

2018

Discovery Assessment and Improvement at an Academic Health Sciences Library: Health Information @ Himmelfarb Five Years Later

JoLinda Thompson
George Washington University

Elaine Sullo
George Washington University

Laura E. Abate
George Washington University

Meaghan Heselden
George Washington University

Kathleen Lyons
George Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://hsrc.himmelfarb.gwu.edu/libfacpubs>

 Part of the [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), and the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

APA Citation

Thompson, J., Sullo, E., Abate, L. E., Heselden, M., & Lyons, K. (2018). Discovery Assessment and Improvement at an Academic Health Sciences Library: Health Information @ Himmelfarb Five Years Later. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 15 (). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15424065.2018.1433093>

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library at Health Sciences Research Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Himmelfarb Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Health Sciences Research Commons. For more information, please contact hsrc@gwu.edu.

Discovery Assessment and Improvement at an Academic Health Sciences Library: Health
Information @ Himmelfarb Five Years Later

Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries

Corresponding author: JoLinda L. Thompson, Systems Librarian, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library, The
George Washington University, Washington, DC. jlt@gwu.edu

Co-authors:

Elaine Sullo, Coordinator, Information and Instructional Services, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library,
The George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA. elainej@gwu.edu

Laura E. Abate, Electronic Resources and Instructional Librarian, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library,
The George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA. leabate@gwu.edu

Meaghan Heselden, Metadata and Scholarly Publishing Librarian, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library,
The George Washington University, Washington, DC, USA. corbettm@gwu.edu

Kathleen M. Lyons, Circulation Desk Manager, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library, The George
Washington University, Washington, DC, USA. Klyons2@gwu.edu

Keywords: library assessment, survey research, web scale discovery, discovery services, EBSCO Discovery
Service, focus groups, DynaMed Plus, full-text delivery, link resolvers, electronic resource management

Abstract

Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library was an early health sciences library adopter of web scale discovery with introduction of a customized instance of EBSCO's Discovery Service (EDS) in 2012. After three years with EDS, the library initiated an evaluation project involving two user surveys and a library staff focus group to assess user satisfaction with the service. Resulting changes included introduction of widgets to improve access to clinical content, addition of radio buttons to the search box to make defaults easier to enable and disable, and a custom course reserves search feature. The improvements launched fall semester 2016.

Introduction

Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library serves the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, and the Milken Institute School of Public Health at The George Washington University. The library serves a diverse population of 5,000+ undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and staff with a wide range of information needs to support learning and studies, patient care, health policy and global health initiatives, and bench and clinical research activities.

The library recognized the need for a one stop search solution in 2005 while developing a five year strategic plan and subscribed to a federated search service two years later.¹ Federated search was a step toward a search tool that would offer the convenience and ease of Google to search the majority of the library's electronic content. It used communication standards to translate a single search query across multiple databases. But the federated search tool proved to be slow and unreliable. Web scale discovery services emerged in 2010 with the introduction of ProQuest's Summon, followed closely by EBSCO's Discovery Service, OCLC's WorldCat Local, and Ex Libris' Primo Central.² These search tools all had content in a common central index which allowed them to be more efficient and effective than federated search. Hoeppener defines web scale discovery as:

“ A pre-harvested central index coupled with a richly featured discovery layer that provides single search across a library’s local, open access, and subscription collections.”³

Himmelfarb librarians investigated the web-scale discovery services available at the time and selected EBSCO’s Discovery Service (EDS) in 2011 after trials of EDS and WorldCat Local. The effort to select EDS and prepare it for release is detailed in Thompson, et al *Web-scale discovery in an academic health sciences library: Development and implementation of the EBSCO discovery service.*⁴

Himmelfarb was an early health sciences library adopter of web scale discovery and there were concerns that EDS “out of the box” would include too much content that was not applicable to an academic health sciences audience. After an in-house trial and customization period that included usability testing, the service was made available to library users in the fall of 2012. Librarians on the implementation team carefully selected the databases and content sources to include, worked with EBSCO to improve relevancy ranking, and activated a default “Available in Library Collections” limiter to improve relevancy of search results.

Himmelfarb’s EDS instance was named Health Information @ Himmelfarb (HI@H) and it became the most prominent search tool on the library’s home page with a search box featured centrally. Although librarians initially assumed that HI@H would be used primarily by students, it was not designed or marketed specifically for them. Librarians anticipated that faculty and researchers might also find it useful for broad exploratory or multi-disciplinary searches.

