Despite the fact that this question invited criticism, an example of a response that was full of praise:

“I think that the people at the library are doing a great job, and as a graduate student who has studied at CSI through my BA as well, I am optimistic that the information collected from this survey and others like this will help to improve the library facility on our campus.”

In response to the above suggestions, the Library will explore extending the loan periods.

Presently loan periods are three weeks with two renewals for students and 8 weeks with one renewal for faculty. In addition, library workshops for faculty will be considered.

Technology (33% responses to open-ended last question)

In the open-ended question that came at the end of the survey regarding future needs of the library, 33% of the statements (made by students and faculty combined) were technology related.

The dominant responses which were from student respondents fell into the following four areas:

Forty percent (40%) of the respondents were asking for more “computers”; 14% bluntly stated that the Library should “block FaceBook,” “MySpace,” “games.”; 13% wanted to see more “outlets” to plug in their laptops and asked for better wireless access; and 9% were asking for more laptops and access to more laptop printers.

Out of all of the critical responses, the most discussed issue was the lack of available computers. 37 respondents identified that they would like to see more available computers in the library. In a closely related concern, 13 respondents viewed the ubiquity of nonacademic computer usage (e.g., games, Facebook, u-Tube) when they needed a computer to conduct academic research as a major problem. 25 respondents identified high levels of noise in the library as a major complaint, 18 requested more seats, 11 asked for more study space, and 25 would like to see the

library extend its hours. All of these 6 issues suggest that the library is straining to accommodate large numbers of users. Here are several representative responses:

“If possible, it would be nice if facebook, etc could be blocked on the csi computers. It bothers me to see the majority of the students using the computers on facebook. This is an issue especially when there aren't any computers available, and I need to get work done for my classes.”

“It is often difficult to locate a computer not in use. I frequently see students using the computers for non-study related activities like facebook. This is very frustrating when I have waited close to 30 min for a computer in the past. It would be helpful if there was staff around to kick these people off the computers.”

Interestingly, one respondent thought that the library enforced usage policies that discourage nonacademic computer usage too punitively. These problems suggest that the library should initiate a process of reviewing its computer usage policies.

In response to the other suggestions, the Library plans to increase the number of computer workstations and laptops for use in the Library. During spring recess, April 2010, outlets and network jacks were installed to accommodate 20 computer workstations on the 2nd floor of the Library. In addition, 30 additional computer workstations were installed on the 3rd floor in summer 2010. With regards to laptops and printers, 25 additional laptops were acquired for the laptop loan program, for a total of 50. In addition, to support the wireless network, 20 additional receptors were installed to boost access points to wireless devices. (No complaints have been heard about the wireless network since.) Lastly, to address the issue of blocking “FaceBook,” “MySpace,” “games,” the Library has increased signage about the use of PCs in the library for “research only.” While the library faculty have observed daily non-academic use of the PCs in the Library, this is a group of professionals that have an aversion to censoring any type of information.

Environment (40% responses to open-ended last question)

In the open-ended question that came at the end of the survey, 40% of the statements (made by students and faculty combined) were about the facility and environment. The dominant responses fell into the following four areas: Twenty-two percent (22%) of the respondents complained about the “noise” level in the Library, especially on the third floor; 22% were asking for longer hours of service and 24/7 study space; 16% wanted to see more “comfortable seats”; 10% were asking for more study space; and 5% would like to increase the amount of available bathrooms in the library (as there are none on the third floor). The remaining responses, although fewer in number, but deserve to be mentioned, asked about “more photocopiers,” and “improved lighting.”

The requests for more seats, study spaces, and complaints about the high levels of noise suggest that the library’s resources are being strained. Many of the complaints about the noise specifically identified the third floor (the designated quiet study floor) which suggests that the enforcement of existing noise regulations is a key issue. Plans are underway to create five additional group study rooms on the 2nd floor of the library, and construction should begin shortly. An addition of 100 ergonomically designed “comfortable” study chairs arrived in April 2010 to alleviate the shortage of seats. With regard to hours of service, the Library hours were expanded in September 2009 from 86.5 hours/week to 97.5 hours/week. This includes an additional seven (7) hours during weekdays and four (4) hours on weekends during the 2009/2010, for a total of eleven (11) hours. Usage, so far, has been found to be more robust during weekends than during late hours on weekdays. A full review will be conducted at the end

of the semester and hours will be extended further if needed, given available funding for personnel and/or changes to the facility to create a study area.

