

Olivet Nazarene University

Institution Characteristics

- Liberal arts university
- Private, affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene
- 3,617 FTE enrollment
- FTE library staff: 5 Librarians; 8.75 staff

CARLI Counts Participant

Jasmine Cieszynski, Instructional Services Librarian, Associate Professor

Project: How does the provision of information about course-integrated library resources impact use of library services by students in the School of Graduate & Continuing Studies nursing programs?

Abstract

Benner Library conducted investigation into the use of Interlibrary Loan, Reference services, and the CINAHL Complete database and found that informal communication to individual course instructors in a handful of courses *did not make a noticeable difference* in the use of services and resources by students when comparing use from the same time period one year prior to intervention. We also found that our recordkeeping methods are incomplete and non-standard across library staff.

Motivation(s) for Project

According to conversations with J. Pickering in the Office of the Registrar, the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies (SGCS) nursing programs have enrolled

the most or second-most students for the past 5-7 years (personal communication, January 8, 2020). Additionally, almost every course in each program requires library research. For both reasons, we targeted these courses for library outreach, in order to produce the most fruit for our labor. We know this is our role because of our professional ethic and from Standards for Libraries in Higher Education, written by the Association of College and Research Libraries. Principle #3 describes the educational role, “libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.” 3.1 and 3.2 are relevant performance indicators, which describe faculty-librarian collaboration and embedded information literacy outcomes in curricula, courses, and assignments. (ACRL, 2018).

Murray, Ireland, and Hackathorn (2016) describe syllabus analysis as a good way to identify information literacy instructions provided by faculty as well as possibly revealing assumptions that faculty have about library services (quality, availability). Therefore, we requested and were granted access to the course modules in Canvas, our institution’s online learning management system, for all nursing course with a library research component.

Increased usage of library resources should be a goal not just for librarians, but also for program directors since Assessment in Action (AiA) compelling evidence reveals that library use increases students success (Malenfant, 2016). Increasing student success is a University-wide goal, as outlined in a confidential University document, titled “Vision 2022: Higher Learning for a Higher Calling” (internal communication, 2017).

Partners and Stakeholders

Early on, SGCS Nursing Program Coordinators expressed enthusiasm for this project and willingness to partner with me in order to communicate with course faculty and revise courses. However, as the project progressed, they were unable to implement changes, the partnership I expected, due to the course revisions process for their programs. Thankfully, other Library colleagues partnered with me by providing data about their services to SGCS nursing students and usage data from CINAHL for the two time periods of interest. These colleagues include the Reference Librarian, ILL manager, Informatics Librarian, and Dean of Library Services.

Additionally, new partners at the SGCS emerged. Stakeholders include:

- Librarians and staff (Interlibrary Loan, Reference, eResources, Dean)
- SGCS Nursing students, faculty, and administrators for the following programs:
 - Accelerated Bachelor of Science in Nursing (ABSN)
 - Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)
 - Master of Science in Nursing (MSN)
 - Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP)
- SGCS administrators, instructional designers, and assessment personnel

Inquiry Question: What is the impact of librarian outreach to adjunct nursing faculty and program coordinators on use of library services by School of Graduate & Continuing Studies (SGCS) students?

The **independent variable(s)** in this study are

- No contact from Benner Library.
- Librarian-sent email messages to adjunct faculty which describe relevant library resources for the current course
- Library support content embedded into Canvas course templates.

The **study period** is February-July 2019. The control period is February-July 2018.

The **dependent variable(s)** in this study are

- Number of SGCS Nursing Reference Desk interactions
- Number of Interlibrary Loan requests by nursing patrons
- CINAHL Complete database usage
- Nursing Subject Guide page hits
- Nursing video tutorial views

Study Participants/Population

Students enrolled in SGCS nursing courses which have a library research assignment, during Feb-July 2019.

Method(s) of Data Collection and Analysis

- Reference librarians and staff are supposed to complete an online form when they assist a patron using email, phone, or in-person methods. Two fields on the

form were searched to identify relevant interactions: patron type (SGCS) and “Other Use” (Nursing) from the control and experimental time periods.

- The ILL manger provided a summary of total number of patrons who made nursing requests in six-month increments.
- The Informatics Librarian and eResources staff assistant reviewed database usage reports and web traffic logs.
- Data was not analyzed with any statistical tool.