HI@H included the library's catalog records, but did not replace the online catalog. The Library migrated to Innovative's Sierra integrated library system in 2013 and implemented Encore⁵ at that time for use as an online catalog with advanced discovery features, like faceting. A link to "Library Catalog" appears under the HI@H search box on the home page. Library staff opted to maintain a separate catalog to retain certain functions that HI@H could not accommodate including library account services {i.e. renewing materials or viewing checked out items} and the ability to search for course reserves by instructor and course name. Librarians also felt that faculty would continue to want to use a dedicated online catalog to search for print materials and e-books due to their familiarity with this type of search tool.

From early days through the present, HI@H had robust usage with steady growth from year to year. In academic year 2012/2013, there were 51,474 search sessions and 41,668 full-text downloads from HI@H. In 2015/2016, those numbers had increased to 204,413 search sessions and 191,162 full-text downloads--a 75% increase. In comparison, the online catalog during that time period had 19,495 search sessions in 2012/2013 and 16,678 in 2015/2016, a 15% decrease.

Although it was clear that HI@H was being used heavily and that searchers were finding useful content judging from full-text download counts, librarians had questions about who was using the service and for which uses HI@H was being deployed. There were concerns that placing HI@H front and center on Himmelfarb's home page automatically drove searchers to it, including in instances for which another search resource might be more appropriate. EDS also continued to evolve and EBSCO had introduced several new optional features since 2013 that could be incorporated. In 2015, a Himmelfarb Discovery Task Force was assembled to assess how the system was being used, who was using it, and how it could potentially be improved to better meet user needs. The declining use of the dedicated online catalog

was also targeted for information gathering to help decide whether a separate catalog interface was still needed.

The Discovery Task Force had five members representing reference and instructional services, document delivery, cataloging, circulation, e-resources management, and systems. Each member brought a unique perspective and expertise that contributed to an effective assessment effort.

Literature Review

Since Himmelfarb's 2013 *MRSQ* article was published, there have been a few papers released on web scale discovery in health sciences libraries. In 2014, the University of Maryland Health Sciences and Human Services Library (HS/HSL) described their purchase and implementation of EDS.⁶ This was part of a larger project to identify a discovery tool for the University System of Maryland and Affiliated Institutions library consortium. A field of seven prospective products was narrowed to EDS, Primo, and WorldCat Local. Trial versions were evaluated by checklist and a survey. EDS was selected based on its health related content, relevancy ranking, customizability, and ease of implementation. It was purchased for the full consortium and the HS/HSL library was able to customize its instance.

During implementation, the HS/HSL recommended several EDS changes to EBSCO that remain a part of the product:

- The name of the database displays in the results list so users can easily see the source.
- "More Search Options" label was changed to "Advanced Search" to make it consistent with other EBSCOhost databases

- A box with the search history and limits engaged displays on the search results screen to show users what is being applied to their current search strategy.

Results of a usability study led to some additional search interface changes including turning off EDS Custom Links so all hits displayed the link resolver button, and collapsing all facets except for Refine Results to de-clutter the left column. HS/HSL saw a 24% increase in full-text access during the soft launch period which they anticipated would increase when the service moved to a more prominent place on the Library's web page.

In 2016, Hanneke and O'Brien published results of their study comparing Primo, Summon, and EDS for health sciences research in *JMLA*.⁷ The authors ran keyword searches representing six health sciences disciplines in two instances of each product. The instances were at universities with health sciences graduate programs including a medical school, and a Carnegie classification of High or Very High. In all areas of evaluation, EDS rated slightly better than both Summon and Primo, although not to a degree that it was deemed a significantly superior interface by the authors. The authors also found that institutional customizations did not make a "substantial impact on search results". The authors found that all three products retrieved "a considerable amount of MEDLINE literature that had not appeared in...precision searches of PubMed."

Methodologies and Results

The assessment effort at Himmelfarb consisted of two surveys and a focus group that were administered during the Spring 2015 and Fall 2015 semesters. All are detailed in the following section.

Spring 2015 Demographic Survey

Objective - To determine basic demographics of the audience using Health Information @ Himmelfarb, including University status and school affiliation, and the primary reason for searching.

