



[University of Michigan Library](#)

[Learning & Teaching](#)

# Final Report: Transfer Student/Commuter Student Library Needs Project & Student Engagement Programs Evaluation Project

Report Authors: Mary Rolfes (Research & Evaluation Assistant), Alex Deeke (Digital Learning Librarian), and Karen A. Reiman-Sendi (Project Librarian)

Date: August 2020

<b>University of Michigan Library</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Learning &amp; Teaching</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
Acknowledgments	3
Summary of Findings	3
Transfer & Commuter Students	3
Student Engagement Programs: Library Mini Grant Program Recipients & Library Engagement Fellows	4
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
Transfer & Commuter Student Needs Analysis	6
Literature review	6
Survey	6
Virtual Focus Group Interviews	7
Student Engagement Programs Evaluation	7
Literature review	7
Surveys	8
<b>Findings</b>	<b>9</b>

Transfer & Commuter Student Survey Summary	9
Demographic information	9
Library Usage	10
Factors for Choosing Primary Library	10
Important Library Services, Spaces, and Resources	10
Non-Library Users	11
Transfer & Commuter Student Focus Group Themes	11
Student Engagement Programs Participants	12
Mini Grant Survey Summary	12
Library Engagement Fellows Survey Summary	18
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>23</b>
Project Challenges	23
Project Limitations	23
Transfer & Commuter Students	23
Mini Grant & Engagement Fellows Programs	24
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
Transfer Student Experience	24
Mini Grant Program	24
Library Engagement Fellows Program	30
Future Research Suggestions	31
<b>Appendix A. Transfer Students' Library Needs Project Charter (March 2020)</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix B. Student Engagement Programs Assessment Project Charter (March 2020)</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix C. Literature Reviews</b>	<b>41</b>
Transfer & Commuter Students Annotated Bibliography	41
Student Engagement Programs Assessment: A Literature Review	54
<b>Appendix D. Survey Questions</b>	<b>62</b>
Transfer & Commuter Student Survey	62
Mini Grant Program Participant Survey	72
Library Engagement Fellows Survey	79
<b>Appendix E. Transfer &amp; Commuter Student Focus Group Protocol</b>	<b>87</b>
Goals of Assessment Project and of Focus Groups	87
Methodology and Participants	87
Focus Group Interview Script	87
<b>Appendix F. Email Invitation to Focus Groups</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Appendix G. Transfer Student Informed Consent Statement</b>	<b>91</b>

## Executive Summary

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge University of Michigan staff, students, and librarians, whose advice, guidance, and participation made this work possible. Thank you to Doreen Bradley, Amanda Peters, Stephen Griffes, Marivi Sifuentes, and Craig Smith for their important contributions to this project.

### Summary of Findings

#### Transfer & Commuter Students

- The Undergraduate Library is the most preferred library but there is a sizable number of students who prefer either the Graduate Library or the Art, Architecture, & Engineering Library.
- Individual working space and quiet study space are both the most important library space needs and biggest factors for selecting their preferred library. Comfortable furniture and private study rooms were also very important space needs.
- Library building hours, proximity to home, and proximity to classes are the biggest accessibility factors for selecting a preferred library.
- Outlets/charging stations, printers, and scanning/copying equipment are the most important library resource needs.
- Incoming transfer students need direct communication from the library to best learn about services, spaces, and resources due to a lack of prior social connections, and a shortened time frame on campus as compared to traditional first year students.
- Future library orientation workshops should be referred to as “tours” as transfer students identify better with the word “tour” for their needs.
- Library orientation resources and events for new transfer students should include commonly known information about each library such as nicknames, study areas, and floor plans.
- Non-library users do not visit or use a physical library due to a library’s distance from either their home or classes, and because their coursework does not require a library visit or help from library staff.

## Student Engagement Programs: Library Mini Grant Program Recipients & Library Engagement Fellows

- Due to a lack of representative data, including data from project supervisors and mentors, generalizations should be interpreted carefully.
- The project tested survey questions that can inform an assessment plan going forward, and serve as the basis for future program assessments.
- Mini grant survey respondents were mostly students pursuing doctoral degrees, which may have influenced the responses in skill development and practice areas. E.g., those areas that respondents felt did not impact their personal growth were communication skills, critical thinking, academic skills, and humanity (cultural awareness, community engagement). These may be areas that PhDs have previously achieved competence.
- While most mini grant survey respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with many library impact or learning value statements (such as “My use of library resources impacted my project positively”), a theme emerged: the Library “brand” is generally not well integrated with their learning experiences.
- Recipients appreciated the funding for interdisciplinary projects and for the impact on their creative practice, but the experience did not lead to library employment nor to exploring career goals. This perspective could be related to the number of PhDs that responded to the survey -- we are assuming that doctoral candidates have previously identified their career paths.
- Mini grant survey respondents were more likely to disagree or neither agree nor disagree with impact or value statements, as compared to Library Engagement Fellow survey respondents.
- Library Engagement Fellows who responded to the survey questions reported personal growth and skill development in all of the key areas included in the survey: communication skills, professional skills, critical thinking, academic skills, and their humanity. The program seems to be exceptionally structured to support this type of development.
- Library Engagement Fellows felt well-supported by their supervisors. Despite the low response rate to the survey, we might assume that there is an opportunity for improvement in the areas of: using library spaces, services, and resources (connecting students to our expertise or “brand”); connecting research methodologies to practical applications; exposure to new softwares, technologies and technology literacies, and equipment supported by the library; time management practices; intercultural competence in the workplace and in higher education; and opportunities to present or speak about their work.
- Library Engagement Fellows respondents strongly agreed that their participation in the program was meaningful, and motivating or clarifying, and that they would recommend participation in the program to their peers.

## Introduction

In October 2019, the assessment project team (Alex Deeke, Mary Rolfes, Marivi Sifuentes, and Karen Reiman-Sendi) began work on two separate but related assessment projects for Learning & Teaching (L&T), as a result of a successful Library Student Engagement project proposal. Our projects were identified to fill knowledge gaps of interest to Learning Programs & Initiatives (LPI) outreach staff, and to provide actionable data to stakeholders. With feedback and suggestions from the stakeholders, the assessment project team wanted to:

- Expand our knowledge about transfer student library needs for the purpose of library programming and future facility improvement initiatives
- Evaluate the impact and outcomes of two student engagement programs, specifically the [Library Student Mini Grants](#) and the [Library Engagement Fellows](#) programs, while piloting assessment methodologies for future program evaluations

The task plan for these projects spanned many months, and was created to maximize engagement with target populations, e.g. surveying transfer students immediately after their first semester on campus, or launching Mini Grant and Engagement Fellows surveys as students were finishing their projects or work experiences during the winter semester.