	February – July 2018	February – July 2019	Change?
Reference # of SGCS nursing student assisted	7	6	-1
ILL	320 (Jan-June)	378 (Jan-June)	+58
CINAHL Complete usage			
--Regular searches	59,332	48,678	-10,654
--Result clicks	65,705	47,925	-17,780
--Record Views	29,427	22,291	-7,136
Web resource usage			
-- Nursing help (.pdf downloads)	63	60	-3
--Nursing help (web page visits)	354 visit to 11 webpages (Average of 32.2 visit per page)	94 visit to 7 webpages (Average of 13.4 visits per page)	-18.8 visits per page
--Nursing Orientation	No data available	25	Unable to draw conclusion

Findings: What did we learn?

1. Librarians and Reference Desk staff don't consistently use our Professional [Reference] Questions data collection form. Some fields are misunderstood;

therefore some patron contacts may not have been recorded in a way that we can identify as fitting our criteria: SGCS and Nursing student.

2. Use of the database CINAHL Complete is down.
3. SGCS Nursing programs have a course revision process which is not open to incorporating new content once a course is in-session.
4. Librarians may send email to adjunct faculty, but we will not know if the content is passed on to students unless we hear back from an individual instructor and/or student.
5. Tracking the impact of messaging to specific students using general data is not a good experimental design. Better methods, which would require IRB approval, might be interview, survey, or track IDs during service provision.
6. Our outreach efforts will be most effective when they are coordinated with course writers, rather than sent to faculty or students as an add-on.

Local Use of Findings

As a result of this initial assessment experience, one small change and one large change have already been implemented. First, we revised the label on our Professional [Reference] Questions data entry form in an attempt to make data entry more uniform and complete. Specifically, the drop-down field labeled “Other Use” has been renamed “Specific Class/Topic.” Second, and most importantly, after hearing about my unsuccessful experience of trying to deliver course-related library resources to program coordinators and individual (adjunct) faculty members, Associate Dean at the SGCS, Rochelle Brock, offered a new partnership between me and her new Instructional Designer (ID). Starting in December 2019, the ID will reach out to the librarian at key points in the Quality Matters course development

process for help in identifying available subscription and Open Education Resources (OER) options.

Next Steps and Other Results

- Check for increased use of UpToDate database, to see if our hunch that students are switching from CINAHL to UpToDate is correct. If so, consider creating more support tutorials/guides/course integrated resources featuring UpToDate, instead of focusing primarily on CINAHL in our instructional materials.
- Stop sending individual email messages to adjunct faculty. Instead send suggested nursing course revisions to ID team, so they can be reviewed and considered for inclusion when the courses are revised.
- CARLI Counts gave me a powerful incentive to follow-up with others at the SGCS despite the failure of my partnership with Nursing program directors. As a result of approaching the ID team and Associate Dean, librarians were welcomed into the most critical phases of course development—an opening that was previously unattainable. This break-through moment was powered by participating in CARLI Counts—thank you!

Additional Reflections

This process was initially exciting, especially when various campus colleagues expressed interest and enthusiasm to collaborate with me. However, I was surprised, disappointed, and confused when my suggestions for integrating library resources into specific courses were not immediately implemented by program coordinators. It turns out that I was both unaware of the workflow at the

SGCS and lacking in personal connections with key personnel responsible for decision-making and implementation. Communicating solely by email, rather than having any face-to-face interaction increased the barriers to understanding forces and constraints at work in Program Coordinator’s personal lives and professional workflows. I now have more appropriate contacts which include a face-to-face component. Our relationships and collaborations can be sustained by email and phone conversations with two key players at the SGCS, Ian Matthews, Instructional Designer, and Associate Dean Brock.