Method - A multiple choice three question survey was embedded directly in the HI@H search interface for three weeks in March and April 2015. Responses were collected and analyzed in SurveyMonkey. The brevity of the survey and placement directly in the interface were done to maximize participation among those using the service.

Survey Questions and Results -

1,329 individuals responded to the survey. See below for the list of survey questions and response distributions.

1. Please identify your status at George Washington University

- a. Graduate student - 66%
- b. Undergraduate student - 17%
- c. Medical student (MSI-IV) - 5%
- d. Faculty member - 8%
- e. Staff member - 2%
- f. Resident - 1%

2. I'm affiliated with the

- a. Milken Institute School of Public Health - 34%
- b. School of Medicine and Health Sciences - 32%
- c. School of Nursing - 34%

3. I'm using Health Information @ Himmelfarb primarily today for

- a. Research - 33%
- b. Patient Care - 4%
- c. School Work - 63%

The results of the brief demographic survey reinforced some of the Task Force's perceptions of how Health Information @ Himmelfarb was being used. The majority of searchers were graduate students, who far outnumber undergraduates in the schools Himmelfarb Library serves. The small proportion of medical student respondents (5%) was somewhat surprising to task force members; however, one of the weeks the survey was administered coincided with the medical students' spring break. Also, there were no Clinical Integration Sessions (CIS) assigned during these weeks. CIS integrates case discussion, clinical literature searching and evaluation to develop clinical reasoning and problem-solving skills for first year medical students. Lack of these sessions could have contributed to the low number of searches in this population. Task force members were not surprised by the low reported usage by faculty, resident, and staff users.

Use of the service split fairly evenly across the three schools the library serves, underscoring HI@H's effectiveness as a multi-disciplinary search tool. However, as only 4% of searches were to find information for patient care, this could indicate a weakness in HI@H's patient care-focused resources, or demonstrate that Himmelfarb's users did not perceive HI@H as a good source for this type of information. The majority of searches were for school work.

Spring 2015 Staff Focus Group

Objective - To assess how Himmelfarb Library staff members were using Health Information @ Himmelfarb (HI@H) and the Library Catalog and determine how satisfied they were with each for specific tasks and needs.

Method - A focus group with a set of predetermined questions was moderated by a reference librarian from the law library on campus to eliminate bias. The moderator met with the Discovery Task Force to consult on the list of questions in advance of the focus group.

Type of questions asked included:⁶

- Opening questions to get participants comfortable with sharing in the environment
- Introductory questions to introduce the topic and get the participants thinking about it
- Transition questions to the main focus of the session
- Key questions which were designed to meet the study objectives
- Ending questions to bring closure

All Himmelfarb staff who used HI@H and the Library Catalog in their jobs were invited to participate and a list of the questions was sent to them in advance. The focus group started with the leader introducing herself, explaining her role as moderator, and describing the purpose of the session. Ground rules were established at the outset to encourage all attendees to express their opinions freely. These included:

- There are no wrong answers, only differing points of view
- Please listen respectfully to others
- Everyone's opinion is valued

The 90 minute session was recorded. An assistant from the Discovery Task Force took detailed notes on an easel with tear off sheets that could be referred to during the focus group and another task force member took notes as the session progressed. Fifteen staff members participated in the focus group.

Focus group questions are included in Appendix A.

Results -

Health Information @ Himmelfarb

Most staff reported using Health Information @ Himmelfarb at least once a month, many weekly. Staff used it most often for searches when:

- They didn't know where to start with a query or needed background information
- They needed to generate citations, confirm a citation (known item search), or create permalinks for other workflows (acquisitions/ILL)

When conducting searches for users, reference staff reported using HI@H for searches for physician assistants and medical students, public health students, and global health faculty. They perceived that students liked the search interface and returned to it because searches were successful.

Staff liked the familiar EBSCOhost-type interface and appreciated the ability to build and embed widgets for searching HI@H in their LibGuides. Staff reported that catalog content was easy to find in HI@H; that known item searches were generally successful; and that full-text coverage was good.

A number of desired improvements to HI@H were mentioned. Reference staff wanted better coverage of certain subject areas like business and economics, and inclusion of content from the main library on campus and local academic consortium. More jacket art, particularly for e-books, was desired and

better searchability of full-text book content. Library staff wanted a more direct way to search on Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), the ability to apply multiple facets at once, and better format options for searching media.