Our work on the transfer student assessment included a literature review, a campus environmental scan, and a survey, completed between October 2019 and January 2020. The focus group interview protocol was developed in March and April 2020; two focus groups were held in April 2020.

The effort to assess the two student engagement programs included an updated literature review and two surveys, developed between January and March 2020, and administered in April 2020. Data analysis, blog post preparation, and report writing were the project foci from April to June 2020.

## Methodology

Both the Transfer and Commuter Needs Analysis assessment and the Student Engagement Programs Evaluation assessment followed a similar research structure. Each project began with a literature review, and an environmental scan to set practical context. From this preliminary research, we pulled out trends and inquiries which we aimed to address through surveys. Next, we planned to follow up on survey data by holding focus groups and/or exit interviews with volunteers from each program, and in the case of the two student engagement programs, with project supervisors or mentors. Finally, we synthesized the quantitative and qualitative data from the survey and the interviews, respectively, into a detailed data analysis and report.

## Transfer & Commuter Student Needs Analysis

### Literature review

The Transfer and Commuter Student Needs Analysis literature review began with searching *Education Abstracts*, *Web of Science*, the web site of the National Institute for the Study of Transfer Students, *Library Literature & Information Science Index*, and *Library & Information Science Abstracts* for “transfer students,” “transfer students” AND “library” together, “transfer student information literacy,” “university library renovation,” and “university library student needs.” Our literature review produced two primary impact areas of focus for our research on transfer and commuter students: physical library spaces and library programs, services, and tools. Our literature review of physical library spaces focused on assessment methodology and framed our research questions, surveys, focus groups, and overall research methodology.

The literature review on library programs, services, and tools led to a number of key findings. First, it is important to understand the diversity of institutions that transfer students come from, and to identify targeted approaches by subgroups that lead to more effective solutions. Second, targeted outreach and services such as personalized emails and dedicated library websites for transfer students are an effective way to reach these students. Third, matching library programs, services, and tools to overall transfer students academic **and** social needs are important.

These findings focused our research to discover which services, resources, and tools are important to transfer and commuter students, and in identifying subgroup commonalities or identities such as previous academic institutions, student classifications, and living proximity to preferred U-M library locations. (Full literature review is found in [Appendix C.](#))

### Survey

To obtain an overview of transfer student experience with the library, we utilized an online survey created and distributed through Qualtrics software. The survey contained 17 questions which asked about transfer students’ experiences during their first semester at Michigan. This survey included: three demographic questions (including on-campus or commuter status); five questions about primary library use; four questions about general/all library use; four questions about the importance of 13 library resources, spaces, and services; one question about awareness of six library resources for transfer students; and one prompt for any additional feedback, ideas, and/or suggestions.

For students who indicated early in the survey that they never use the University of Michigan Library system, the survey contained thirteen questions. This included: three demographic questions; one question about frequency of library use (to which they responded “Never”); three questions about which factors contributed to their “Never” response; four questions about which factors could increase their library use; one question about awareness of six library

resources for transfer students; and one prompt for any additional feedback, ideas, and/or suggestions.

Survey invitations were sent via email in January 2020 to 1,156 students who transferred to the University of Michigan for enrollment for the Fall 2019 semester; the survey remained open for 11 days. As an incentive for completing the survey, students were invited to enter a drawing for one of two prizes at the campus Computer Showcase. Additionally, students were given the opportunity to indicate if they would be interested in further research participation.

### Virtual Focus Group Interviews

Based upon our initial analysis of responses to the transfer student library survey, we formatted a focus group protocol to further assess transfer student experience with the library. Focus group prompts were written to obtain in-depth, qualitative data as an expansion to the quantitative data we obtained through the survey. This protocol was meant to take approximately one hour with small groups. (Protocol can be found in [Appendix E](#).)

Originally, four focus group sessions of 4-7 students were scheduled throughout March 2020. Two groups consisted of general transfer students, one group consisted of commuter students, and one group of students that used the Art, Architecture and Engineering library as their primary library. However, due to changes in university and library policies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were unable to move forward with these in-person focus groups.

Subsequently, we adjusted the focus group protocol for an online format, and asked students who had been interested in our in-person focus groups if they would be interested in participating in a virtual group interview during mid-April, using BlueJeans video conferencing software. Two transfer students participated in a virtual group interview, and one commuter transfer student participated in a virtual individual interview. Students were compensated with a gift card for participating.

## Student Engagement Programs Evaluation

### Literature review

For the Student Engagement Programs Evaluation portion of our assessment work (Mini Grants and Engagement Fellows), we used a literature review conducted in 2019 as a basis to update our knowledge. We supplemented the existing citations with a search of *Education Abstracts* and *Web of Science* for “student engagement,” as well as “engagement” AND “library.” Our literature review produced several key ideas that motivated our research questions.

First, the literature established that engagement in endeavors outside of the classroom (“student engagement”) provides tangible and intangible benefits to college students, and that they are specific to extracurricular student engagement (i.e., cannot be gained to their fullest extent or at all through traditional classroom activity). Second, there are a range of potential and

desirable impacts of student engagement, including but not limited to professional competence, academic improvement, and humanitarianism. Third, student engagement benefits different populations in different ways, and to different extents (e.g., fields of study, gender, race). Finally, the literature review demonstrated that the library can and should play a unique role in providing student engagement opportunities, and in helping students achieve the positive outcomes of their engagement. Additionally, the literature included a look at two previous examples of library student engagement experiences, which had different levels of success in achieving desired outcomes of engagement. (The full literature review can be referred to in [Appendix C](#)).

Our review also incorporated a brief environmental scan, which looked at similar initiatives in other departments at the University of Michigan and at other peer institutions. Overall, the key ideas we discovered through this review motivated the types of questions we would ask in our research. In general, we targeted the following questions:

- (1) What types of students are participating in the Mini Grant and Engagement Fellows programs, and what types of projects are they pursuing?
- (2) Are students experiencing the desired impacts and outcomes of student engagement through participation in these programs?
- (3) How is the University of Michigan Library and its resources (e.g. spaces, staff, etc.) contributing to student engagement through these programs?

## Surveys

Because we knew that the Mini Grant program and the Engagement Fellows program were two distinct programs that LPI hosted and sponsored, we distributed two surveys via Qualtrics software, one to each program group.

The Mini Grant Experience survey contained 12 questions which asked current and/or former Mini Grant recipients to reflect on the impact and outcomes of their experience. These included: three demographic questions (e.g., degree pursued during award period); two questions about prior and/or subsequent employment with the University of Michigan Library (with prompts to elaborate, if applicable); two questions about growth across five general skill areas; four questions about project experience and connection to the library; and one prompt for any additional information participants would like to share. Survey invitations were sent in early April 2020 to the 57 Mini Grant recipients from the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 cohorts. Participants were entered into a drawing for three library-themed prizes for completing the survey and entering their email. Additionally, respondents were given the opportunity to indicate if they would be interested in further research participation. (The full survey can be viewed in [Appendix D](#).)