Timeline

February 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean of Library Services and I identified SGCS Nursing programs as high-interest, due to large number of students and large number of courses with research components • Dean and I identified time period for control and activity (intervention) • Dean and I decided to compare interventions (2019) with last year’s data, when there was no outreach to these programs • Identified relevant research and values: AiA findings, ACRL Standards for Academic Libraries, and Olivet’s own strategic plan
March 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to avoid going through the IRB review process, the Dean and I decided not to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review the IT departments proxy/IP logs for CINAHL use ○ Ask patrons for their program or status (traditional-undergraduate or SGCS) during Reference interviews ○ Compare student enrollment within certain courses with patrons making ILL requests • Dean of the SGCS, Jeremy Van Kley, expressed interest in and support for the CARLI Counts assessment of outreach in the Nursing programs. • Rochelle Brock, Associate Dean at the SGCS, directed nursing program coordinators to give me access to 45+ canvas course templates for the SGCS Nursing classes across four programs from bachelors to doctoral levels: ABSN, BSN, MSN, FNP. • I revised my IVs and DVs
April-May 2019	I sent assignment-related library support information to the program coordinators and individual faculty for the following courses:

	Program	Course	Outreach method(s)	Date(s) 2019
	RN to MSN	NRSG 301: Introduction to Informatics and Baccalaureate Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May and April
	RN to MSN BSN	NRSG-326: Community Health Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May and April
	RN to MSN BSN	NRSG-361: Pharmacology	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May and April
	RN to MSN	NRSG-443: Global & Transcultural Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May and April
	BSN	NRSG-463: Leadership/Management in Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May and April
	MSN	NRSG-628: Nursing Informatics	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May 22
	MSN	NRSG-653: Theoretical and Professional Foundations of Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May 21
	ABSN	NUR 456: Leadership & Trends in Nursing	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May 2 and June 4
	ABSN	NUR 466: Nursing Research	Sent tips by email to Program coordinator and Professor	May 8 and June 4
August-December 2019	My Library colleagues provided ILL, eResource, and web site usage data. I queried the reference database.			
September 2019	In a phone consultation, Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, pointed out weaknesses in my assessment design, reminding me that that I don't really have any IVs since I am not comparing the actual use of library resources by			

	<p><i>certain</i> students (those enrolled in courses with library intervention) against that of students who had no intervention.</p> <p>During the phone consultation, she taught me useful concepts and phrases including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Reference Desk staff have poor <i>implementation fidelity</i> in our tracking (reference desk) since various staffers used the data collection form inconsistently. • I have inconclusive assessment project results for a variety of reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I don't know if adjunct faculty forwarded our information to the students ○ I did not have direct access to students (in order to ask questions like, "Did you talk to a librarian?" "What motivated you to talk to a librarian?") ○ Students seem to be are getting through courses with adequate grades using current behavior and (non-library) research tools. Therefore, students may not feel motivated to change research methods/tools. • Marketing research shows that repeated exposure to messages is needed before people will take action • In order to document intervention, campus partners need to engage in the assessment process by integrating relevant library resources into course assignments and by measuring the performance of those particular students.
December 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I met with Rochelle Brock & Ian Matthews. They explained the process for course revisions in the SGCS and invited me to participate in a new way. • I reflected on the experience and wrote this project summary.

Bibliography

Malenfant, K. (2016, April 26). ACRL report shows compelling evidence of library

contributions to student learning and success. *ACRL Insider*.

<https://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/11755>

Murray, A., Ireland, A., & Hackathorn, J. (2016). The value of academic libraries:

Library services as a predictor of student retention. *College & Research*

Libraries, 77(5), 631–642. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.5.631>

Standards for Libraries in Higher Education Task Force (2018). *Standards for*

libraries in higher education [Text]. Association of College & Research

Libraries (ACRL). <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardslibraries>

Appendix A

ACRL Standards for Libraries in higher Education.

Principle #3

Educational Role: Libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.

Performance Indicators

3.1 Library personnel collaborate with faculty and others regarding ways to incorporate library collections and services into effective curricular and co-curricular experiences for students.

3.2 Library personnel collaborate with faculty to embed information literacy learning outcomes into curricula, courses, and assignments.

Source:

Standards for Libraries in Higher Education Task Force (2018). *Standards for*

libraries in higher education [Text]. Association of College & Research

Libraries (ACRL). <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardslibraries>

Appendix B

AiA compelling Evidence

2. Library use increases student success. Students who use the library in some way (e.g., circulation, library instruction session attendance, online databases access, study room use, interlibrary loan) achieve higher levels of academic success (e.g., GPA, course grades, retention) than students who did not use the library.

Source:

Malenfant, K. (2016, April 26). ACRL report shows compelling evidence of library contributions to student learning and success. *ACRL Insider*.

<https://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/11755>