Library Catalog

Most staff reported using the catalog daily, or at least weekly. Staff used the catalog for generating lists of resources, for assembling book displays, searching for prior editions before selecting titles from the approval plan, and searching for materials on reserve. They liked the RefWorks integration, the prevalence of jacket art, and the virtual shelf-browsing feature which displays jacket art of other items on the shelf near the retrieved item.

Staff perceived that students, faculty, and staff were using the catalog for quick reference and look-up of print books and journals. They believed the e-text and e-journal A-Z lists were preferred for searching for electronic resources.

Among desired improvements were an integrated citation generation tool, better ISBN and MeSH searching (Encore treats subject terms as keywords), improved format labeling for AV materials, alerts functionality, and single sign-on for patrons to access their library accounts.

Fall 2015 Discovery Survey

Objective - To assess awareness of Health Information @ Himmelfarb and the Library Catalog among faculty, staff, and students, how frequently each was used, what types of searches were done on each, what features were most valued, and the level of satisfaction with each service.

Method - A twenty five question survey was administered via SurveyMonkey over four weeks in October and November of 2015. The survey included multiple choice, rating scale, and dichotomous and open-ended questions. The survey link was shared via email to student and faculty listservs and a pop out tab on the library's home page prompted survey response. Paper bookmarks promoting the survey were distributed at the Circulation Desk to reach those who might not use the Library's web page. Survey participants were invited to enter a drawing for a \$20 Starbucks card as an incentive.

A complete list of questions and tabulated responses are included in Appendix B.

Results -

207 surveys were completed with the majority of respondents (65.8%) identifying themselves as graduate or clinical students. Among respondents, the next largest group were faculty (22%). 58% were from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 32% from the School of Public Health, and only 10% were from the School of Nursing which was surprising given their strong representation in the earlier demographic survey. 30% of respondents identified as being primarily off campus (distance education or another location).

63% of respondents reported using HI@H weekly or monthly. Only 34% reported using the Library Catalog as frequently, and 38% said they never used the catalog. Most who reported never using HI@H were unaware of the service (70%), while 40% reported the same about the catalog. 30% of those who did not use the catalog said they didn't need it, with another 19% saying they preferred to search this content in HI@H.

Satisfaction with HI@H search results was high. 72% reported usually finding useful content on the first page of results. Only 16% reported retrieving too much content that did not meet their needs. Most searches were exploratory, with 80% reporting using it for this purpose, but over half also reported using it for in-depth research (58%), and answering clinical questions (42%). This was somewhat contradictory with the demographic survey results where few reported using HI@H for patient care. There was little awareness of the default limiter for “Available In Library Collections,” or that it could be turned off to expand the results set. Users were satisfied with coverage of clinical, biomedical research, and public health content. What they most wanted to see improved was access to full-text content. Better integration with interlibrary loan options was also desired.

Those who used the Library Catalog were mostly searching for books and journals. Reserves and AV searching was much less frequent. 65% said they usually found what they were looking for in the catalog. Respondents did not report using the self-renewal or check your library accounts features of the catalog much. Few users accessed the catalog via mobile device (14%). If they did they were looking for a specific item or doing a quick, general search. About half said they would like to be able to renew items, check library accounts, or place holds with a mobile device. The most desired improvements were ease of use and access to full-text.

Response to Results

The Discovery Task Force focused on the following four findings to make improvements to Health Information @ Himmelfarb. These changes were introduced during the Fall 2016 semester.

Few users were turning to Health Information @ Himmelfarb for patient care needs, despite integration of clinical focused content like DynaMed Plus.

Newly available widget and placard apps for EDS were targeted for integration into HI@H to highlight clinical content.

- A DynaMed Plus placard displays above search results when search terms match on DynaMed Plus content. The placard has direct links to this content.
- A “Find more results in...” widget has buttons to continue the search in Himmelfarb’s clinical full-text sources. These include DynaMed Plus, Lexicomp, Epocrates, PubMed, AccessMedicine, and ClinicalKey. This widget displays at the top of the far right column of the results screen.
- A second widget was added to the right column in results display to highlight matches on Himmelfarb’s extensive Research Guides (LibGuides) collection. This content directs searchers to high quality selected resources and overviews of a topic.

<Insert Figure 1: Clinical Resource Widget and DynamedPlus Placard>

Most searchers were unaware of the Health Information @ Himmelfarb default limiter for Available in Library Collections.