The Library Engagement Fellows survey was distributed to participants in this program from 2018 to 2020. The goal of this 12-question survey was to learn more about program impact on student skill development and their awareness of library services, programs, and resources. The questions included: three demographic questions (e.g., degree pursued during award period); two questions about prior and/or subsequent employment with the University of Michigan



Library (with prompts to elaborate, if applicable); two questions about growth across five general skill areas; four questions about project experience and connection to the library; and one prompt for any additional information participants would like to share. Survey invitations were sent in April 2020 to 18 program participants. Respondents were invited to enter a drawing for a pair of Skullcandy headphones. (These survey questions are also available in [Appendix D.](#))

## Findings

### Transfer & Commuter Student Survey Summary

Because our original impetus was to learn about transfer and commuter students' needs in relation to the Shapiro 3rd floor renovation project, we asked students a series of questions relating to their library usage, factors that influence their choice of library to use, and opinions on types of services, resources, and spaces offered in a library. We also asked questions specific to a number of library events and resources created and marketed towards new transfer students to measure usage and elicit any feedback from students.

Below we have selected findings that we believe are unique or important to transfer students. Most of the selected findings highlight factors or choices that were rated as "very important" by a majority of respondents. (For tables that represent all survey answers, see [Appendix I.](#))

#### Demographic information

Out of 1,156 invitations, we received 235 completed responses to the transfer student library survey, representing about 20% of the Fall 2019 transfer student population. At the time of the survey, a majority of the respondents would be classified as either second year students (36%) or third year students (42%) based on their expected graduation date. The portion of community college or technical college transfer respondents (37%) in the sample is slightly higher than the University of Michigan average. Commuter students are classified as those who live outside of Ann Arbor and need to drive or use public transportation to commute to campus (14%, n=34).

Respondents were classified as either library users or non-library users depending on how often they physically visited any U-M Library. Non-library users (6%, n=13) were asked a series of questions related to reasons why they did not use the library while library users (94%, n=222) were asked questions related to their experience using the library.

The demographic information from our survey may be limited in its usefulness as it does not include the number of institutions students had previously attended, nor does it account for international students who first transferred to another U.S. university or college before transferring to the University of Michigan.

## Library Usage

The most popular library for transfer students is the Undergraduate Library (54.3%), followed by the Hatcher Graduate Library (22.6%) and the Art, Architecture & Engineering Library (20.8%). Monday through Thursday were the most popular days to visit with each day being roughly equally visited (18% or 17%), and Saturday the least visited day (8%). The majority of students visited their primary library either in the afternoon (43%) or in the evening (41%).

The most popular reasons respondents visited their primary library was for individual study (37%), to work on course work with other students (20%), and to use computers, printers, and technology (17%). There was little variation between the reasons students would use their primary library compared to reasons why students would use *any* U-M Library.

## Factors for Choosing Primary Library

A majority of students found hours of service (57%), proximity to their home (55%), and proximity to their classes (61%) as very important accessibility factors in choosing a library, while a majority of students ranked proximity to their job (60%) and the parked car (68%) as either not important or not applicable. However, 34 respondents did rate a library's location relative to where they park their car as very important which corresponds with the number of commuter students identified in the demographics section but this data has not been cross-referenced.

The only environmental factor rated as very important by a majority of students was an atmosphere that allows for dedicated individual or quiet study (76%).

No service factor was reported as very important by a majority of students. Combining very important responses with moderately important responses did produce majorities for library tools and software (77%) and library staff help (61%) as services students consider when choosing a library.

## Important Library Services, Spaces, and Resources

A majority of students found online services (74%), physical library collections (55%) and library staff help (54%) as either moderately or very important library services but no service had a majority of very important responses.

In terms of resources, a majority of students rated outlets/charging stations (81%), printers (72%), and scanning/copying equipment (52%) as very important.

A majority of students rated individual working areas (81%), quiet areas (78%), comfortable furniture (68%), and private study rooms (61%) as very important in terms of library space.

## Non-Library Users

Transfer students that do not use a physical library (6%, n=13) answered similar questions to self-identified library users to determine which factors affect their non-usage. The small number of non-library users should be considered when in the following findings and may not be representative of all transfer students that are non-library users.

A majority of non-library users agreed with the accessibility factor statements that either a library was not close to their home (69%) and/or not close to their classes (50%). In terms of library resource factors, a majority of non-users agreed with statements that their coursework did not require a library visit (77%) and/or that library staff help was not necessary to complete their course work (62%). None of the library space factors received a majority of agreement statements.

In terms of library services, spaces, and resources that would increase their use of the library, non-library user responses primarily echoed responses given by library users.

## Transfer & Commuter Student Focus Group Themes

These focus groups included three participants that transferred from the University of Michigan-Flint, Michigan State University, and a public university in the state of California. The first focus group consisted of two general transfer students, and the second focus group had one transfer student who was also a commuter student.

A number of important themes emerged from the focus group conversations. First, the transfer student orientation experience lacks in quality and quantity compared to traditional first year orientation which influences transfer students' understanding of the library. For example, one participant described their orientation experience as "terrible," and others described it as "being brushed over compared to the usual first year orientation."

Second, transfer students rely on information provided to them by the library as they lack the appropriate social and personal networks that traditional students rely on to learn about library resources, spaces, and services.

Third, library orientation information (for example, the [Library Services for Transfer Students research guide](#) and welcome workshops) should be emailed to incoming transfer students during the first few weeks of the semester. Participants that attend some library events for transfer students indicated that they learned about them via emails.

Fourth, transfer students identify more with the term "tour" than "workshop" when looking for helpful orientation events at the library.

Fifth, the physical library is mainly used, perceived, and preferred as a study and group work area, especially due to the comfortable seating, charging stations, and studious atmosphere.

Finally, the focus group participants provided the following feedback on the research guide [Library Services for Transfer Students](#):

- Provide a way to directly search the library catalog from the guide and provide instructions on how to use advance search and filters, especially filtering by online materials
- Include commonly known information about each library such as nicknames, types of study areas/floors, and floor plans
- Add information specifically from the “Essential Library Information” box in the [Library Guide for International Students research guide](#), with a focus on library maps, study areas, and glossary.
- Emphasize Ask a Librarian service information by moving it higher on the “Research 101” page
- “Research 101,” “Finding Books,” “Computers & Printing,” and “Get Help” are viewed as the most important pages within this guide.

## Student Engagement Programs Participants

As mentioned above, we sent two surveys: one was aimed at Mini Grant program participants and one was distributed to Library Engagement Fellows.