X. SURPRISES AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE:

Several responses and comments were surprising, but have been noted for further observations and actions. They include, but are not listed in any order:

- JSTOR subscription database ranked the highest in use by student respondents. The database is an archival database is known for having full-text of a particular journal from its first volume up to three to five years ago. Usage statistics over the past five years tell us that *Academic Search Complete* (EBSCO) ranks #1 in the most accessed database and the most downloaded database for full-text. However, this new finding leaves us speculating that respondents are either directed to use JSTOR by their professors or they have themselves found that the database will never fail to produce a full-text article.
- A high number of student respondents asked that FaceBook and access to other social networking tools (i.e. games, MySpace, u-Tube, twitter, etc.) be blocked on Library computer workstations. This appeared to be an unusual request in that students have hardly ever approached librarians to ask them to remove students who were surfing the Internet and taking up a computer that could be used for research purposes. Librarians have since become proactive about this issue and are politely asking students who are surfing the Internet to vacate the workstation so that the student patiently waiting in line can use the PC for the appropriate purpose.
- While the survey was anonymous, it was heartwarming to learn that the highest response in the unsolicited response section about service (under “Other”) comprised of positive

compliments and high praise for librarians and staff (15%). While we will not ignore that 8% of the responses that called for better/improved services, this affirmed the CSI Library's commitment to providing high quality customer service.

- To learn that the “Silent Zone” on the 3rd floor of the Library “was not really quiet” was quite a blow. A Peace Officer has always been stationed on the 3rd floor to maintain a silent environment from 1:00pm – 9:00pm, however when the issue was investigated, we found out that the Silent Zone was indeed not silent before and after the Peace Officer's scheduled hours. To remedy the situation, the 3rd floor is now being patrolled by Public Safety Officers on a regular basis before and after the Peace Officer's scheduled hours.
- The requests by Faculty for training workshops on accessing subscription databases as well as integrating instructional technology into their curriculum materials was another surprise as the library conducts workshops strictly for faculty during intersessions (i.e. mid-January and June) that have had healthy number of attendees. Upon further analyzing all the faculty respondents who indicated the need for more training workshops, we discovered that many were asking for workshops at times convenient for them. Due to shortage of library faculty, we cannot, at this time, accommodate workshops during the semester which might be more convenient to many more faculty.
- When the overall comments in the most 2009 survey were compared to the last survey conducted in 2005 and in 1999, one common element that resonated among the three data sets was the need for longer hours for the library. In 1999 and 2005, the total opening hours of service was 82.5 hours per week. As of September 2009, the total opening hours of service was expanded to 97.5 hours per week, an 18% increase. The literature on library hours of opening indicates that students are often not impressed with current

library hours and will always ask to expand the hours of library service. However, as a non-residential college that supports a student population that is made up of a majority of students who work full-time and have family obligations, we were shocked that having hours up to 11:00pm seven days a week was not adequate. This made us speculate that either the Library has not promoted the new hours adequately or that unless the Library was open 24/7, the hours would never be adequate. Nevertheless, efforts were made in fall 2010 to saturate the college community with the newly extended hours – until midnight, seven days a week.

- Faculty's awareness of databases available at the library in their disciplines was of great concern when the results showed that 11 of 22 titles of journals and databases requested by faculty were available at the CSI Library. This was of high concern for the Chief Librarian and as a result has decided to make the promotion of e-resources and services to faculty as one of Library's goal in the 2010/2011 academic year. Emphasis will be stressed on using recently upgraded Inter-Library Loan system to retrieve documents unavailable at the CSI Library.
- The noise level in the Library has grown as a result its inadequacy to accommodate the ever increasing number of students in the Library as a result of the ever increasing enrollment in the student body each semester since fall 2007. Plans to create additional study rooms are underway, which will hopefully accommodate collaborative learning groups that appear to be the source of the increased noise level.
- Students were more vocal about technological needs in the Library as 40% responses related to technology concerned the call for additional computers, 13% requested more outlets and better wireless access, and 9% asked for more laptops and access to laptop

printers. A proposal for additional computer workstations, laptops, outlets, and wireless access was submitted before this report was completed to the Vice-President of Technology Systems. By the end of the spring semester, 20 new computer workstations were installed on the 2nd floor of the Library and 15 new laptops were delivered to the Laptop Loan Program. Twenty (20) wireless access receivers were installed all around the Library building and there has since not been a single complaint about the wireless network.

XI. CONCLUSION

While responses to the survey has provided us with rich data that is still being analyzed, we plan to administer this survey again in fall 2011 in order to see how much change there has been in the four categories (i.e. Collections, Services, Environment, and Technology). Plans are underway to remedy issues raised in sections about “Surprises” and it is hoped that there will be improvements in all the categories for both faculty and students. In the meantime, the Library faculty and staff will continue to ensure the development of collections and services to support the college curriculum, while maintaining a clean and welcoming environment, along with the appropriate technological equipments. On-going assessment will continue using polls, as needed, and benchmarks with CUNY senior colleges and peer institutions will be reviewed annually.

**Analyzed and written by
Wilma L. Jones, Chief Librarian,
with Jonathan Cope, Instruction/Reference Librarian
September 2010**