The default was originally configured to increase relevance of retrieved content and limit to mostly content to which Himmelfarb's collection provided full-text access. However, it could eliminate useful content in subject areas where Himmelfarb's electronic subscriptions are limited.

To make users more aware of the default, the Task Force decided to re-configure the HI@H search box on the library home page to add radio button options for "Available in Library Collections" and "Catalog Only". The "Available in Library Collections" button remains checked on by default, but its prominent placement draws attention to the option to remove the default to broaden search results.

The Catalog Only button option enables searching on catalog collections only, simulating a search on the Library Catalog. The majority of users indicated they searched this content in HI@H instead of in the separate Encore Library Catalog interface.

<Insert Figure 2: HI@H Search Box with Radio Button Options>

Use of the library catalog was diminishing for many library users, but it was still an important resource for staff.

The Focus Group in particular highlighted staff preference for the Library Catalog for many collections management tasks. But user preference for a unified discovery layer that includes article-level content was clear from the fall survey results. Instead of investing in enhancements to the Library Catalog, the Task Force looked for ways to add catalog features to Health Information @ Himmelfarb.

Course reserves searching was an area that EBSCO was interested in developing for EDS. An EBSCO programmer worked with Himmelfarb to develop a placard that would pop up at the top of search results when a search term matched on a course reserves professor name, course name, or course reserve. The placard displays the course reserve title, call number, and barcode.

<Insert Figure 3: Course Reserve Placard>

Currently there is no way to fully integrate library account management features of the catalog in EDS. It is hoped that with release of item- and patron-level APIs for the Sierra integrated library system, that Himmelfarb can work in the future to integrate renewals, holds, and other user account management functions.

Access to full-text was the area users most wanted to see improved.

Maintaining fully functional linking to full-text assets retrieved in Health Information @ Himmelfarb has been the biggest challenge with the service. Himmelfarb uses the 360 Resource Manager and 360 Link products for electronic resources management (ERM) and link resolver functions. Smart linking, which provides a direct link to PDF or HTML full-text, is available for content subscribed directly from EBSCO. Records from other subscription/aggregator sources have “custom links” to determine what link button and URL is used to link to the full-text. Most full-text subscription content displays a Full-Text @ Himmelfarb button and relies on data from 360 Resources to supply a base URL to construct the link. Himmelfarb set up these custom links for the EBSCOhost platform in general, which means they apply to both HI@H and Himmelfarb’s other EBSCO databases. These custom links require frequent

maintenance to keep them in line with changes from content sources and back-end platform changes at EBSCO and ProQuest.

Find It @ Himmelfarb buttons are provided for sources that are not part of Himmelfarb subscribed collections. The Find It option provides a link to check full-text availability at the University library (i.e. non-health sciences library) and provides interlibrary loan options. A direct link from the Find It screen to Himmelfarb's Docs2Go, which automatically populates an ILL request form with bibliographic data from the retrieved item, was already available. One of the fall 2015 survey findings was that users wanted better integration with interlibrary loan. The Task Force looked at the configuration of the Find It button and request screens to see if improvements could be made and considered changing the button text from "Find It" to "Request It". After consulting with the administrative team, this idea was abandoned due to concerns that it might discourage some users from clicking through if they did not want to wait or pay for an item.

Ultimately, this was an area where the Task Force did not make any changes. Attention remains focused on testing full-text linking within the service to nip any issues in the bud as they arise. The Task Force is also working with the library's web team to improve design of the Full Text and Find It @ Himmelfarb buttons to make them more visible and readable.

Next Steps

The lack of appeal of Health Information @ Himmelfarb to clinical audiences was one of the key findings of the surveys. Users reported in the fall 2015 survey that coverage of clinical content was good. HI@H includes MEDLINE Complete, PubMed, CINAHL Plus with Full Text, and DynaMed Plus. To make clinical

content more visible, the DynaMed Plus placard was added to top of the results list when search terms match DynaMed Plus content. “Find more results in” buttons were added to the right column to allow searchers to execute their search directly in other clinical full-text resources, like Epocrates, LexiComp, and ClinicalKey. Use of the service for clinical applications and success of the widgets will be assessed in the future, possibly with another quick embedded survey.