- 57 Mini Grant program participants received a survey invitation (28 from 2019-2020 cohort and 29 from 2018-2019 cohort); 21 individuals completed the survey, the majority (16 or 80%) were from the 2019-2020 cohort
- 18 Library Engagement Fellows received survey invitations; 6 students responded, the majority (4 or 66%) from the 2018-2019 cohort

## Mini Grant Survey Summary

Survey respondents that participated in the Mini Grant program represented undergraduate, graduate and PhD ranks. No undergraduates from the 2018-2019 cohort responded to the survey. Respondents were overwhelmingly doctoral students (48%).

	# of Respondents
<b>Bachelor’s degree (BA, BS, BSE, BBA, etc.)</b>	4 (19%)
<b>Master’s degree (MA, MS, MSW, MPH, etc.)</b>	7 (33%)
<b>Doctoral degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.)</b>	10 (48%)

<b>Other (please explain):</b>	0
<b>Unsure/don't know</b>	0
<b>Total</b>	21

Only one respondent was employed by the Library before, during or after their mini grant award period.

Overall, Mini Grant participants found value in the interactions they had with the Library, and the support the Library provided.

In response to the question, "Do you believe that your experience with a Mini Grant project helped you grow in any of the following skill areas?," the majority of the five skill areas we identified in our research were represented in recipients' engagement experience.

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Communication skills (e.g. written communication, communicating with co-workers)</b>	20 (95%)	1 (5%)	21
<b>Professional skills (e.g. ability to work in an office, meeting deadlines, teamwork ability)</b>	19 (100%)	0	19
<b>Critical thinking (e.g. problem solving, analytical thinking, evaluating outcomes)</b>	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	19
<b>Academic skills (e.g. researching, analytical reading, applying theory to practice)</b>	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	19
<b>Humanitarianism (e.g. cultural awareness, community engagement)</b>	19 (90%)	2 (10%)	21

Some respondents who answered "no" to this question elaborated:

*I do not think these areas were within the scope of such a small project.*

*My role in the project didn't put me in a role to do technical research. Others on my team handled the research while I oversaw logistics.*

*I just don't think this experience really aided my development with those skills. My project is diversity centered, but didn't involve community engagement really and I don't think the experience with the grant uniquely impacted my critical thinking skills.*

Four respondents shared their perspectives on the question, "Are there other skill areas not mentioned above that you would like to mention as part of your Library Mini Grant experience?":

*Presentation skills*

*This mini-grant helped us as a team to be supportive of each other's work and overcome some barriers to productivity*

*Working in partnerships with U-M Librarians - knowing more about the resources that the library offers*

*Further my copyright knowledge*

In the survey we then presented a series of statements aimed to understand how strongly respondents agreed with the presence of certain experiences or elements in their mini grant work and their reflection on the Library's impact or value on their learning. All but one respondent strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that use of library spaces and use of library resources positively impacted their projects. Two respondents reported that they neither agreed or disagreed that their mentor impacted their project positively; all others strongly agreed or somewhat agreed. All respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that their mentor provided appropriate support for the project.

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>My use of library spaces impacted my project positively.</b>	9 (47%)	7 (36%)	2 (11%)	0	1 (5%)	19
<b>My use of library resources impacted my project positively.</b>	14 (67%)	6 (28%)	1 (5%)	0	0	21

<b>My library mentor impacted my project positively.</b>	16 (76%)	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	0	0	21
<b>My library mentor provided me with appropriate support to complete my project to my satisfaction.</b>	15 (71%)	6 (29%)	0	0	0	21

The next set of statements attempted to gather information to understand the experiential or practical components of their mini grant program experience. Most respondents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the program participation allowed them to practice key skills, such as effective interpersonal communication. One respondent somewhat disagreed that the experience allowed for public presentation practice.

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>I practiced my public presentation skills.</b>	9 (56%)	4 (25%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	0	16
<b>I practiced professionalism.</b>	15 (71%)	6 (29%)	0	0	0	21
<b>I practiced effective interpersonal communication.</b>	13 (65%)	7 (35%)	0	0	0	20
<b>I practiced effective problem solving.</b>	12 (57%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)	0	0	21

<b>I practiced effective teamwork.</b>	12 (75%)	4 (15%)	2 (10%)	0	0	18
<b>I practiced intercultural competence.</b>	15 (67%)	3 (22%)	2 (11%)	0	0	20

The final group of survey statements attempted to understand the impact of their mini grant experience on their learning and growth. A wider range of agreement/disagreement became apparent in one statement, specifically, “I enhanced my library research skills.”

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>I became more aware of library resources.</b>	18 (86%)	3 (14%)	0	0	0	21
<b>I enhanced my library research skills.</b>	13 (62%)	5 (24%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	0	21
<b>I have more confidence in using library resources, services, and spaces.</b>	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	0	0	0	20
<b>I have more confidence in contacting and/or working with Library staff.</b>	17 (81%)	4 (19%)	0	0	0	21

The next set of three statements on our survey aimed to gauge the overall value of the program to an individual. The statement “Participating in the Library Mini Grant program motivated me to explore or clarify my career goals” surfaced six responses of “neither agree or disagree.”



	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Participating in the Library Mini Grant program was a meaningful part of my educational experience.</b>	19 (90%)	2 (10%)	0	0	0	21
<b>Participating in the Library Mini Grant program motivated me to explore or clarify my career goals.</b>	14 (70%)	0	6 (30%)	0	0	20
<b>If asked, I would recommend participation in the Library Mini Grant program to my peers.</b>	20 (95%)	1 (5%)	0	0	0	21

Four respondents provided general comments about their program experience, all of which were very positive, and indicating another possible element for future assessment, specifically *confidence building*:

*It was a really amazing experience to have a mentor in the library to conduct my research project and to receive support with tons of resources.*

*Amazing and beneficial experience! Made a huge impact on my research and creative practice! Thank you for providing this opportunity for students.*

*I love this program! It was huge confidence boost for me to see the Library investing in my work.*

*I think the Library Mini Grant program is an exceptional opportunity! It gave me the opportunity to work on this project I had been thinking about for a while, and the resources*

*of the library gave me more practice and confidence in my research skills. I also really appreciate that the projects the programs funds are multi- and interdisciplinary.*

## Library Engagement Fellows Survey Summary

All but one Library Engagement Fellows survey respondents were master's students at the time of their program experience. Only one respondent had been employed by the Library prior to their program participation.

Respondents learned about the program through a few channels, but encouragement from a trusted individual may be an important path (e.g. faculty, friend).