The staff focus group revealed that the Library Catalog remained an important resource for collection management activities. Though staff had a number of suggested improvements for the catalog, low reported usage on the survey and declining usage statistics made the Task Force question whether these should be priority. For now, the dedicated catalog remains available but development is focused on HI@H. EBSCO was able to integrate course reserves searching in HI@H with some custom programming. The Library will work towards integrating other unique catalog features, like library accounts management, in HI@H.

What users most wanted to see improved was access to full-text content. Defaults in HI@H already limit most of the items retrieved to full-text content sources. Linking to this content can at times be problematic, particularly for the custom links designed to work with 360 Resources and 360 Link. The Task Force is making the custom link buttons more visible and will continue to closely monitor linking performance in HI@H to be as proactive as possible in resolving any issues that arise.

References

1. Boss, S. C., and Nelson, M.L.. "Federated Search Tools: The Next Step in the Quest for One-Stop Shopping." *The Reference Librarian* 44, no. 91-92 (2005):139-160.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J120v44n91_10
2. Vaughan, J. *Web Scale Discovery Services*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2011.
3. Hoepfner, A. "The Ins and Outs of Evaluating Web Scale Discovery Services." *Computers in Libraries* 32, no. 3 (2012): 6-10, 38-40.
4. Thompson, J.L., Obrig, K. S., and Abate, L.E.. 2013. "Web-Scale Discovery in an Academic Health Sciences Library: Development and Implementation of the EBSCO Discovery Service." *Medical Reference Services Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (2013): 26-41.
5. Fifarek, A. "The Birth of Catalog 2.0: Innovative Interfaces' Encore Discovery Platform." *Library Hi Tech News*, 24, no. 5 (2007): 13 - 15.
6. Pinkas, M. M., Del Baglivo, M., Kline, I.R., Brown, E., Harris, R., and Gerhart, B. "Selecting and Implementing a Discovery Tool: The University of Maryland Health Sciences and Human Services Library Experience." *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* 11, no. 1 (2014):1-12.
7. Hanneke, R. and O'Brien, K.K. "Comparison of Three Web-Scale Discovery Services for Health Sciences Research." *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 104, no. 2 (2016):109-117.
8. Krueger, R.A. *Developing Questions for Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Appendix A: Spring 2015 Library Staff Focus Group Questions

HI@H=Health Information @ Himmelfarb (EDS/ main search box on home page)

Library Catalog=Encore

- What's your favorite browser?
- What is your favorite search tool and why do you like it?
- How often do you search resources at Himmelfarb?
- When was the last time you used HI@H?
- When was the last time you used the catalog?
- What do you primarily use HI@H for?
 - What audience are you searching it for?
- What do you primarily use the catalog for?
 - What audience are you searching it for?
- What types of searches are most successful in HI@H?
- What functions do you find difficult in HI@H?
- How would you describe the relevancy ranking on HI@H? (Examples - hard to find relevant items or relevant items frequently toward top of retrieval)
- Is the content in HI@H too narrowly focused on a health sciences environment? Can you give an example?
- How successful is linking to full-text in HI@H? – Examples, e-book, e-journal, full-text, print holdings
- What do you use the catalog for that you can't do in HI@H and vice versa?
- Why don't you use HI@H or the catalog?
- How does HI@H and/or the catalog compare to similar systems at other libraries you've used?
- How would you change HI@H? What are one or two things you wish it did or did better?
- How would you change the catalog? What are one or two things you wish it did or did better?
- Is there anything you'd like to add?

Appendix B: Fall 2015 User Survey Questions and Responses

% of response reported first, followed by number of responses in ().

Q1. What is your current status at GW?

Undergraduate student: 1.5% (3)

Graduate student: 41.2% (82)

Clinical student (PA, NP, MD, PT): 24.6% (49)

Resident or house staff: 6.0% (12)

Faculty: 22.6% (45)

Staff: 4.0% (8)

Other (please specify): 9

answered question 199, skipped question 8

Q2. What is your school affiliation?

Milken Institute School of Public Health: 31.9% (65)

School of Medicine and Health Sciences: 58.3% (119)

School of Nursing: 9.8% (20)

Other (please specify): 4

answered question 204, skipped question 3

Q3. Where do you work or take the majority of your classes?

Foggy Bottom: 70.4% (138)

VA Sci Tech Campus (Ashburn): 2.0% (4)

Children's National: 7.7% (15)

Online: 19.9% (39)

Other (please specify): 10

answered question 196, skipped question 11

Q4. How frequently do you use Health Information @ Himmelfarb (the main search box on the Library's web page)

Daily: 14.5% (30)

Weekly: 38.6% (80)

Monthly: 24.2% (50)

Less frequently than monthly: 12.6% (26)

I never use Health Information @ Himmelfarb: 10.1% (21)

answered question 207, skipped question 0

Q5. What types of resources are you generally searching for when using Health Information @**Himmelfarb? Select as many as applicable:**

Scholarly journal articles: 95.9% (162)

Books or E-books: 51.5% (87)

Magazine articles: 5.9% (10)

News: 4.7% (8)

Government reports: 13.0% (22)

Theses and dissertations: 3.6% (6)

Gray literature (meeting posters, presentations, newsletter articles, etc.): 4.1% (7)

Other (please specify): 1.8% (3)

answered question 169, skipped question 38

Q6. What types of searches do you typically run in Health Information @ Himmelfarb? Select as many as applicable:

Exploratory searches (getting background information, general info):

83.0% (137)

Locating or getting more information about a known item/publication:

63.0% (104)

In depth research: 57.6% (95)

Clinical questions: 42.4% (70)

Other (please specify): 2

answered question 165, skipped question 42

Q7. Check all that apply about search results in Health Information @ Himmelfarb:

Useful content is usually on first page of results: 71.8% (117)

There is too much content that does not meet my needs: 16.0% (26)

I need to apply additional limits to get the content I want: 38.0% (62)

I rarely get useful results: 1.2% (2)

Other (please specify): 9

answered question 163, skipped question 44

Q8. Do you ever turn off the default "Available in Library Collection" limit in Health Information @ Himmelfarb?

Yes: 8.9% (15)

No: 32.1% (54)

I didn't know it was an option: 58.9% (99)

answered question 168, skipped question 39

Q9. Please rate the coverage in Health Information @ Himmelfarb for the following types of content (5 being excellent, 1 being poor, 0 not applicable/don't search for this topic):

Answer Options

5 (excellent)

4 (good)

3 (fair)

2 (neutral)

1 (poor)

0 (n/a)

Clinical/Patient care: 5(45), 4(69), 3(10), 2(6), 1(0), 0(35)

Biomedical research: 5(31), 4(66), 3(11), 2(4), 1(0), 0(50)

Public health: 5(43), 4(82), 3(10), 2(4), 1(0), 0(27)

Nursing: 5(22), 4(29), 3 (2), 2 (5), 1(0), 0(104)

Business & Economics: 5(7), 4(28), 3(7), 2(5), 1(1), 0(114)

Statistics: 5 (12), 4(45), 3(10), 2(7), 1(0), 0(90)

Social sciences: 5(18), 4(49), 3(13), 2(4), 1(0), 0(79)

Physical sciences: 5(11), 4(36), 3(9), 2(4), 1(0), 0(104)

News: 5(10), 4(27), 3(11), 2(6), 1(0), 0(108)

answered question 166, skipped question 41

Q10. Are there any other subject areas you feel are not well covered by Health Information @ Himmelfarb?

No or n/a responses (46)

Other (8): There appears to be no medical legal section; Strategic planning is not well covered; genetics; Physical therapy resources/publications; Military Health Care; I really miss FirstConsult or to have a similar database that is symptoms based- like Isabel; Older public health articles (> 10 years old) are often unavailable; More global health (PH info)

answered question 54, skipped question 153

Q11. How does Health Information @ Himmelfarb compare to similar systems you've used at other libraries?

A. Better than others: 28.3% (47)

B. About the same 37.3% (62)

C. Worse 6.0% (10)

Haven't used a similar system before: 28.3% (47)

If you answered A, B, or C, what similar system(s) have you used? 30

answered question 166, skipped question 41

Q12. How could Health Information @ Himmelfarb be improved (check all that apply)?

Ease of use: 38.2% (60)

Relevance of content retrieved: 33.8% (53)

Ability to get to full-text: 66.9% (105)

Ability to save/output information: 36.3% (57)

Other (please specify below): 8.9% (14)

Describe how else it could be improved: 23

answered question 157, skipped question 50

Q13. Why don't you use Health Information @ Himmelfarb?