<b>Library website (www.lib.umich.edu)</b>	2
<b>Encouraged to apply by my academic department, faculty, staff, instructor, etc.</b>	2
<b>Referred by a friend</b>	1
<b>Other: career fair</b>	1
<b>Campus student employment website</b>	0
<b>Became aware while utilizing library services, resources, programs, etc.</b>	0
<b>Unsure/don't know</b>	0

Overall, Library Engagement Fellows who responded to the survey questions reported personal growth and skill development in key areas included in the survey; all respondents felt the program helped them grow in communication skills, professional skills, critical thinking, academic skills, and their humanity. One respondent shared that learning Qualtrics to create a survey was an important area of personal growth.

Generally respondents felt their learning was positively impacted by participating in this Library-sponsored program. Five respondents recorded feeling neutral (neither agree nor disagree) to the following statements ("Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements about your learning").

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>I understood how to effectively use library spaces.</b>	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	0	0	0
<b>I became aware of how a Library operates.</b>	4 (66%)	1 (17%)	1(17%)	0	0	0
<b>I learned how to effectively use library resources (media, databases, websites, online journals, etc.).</b>	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0	0	0	0
<b>I learned how to employ appropriate research methodologies.</b>	4 (66%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0
<b>I learned how to use new software, technology, and/or equipment.</b>	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0

Respondents also overwhelmingly felt that their library supervisors supported their work.

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>My supervisor/mentor provided an appropriate level of job training.</b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0
<b>My supervisor/mentor communicated with me regularly about my role, duties, project work, deadlines, etc.</b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0
<b>My supervisor/mentor provided me with appropriate regular support to successfully complete my Library Engagement Fellow project.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>My supervisor/mentor connected me to other Library staff that had an interest or a role in my work/project.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0

<b>My supervisor/mentor helped me incorporate diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility values into my work.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
--	----------	---	---	---	---	---

One survey question attempted to understand the experiential or practical parts of their Fellows appointments, by asking about specific elements of their work experience.

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>
<b>I practiced public presentation skills.</b>	4 (67%)	0	2 (33%)	0	0	0
<b>I practiced professionalism.</b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0
<b>I practiced effective interpersonal communication.</b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0
<b>I practiced written communication.</b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0
<b>I practiced effective problem solving.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>I practiced effective teamwork.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0

<b>I practiced time management.</b>	5 (83%)	0	1 (17%)	0	0	0
<b>I practiced intercultural competence.</b>	4 (66%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0	0	0
<b>I practiced my computer or technology skills and literacy (e.g. G suite, Microsoft Office, Qualtrics, OCLC, etc.)</b>	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	0	0	0	0
<b>I practiced project management.</b>	6 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0

Every respondent indicated that they strongly agreed that their participation in this program provided useful skills for future employment, was a meaningful part of their educational experience, provided motivation to explore career aspirations, and allowed them to develop relationships with their supervisors or mentors. Each respondent would recommend the program to their peers.

Additional comments from respondents about their employment experience included the following:

*[name omitted], my supervisor, did a great job in terms of mentorship. I learned a lot from my LEF experience which I believe helped me with my transition into industry. I hope to see this program continue in the future!*

*My experience with the Library Engagement Fellows program was extremely positive! I learned a lot and got to run projects that I was passionate about!*

*I'm now looking for full-time employment in libraries and library-affiliated roles.*

## Discussion

### Project Challenges

One challenge we experienced was the reduction of available research assistant staff (2 employees to 1) in December 2019. The project plan and associated tasks were revisited and revised to account for less personnel.

Like all operations on campus, the Library was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting closures and stay-at-home orders in March 2020. The populations we aimed to involve with our research efforts left campus, and as a result communication with the Mini Grant program participants and Library Engagement Fellows became more challenging, as students focused on moving home and completing their coursework in potentially unfamiliar online environments. We recognized that societal, organizational, and personal priorities shifted, making our assessment work less compelling. Again, project plans were revised to get some type of data for the two student engagement programs, while leaving enough time to analyze the data we had collected previously.

And the final challenge we experienced was an unexpected but firm budgetary deadline related to student employment. Student employees had to submit their final hours worked for payroll by May 4, 2020, meaning that our plan to work through May as a group to finish data analysis and writing was critically impacted.

### Project Limitations

#### Transfer & Commuter Students

One major limitation is that we did not compare data collected from transfer students to equivalent data from any other population source. This limits our ability to contextualize the transfer student library experience in relation to the general campus population. Additionally, the relatively low number of focus group participants, and survey respondents classified as non-users, limits our ability to use their responses in our analysis more than anecdotally.

It is also worth noting that we did not allow survey respondents to identify the number of schools they previously attended. Although generally a low percentage of transfer students, this study does not take into account how the number of institutions attended affects library usage. Additionally, the survey does not distinguish between international students that transferred directly from an international institution to those that transferred first from an international institution and then to a domestic institution and then to the University of Michigan.

## Mini Grant & Engagement Fellows Programs

The focus group discussions with a small number of Mini Grant recipients (4) limited our ability to further understand the survey data we received. We received six responses to the Library Engagement Fellows survey, and were unable to conduct focus groups with members of that group, which negatively impacted our ability to clarify or elaborate on the survey responses we received. Additionally, we originally thought to survey or interview the supervisors or project mentors of the last two Library Engagement Fellows cohorts, to better understand the experiences of all involved, but due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, we abandoned that piece of the assessment project. The limitations on data collected impacted our ability to make statistically sound recommendations for these two programs.

## Conclusion

### Transfer Student Experience

Future facility initiatives should prioritize maintaining or increasing individual and quiet working space to improve the library experience for transfer students. Comfortable furniture, outlets/charging stations, printers, and scanning equipment are also important to meeting transfer student needs. The Undergraduate Library should be the focal point of any updates to improve the transfer student experience. However, since most transfer students prioritize proximity to their home and classes when selecting a primary library, any updates or services for transfer students should include the Art, Architecture, & Engineering Library for north campus students.

The transfer student experience is heavily influenced by the poor quality of their orientation experience as well as their lack of social networks and limited time on campus compared to traditional first year students. Orientation resources should be emailed directly to students at the beginning of the semester and should include local information such as library nicknames, study areas, and library locations on campus maps. Orientation workshops should be referred to as “library tours.”

### Mini Grant Program

We learned that Library employment is no indicator of program participation, and that program participation is likely no predictor of a recruitment path to librarianship. The possible variety of projects in this program may feel hit or miss in terms of specific skill development or a defined role and connection to the Library staff as well as to the Library “brand” (e.g. library research skills, library outreach, etc.).



The number of PhD candidates that responded to the survey caused us to look more in depth at some responses. Their responses indicated that the program experiences were somewhat less positively viewed as compared to those who were pursuing other degree programs.