I was not aware of its existence/don't know what it is: 70.0% (21)

I know what it is, but I don't choose to use it: 30.0% (9)

answered question 30, skipped question 177

Q14. Why do you choose not to use Health Information @ Himmelfarb? Select as many answers as applicable:

I prefer searching individual databases (PubMed, CINAHL, Scopus, etc.): 53.8% (14)

I prefer to search the Himmelfarb Library Catalog: 11.5% (3)

I prefer to access lists of journals/e-books: 15.4% (4)

I don't want to learn a new search tool: 7.7% (2)

The content does not meet my needs: 3.8% (1)

Other (please specify): 42.3% (11)

answered question 26, skipped question 181

Q15. How often do you search the Library Catalog?

Daily 5.4% (10)

Weekly 20.5% (38)

Monthly 14.1% (26)

Less frequently than monthly 23.2% (43)

I never use the Library Catalog 36.8% (68)

answered question 185, skipped question 22

Q16. Why don't you use the Library Catalog?

Prefer to search library materials in Health Information @ Himmelfarb: 19.1% (13)

Prefer to search library materials on other catalogs: 1.5% (1)

I don't need to search Library Catalog content: 30.9% (21)

I prefer to call or contact library for help: 4.4% (3)

I didn't know it existed: 39.7% (27)

Other (please specify below): 4.4% (3)

Describe other reason(s) for not using the Catalog: 7

answered question 68, skipped question 139

Q17. How does the Library Catalog compare to similar systems you've used at other libraries?

Better than others: 16.5% (19)

About the same: 54.8% (63)

Worse: 6.1% (7)

I haven't used similar systems: 22.6% (26)

answered question 115, skipped question 92

Q18. In the Library Catalog, do you ever:

Renew materials online

Yes: 37

No: 76

Check your User Account (materials checked out and due dates; fines owed)

Yes: 28

No: 84

Would you like to be able to place holds on materials online (not currently available)?

Yes: 71

No: 42

answered question 114, skipped question 93

Q19. What types of resources do you search for in the Library Catalog (check all that apply)?

Books (including e-books): 70.2% (73)

Journals (including e-journals): 84.6% (88)

Course Reserves: 14.4% (15)

Audiovisuals: 3.8% (4)

Databases: 27.9% (29)

Software: 3.8% (4)

Anatomic models: 6.7% (7)

Equipment (headphones, etc.): 3.8% (4)

Other (please specify): 2

answered question 104, skipped question 103

Q20. When searching the Library Catalog, do you find what you're looking for:

Most of the time: 65.1% (69)

Sometimes: 29.2% (31)

Not often: 5.7% (6)

answered question 106, skipped question 101

Q21. How could the Library Catalog be improved (check all that apply)?

Ease of use: 50.5% (46)

Relevance of content retrieved: 28.6% (26)

Ability to get to full-text: 54.9% (50)

Ability to save/output information: 28.6% (26)

Other (please specify below): 6.6% (6)

Describe how else the Catalog could be improved: 12

answered question 91, skipped question 116

Q22. Do you search the catalog or Health Information @ Himmelfarb on your mobile device?

Yes 10.0% (18)

No 86.1% (155)

Don't have or use a mobile device 3.9% (7)

answered question 180, skipped question 27

Q23. What types of searches do you do from your mobile device (check all that apply)?

Locate specific book or resource 87.5% (14)

Course Reserves 12.5% (2)

Quick search for general information/reference 56.3% (9)

In-depth topic/research 25.0% (4)

Other (please specify): 1

answered question 16, skipped question 191

Q24. Would you like to be able to do the following via mobile device (check as many as apply)?

Renew materials 49.7% (83)

See what you have checked out 49.1% (82)

Place holds 43.1% (72)

Locate an item in library stacks 50.9% (85)

Place an interlibrary loan request when the library doesn't own an item 41.9% (70)

None of the above 34.1% (57)

Other (please specify): 8

answered question 167, skipped question 40

Q25. Is there anything else you would like to share about Health Information @ Himmelfarb or the Library Catalog?

No or answer not relevant to the survey topic (40)

Other (8): Make the site address easy to remember; create an easy link at Childrens; I appreciate it's existence. It is not perfect but it is very helpful; I like that Health Information @ Himmelfarb links us to very useful sources and consolidates them into one list; Easier full text; it's a good resource but complicated; I like the convenience of the on line library and full text; It has been very helpful for me. Having more full text would be more useful to my research

answered question 48, skipped question 159