		Total	Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) Responses
<b>My use of library spaces impacted my project positively.</b>			
	Strongly agree	9	4
	Somewhat agree	7	3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	1
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	1	0
<b>My use of library resources impacted my project positively.</b>			
	Strongly agree	14	5
	Somewhat agree	6	4
	Neither agree nor disagree	1	1
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>My library mentor impacted my project positively.</b>			
	Strongly agree	16	6
	Somewhat agree	3	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	2
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0

<b>My library mentor provided me with appropriate support to complete my project to my satisfaction.</b>			
	Strongly agree	15	6
	Somewhat agree	6	4
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0

		Total	Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) Responses
<b>I practiced my public presentation skills.</b>	Strongly agree	9	3
	Somewhat agree	4	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	2
	Somewhat disagree	1	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I practiced professionalism.</b>	Strongly agree	15	7
	Somewhat agree	6	3
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I practiced effective interpersonal communication.</b>	Strongly agree	13	5

	Somewhat agree	7	4
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I practiced effective problem solving.</b>	Strongly agree	12	6
	Somewhat agree	7	3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	1
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I practiced intercultural competence.</b>	Strongly agree	15	7
	Somewhat agree	3	3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I practiced effective teamwork.</b>	Strongly agree	12	7
	Somewhat agree	4	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0

		Total	Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) Responses
<b>I became more aware of library resources.</b>	Strongly agree	18	8
	Somewhat agree	3	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I enhanced my library research skills.</b>	Strongly agree	13	5
	Somewhat agree	5	3
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	1
	Somewhat disagree	1	1
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I have more confidence in using library resources, services, and spaces.</b>	Strongly agree	15	7
	Somewhat agree	5	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>I have more confidence in contacting and/or working with Library staff.</b>	Strongly agree	17	8
	Somewhat agree	4	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0

	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0

		Total	Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) Responses
<b>Participating in the Library Mini Grant program was a meaningful part of my educational experience.</b>	Strongly agree	19	8
	Somewhat agree	2	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>Participating in the Library Mini Grant program motivated me to explore or clarify my career goals.</b>	Strongly agree	14	7
	Somewhat agree	0	0
	Neither agree nor disagree	6	3
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
<b>If asked, I would recommend participation in the Library Mini Grant program to my peers.</b>	Strongly agree	20	9
	Somewhat agree	1	1
	Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
	Somewhat disagree	0	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0

We think we can safely assume that students appreciate the money from the Library to pursue their interests, projects, and leadership opportunities. Because of the high number of PhD students in the program, it may be worth learning more about what challenges these types of students have related to grant applications and the relationship between discipline-specific or departmental grants and the Library's role in funding. It may also be worthwhile to review the program goals in terms of supporting BA and MA students' funding and project experiences, as these student populations may be a better avenue for connecting to the Library "brand" and maximizing the value the Library can bring to experiential learning. Across all degrees, the goal of exploring a career path by participating in this program may not be realized.

## Library Engagement Fellows Program

Like the Mini Grant program, we think Library employment is no indicator of program participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program, as well as program participation is no predictor of a recruitment path to librarianship. Despite the low response rate to the survey, we might assume that there is an opportunity for improvement in the areas of:

- using library spaces, services, and resources (connecting students to our expertise or "brand")
- connecting research methodologies to practical applications in libraries, in higher education, etc.
- exposure to new softwares, technologies and tech literacies, and equipment supported by the library
- time management practices
- intercultural competence in the workplace and in higher education
- and, opportunities to present or speak about their work

Program participants felt well-supported by their supervisors/project mentors. Communicating that value or theme back to project supervisors may be effective in continuing a positive outcome for students.

Generally, Library Engagement Fellows were positioned to practice several professional skills. All respondents strongly agreed that creative problem solving, teamwork and project management were practiced during their appointments. Where there might be areas to improve, we suggest future projects that emphasize presentation, group interaction to observe and to practice professionalism and interpersonal communication, and exposure to business and library technologies. For example, this year many students missed the opportunity to talk about their projects in a public speaking situation (due to the COVID-19 pandemic). Providing other opportunities for Fellows to present their work and mid-project reflections may be an effective practice (e.g. short presentations at departmental meetings, guest presentations at Public Services Communication Forum meetings, more frequent blog posts, etc.).

Unlike the Mini Grant program respondents, the Library Engagement Fellows respondents strongly agreed that their participation in the program was meaningful, and motivating or clarifying, and that they would recommend participation in the program to their peers. Because five of the six respondents were M.A. degree students, we might assume that our practical learning experiences appeal to those whose degree programs are related to libraries or archives. Library Engagement Fellows' projects may more easily support the learning objectives we found articulated in the literature review, such as professional competence and academic improvement.

## Future Research Suggestions

A detailed analysis of the transfer and commuter student survey results would be helpful in better understanding the library experience of particular sub-populations. This would be particularly helpful in understanding how the commuter experience varies from the general transfer student experience. A coded analysis of qualitative answers from open-ended survey responses would also be beneficial.

Planning for either individual interviews or small focus groups consisting of Mini Grant and Engagement Fellows supervisors or mentors would allow for a better understanding of the experiences for all participants, and potentially clarify characteristics of successful projects for students and for supervisors, which could serve as one method to support program participants.

The foundational survey structure now exists for future assessments with Mini Grant and Engagement Fellow programs, and may identify articulated learning outcomes that can be used for future evaluations. Each cohort experience could be evaluated, to respond to changing demographics and library initiatives, as well as to develop a longitudinal perspective of the programs over time.

## Appendix A. Transfer Students' Library Needs Project Charter (March 2020)

<p><b>Project Sponsor</b> <i>Who initiated this project?</i></p>	<p>Karen Reiman-Sendi, Alex Deeke</p>
<p><b>Stakeholders</b> <i>Who cares about this project?</i> <i>Who SHOULD care?</i> <i>Who do we need to keep informed?</i></p>	<p>Library Operations: Steve Griffes, Jasmine Pawlicki Learning &amp; Teaching: Doreen Bradley, Jesus Espinoza Dean's Office: Craig Smith Campus Partners: Erika Johnson (ONSP), transfer students, campus student organizations</p>
<p><b>Project Team Members</b> <i>Who is working on the project?</i> <i>What are our roles?</i> <i>Who will be responsible for what?</i></p>	<p>Library Engagement Fellows 2019-2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mary Rolfes (Oct. 2019-May 2020)</li> <li>● Marivi Sifuentes (Oct. 2019-Dec. 2019)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project Description/Context</b> <i>What are we trying to do?</i> <i>What problem are we trying to solve?</i></p>	<p>Assess transfer student library needs for the purpose of practical library programming/resource/design initiatives. Sponsors are interested in discovering more about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The student academic experience for the transfer student population on the Ann Arbor campus</li> <li>● Transfer student engagement with the Library spaces, services, and resources over the last 1-2 years</li> <li>● The impact of that engagement on transfer student learning outcomes</li> </ul> <p>Through this process, we anticipate gathering data and feedback based on articulated needs that allows for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proposed spaces in Shapiro specifically, and other libraries generally, that support transfer and commuter students library-related needs</li> <li>● Articulation of the academic vs the social needs of these students in relation to the Library's mission</li> <li>● Analysis of current student perspectives on library services, programs, and spaces, and identification of potential gaps</li> <li>● Reveal the communication and outreach channels appropriate for the Library to integrate the academic library into transfer student life</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identification of collaboration opportunities with campus partners, including transfer students individually and as a group</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact</b> <i>Why are we doing this project? What is our intended impact?</i></p>	<p>To improve transfer/commuter student experience at the library and at U-M, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improved qualitative data regarding academic/social experience</li> <li>● Improved quantitative data for transfer student success markers (graduation rate, retention, GPA, etc.)</li> <li>● Awareness of strategies for future engagement around spaces, services, and resources</li> </ul>
<p><b>Deliverables</b> <i>What do we hope to have at the end of the project?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A more complete understanding of transfer students and the library at our institution</li> <li>● Feasible plans/suggestions for transfer/commuter program improvement at U-M Library</li> <li>● Quantitative data from survey &amp; virtual interviews</li> <li>● Experience to share in Student Stories blog post</li> <li>● Organized and shareable project report for stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>In Scope</b> <i>What outcomes are required?</i></p>	<p>U-M libraries across campus; partnerships w/ other campus programs Presentable findings and suggestions</p>
<p><b>Out of Scope</b> <i>What things are explicitly out of scope?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Financial aid/funding U-M</li> <li>● Ann Arbor housing market</li> <li>● Extensive physical/structural building alterations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Resources</b> <i>What resources (both people &amp; money) do we have?</i>  <i>Which do we still need to acquire, and what's the process for doing so?</i></p>	<p>People: transfer champions; library resources; research/design experts; transfer students Money: Seek program-based funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Additional funding for incentives</li> </ul>
<p><b>Time Constraints</b> <i>What are our deadlines? How absolute are they?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 12/20/19 - End of Fall Semester</li> <li>● Jan/Feb 2020 - Shapiro 3rd floor contribution</li> <li>● 02/11/20-02/15/20 - Transfer Student Appreciation Week</li> <li>● 02/28/20-03/11/20 - Spring Break</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 03/10/20-03/15/20 - Unexpected COVID-19 Cancellations</li> <li>● 04/29/20 - Student Stories blog post due</li> <li>● 05/04/20 - Project completion date</li> </ul>
<p><b>Risks</b>  <i>What are the most likely things to go wrong?  How will we know things are going off the rails?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Failure to recruit a sufficient number of study participants</li> <li>● Problems discovered through data collection are out-of scope; failure to find actionable solutions for transfer/commuter student engagement</li> <li>● Lack of participation, interest, or ability to contribute due to unexpected circumstances (COVID-19). Data may be unavoidably swayed by circumstances external/uncontrollable by the library</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b>  <i>How will we learn from this project?  How will we identify success?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We will keep detailed notes/records of our methods and projects that ourselves and future fellows can utilize and learn from in the future. <b>Note</b> that we will adjust our methodology to meet the unexpected challenge and circumstances created by COVID-19</li> <li>● We will reassess our methodology and progress once per month to ensure we are still on the right track and our project is successfully moving towards our goals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project/Action Plan</b>  <i>What are the tasks?  What are the milestones?  Who's going to be working/focusing on what?</i></p>	<p>Tasks: Literature review &amp; environmental scan; initial quantitative data collection; further qualitative data collection; data transcription and analysis; organization of results; presentation to stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Milestone one: complete the literature review and environmental scan - 12/20/19</li> <li>● Milestone two: complete collection and analysis of quantitative survey - 02/01/20</li> <li>● Milestone three: complete collection and analysis of qualitative focus groups/interviews - 04/29/20</li> <li>● Milestone four: blog post submission - 04/29/20</li> <li>● Milestone five: report submission - 05/04/20</li> </ul>
<p><b>Communication Plan</b>  <i>Where will we track our work?  How will we keep stakeholders updated?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We will use Trello to track and check our project progress.</li> <li>● 2-3 hours of designated working time in Karen's Office (Oct. 2019 - Feb. 2020)</li> <li>● We will share Google calendars to keep track of work hours and availability.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We will CC: all relevant parties in email communication.</li> <li>● We will use phone numbers for urgent questions/emergencies.</li> <li>● We will use emails and, if possible, brief meetings to keep stakeholders informed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>End of project plan</b>  <i>End of project criteria  and final report/presentation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Writing up the literature review and environmental scan</li> <li>● Organizing data into presentable formats</li> <li>● Leaving stakeholders with practical suggestions</li> <li>● If possible, goal could include supporting in implementation of suggestions in a final report that could include: Literature review and environmental scan; data collection methods &amp; analysis; findings; conclusion</li> </ul>
<p><b>Shared Values</b>  We ...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ...are committed to user centered design, inclusivity, and flexibility. We operate with a bias toward action and thrive on collaboration.</li> <li>● ...want to hear people, but we also really like data to drive decision making.</li> <li>● ...are not afraid of being wrong. We test our assumptions early and often and apply what we learn from our findings.</li> <li>● ...trust what our users say about their experience with our website or libraries. If they are having problems, we don't blame them or their way of using our tools or buildings.</li> <li>● ...work together from a starting point of trusting each other's good intentions.</li> <li>● ...recognize the unexpected, uniquely challenging circumstances created by COVID-19, and treat each other, project participants, and our expectations accordingly.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B. Student Engagement Programs Assessment Project Charter (March 2020)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Project Sponsor</b> <i>Who initiated this project?</i></p>	<p>Doreen Bradley, Karen Reiman-Sendi</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Stakeholders</b> <i>Who cares about this project?</i> <i>Who SHOULD care?</i> <i>Who do we need to keep informed?</i></p>	<p>Amanda Peters (Student Engagement Librarian) Learning Programs &amp; Initiatives (LPI, undergraduate instruction) Learning &amp; Teaching staff (student supervisors, engagement program developers and project mentors) SEP library supervisors or project mentors</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Project Team Members</b> <i>Who is working on the project?</i> <i>What are our roles?</i> <i>Who will be responsible for what?</i></p>	<p>Mary Rolfes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Conduct a literature review and background research</li> <li>● Design and analysis of SEP Assessment Survey and results (including incentives)</li> <li>● Schedule and conduct virtual focus groups and interviews</li> <li>● Submit blog post to Library’s “Student Stories” blog</li> <li>● Organize final data and write report</li> </ul> <p>Alex Deeke and Karen Reiman-Sendi</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Monitor and support project progress</li> <li>● Provide potential connections to support project completion</li> <li>● Stay updated on stakeholder and library changes</li> <li>● Coordinate survey and virtual interview completion</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Project Description/Context</b> <i>What are we trying to do?</i> <i>What problem are we trying to solve?</i></p>	<p>Learning Programs &amp; Initiatives staff host, sponsor, and develop experiential learning opportunities for students on the Ann Arbor campus, known as student engagement programs (SEP). Our project goal is to evaluate the impact, outcomes, and potentially the implementation of these paid and/or sponsored programs, focusing specifically on the <a href="#">Library Student Mini Grants</a> and the <a href="#">Library Engagement Fellows</a> programming for this phase. We envision that future phases may include some longitudinal assessment elements.</p> <p>Based on a review of the literature review conducted in 2019, and based on conversations with student engagement program leadership in LPI, we have identified several research questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact: What are the expectations and individual goals of program participants through their engagement in</li> </ul>

	<p>these programs? What are the expectations and goals of program and project mentors, including sponsors and stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact/Outcomes: What is the overall academic and/or non-academic impact of the program on students and library staff? What value is consistently being achieved/has been achieved? What desired outcomes or values are not being/were not achieved?</li> <li>● Implementation: How are students discovering and applying for SEP positions? Is the advertising strategy for these programs effective? Where are the gaps?</li> </ul> <p>For this part of our assessment work, we intend to focus on the impact of these engagement programs on students and library staff.</p>
<p><b>Impact</b> <i>Why are we doing this project? What is our intended impact?</i></p>	<p>We are developing this assessment project to better understand the previous and current iterations of SEP programming. With data and feedback, our goal is to inform program development and future enhancements, as well as future funding requests, thereby positively meeting students' and stakeholders' needs and expectations in an evolving educational environment. Additionally, we hope to set the foundation for future, routine program evaluation. This effort contributes to the Library's interests in creating and supporting a culture of assessment.</p>
<p><b>Deliverables</b> <i>What do we hope to have at the end of the project?</i></p>	<p>As part of this assessment project, the project lead and project team will create the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An updated literature review on student engagement programs in libraries/higher education</li> <li>● Two survey outlines for potential future (longitudinal) use</li> <li>● One focus group interview protocol for potential future (longitudinal) use</li> <li>● Program evaluation data and analysis as presented in a final written report. This report will include ideas and/or recommendations for future program enhancements, assuming we reach the survey and focus group implementation stage</li> </ul>
<p><b>In Scope</b> <i>What outcomes are required?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research and comparison to similar programming at U-M and other institutions (competitive analysis, environmental scan)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Assessment on Mini Grants and Engagement Fellows for last 2 cohorts (2018-2019, 2019-2020) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Impact on student participant academic/professional success</li> <li>○ Impact on program facilitators</li> <li>○ Review of program itself</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Project impact on library staff, initiatives, and programs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Out of Scope</b> <i>What things are explicitly out of scope?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact on participant financial aid packages</li> <li>● Assessment on Michigan Library Scholars, PIC students, library ambassadors</li> <li>● Project impact on greater community</li> </ul>
<p><b>Resources</b> <i>What resources (both people &amp; money) do we have?</i></p> <p><i>Which do we still need to acquire, and what's the process for doing so?</i></p>	<p>People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● L&amp;T staff (e.g. Doreen Bradley, Gabriel Duque, Amanda Peters, Craig Smith)</li> </ul> <p>Financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Funding for incentives (surveys and interviews)</li> <li>● Potentially an hourly wage for Engagement fellow(s) to participate in surveys/focus groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>Time Constraints</b> <i>What are our deadlines? How absolute are they?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● University breaks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Winter break (2/29-3/8)</li> <li>○ Unscheduled COVID-19 cancellations (3/10-3/15)</li> <li>○ Study and exam period (4/22-4/30)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Project blog post: April 29th</li> </ul>
<p><b>Risks</b> <i>What are the most likely things to go wrong?</i> <i>How will we know things are going off the rails?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Difficulty contacting and/or recruiting prior program participants to participate in study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Portion of previous participants no longer on campus</li> <li>○ Low response rate</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Time constraints leading to lack of presentable data</li> <li>● Conflicts with transfer student project</li> <li>● Lack of participant interest/ability to participate due to unexpected changes in life circumstances from COVID-19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Difficult to provide long-distance/virtual incentives</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mini-grant recipients and engagement fellows may not be able to finish projects due to unexpected circumstances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Responses in surveys and focus groups/interviews may be unavoidably swayed by circumstances separate from the program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b>  <i>How will we learn from this project?</i>  <i>How will we identify success?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How did the previous transfer student project contribute to our execution of the SEP project?</li> <li>● Use this experience to provide recommendations for how to conduct future Research Fellow programs</li> <li>● Noting our ability to meet deadlines or need to adjust project timeline will contribute to the design of a realistic project timeline for future fellows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How did we adjust to the unexpected challenges created by COVID-19?</li> <li>○ How can our adjustment to virtual work contribute to more accessible project design in the future?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Project success will be achieved by providing meaningful and actionable research on Student Engagement Programming to project stakeholders and sponsors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Additionally, the project will have been a meaningful learning and working experience for project team members, as well as a pilot for program assessment going forward</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Project/Action Plan</b>  <i>What are the tasks?</i>  <i>What are the milestones?</i>  <i>Who's going to be working/focusing on what?</i></p>	<p>Tentative project outline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 1/31/20: Literature review and other background work completed</li> <li>● 2/6/20: Literature review is shared with stakeholders and project sponsors</li> <li>● 2/6/20: Update list of possible participants from Amanda Peters</li> <li>● March 2020: Create a rough draft survey for Mini Grant and Engagement Fellows participants</li> <li>● March 2020: Review survey content with Craig Smith</li> <li>● Early April 2020: mini-grant survey window</li> <li>● Late April 2020: engagement fellows survey window</li> <li>● 5/1/20: Student Stories blog post deadline</li> <li>● 5/4/20-5/8/20: Project report completed</li> </ul>

	<p><b>MILESTONES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Literature review and annotated bibliography completed</li> <li>● Surveys completed</li> <li>● Library blog post completed</li> <li>● Data analysis and report completed</li> <li>● Project communication to stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>Communication Plan</b>  <i>Where will we track our work?  How will we keep stakeholders updated?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Communicate primarily through email</li> <li>● Keep all work in SEP folder on Google Drive</li> <li>● Develop comprehensive agendas for weekly meetings</li> <li>● Share literature review, survey data, focus group results with stakeholders primarily via email (potential to schedule virtual meetings, if stakeholders are interested)</li> </ul>
<p><b>End of project plan</b>  <i>End of project criteria and final report/presentation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Share results with project stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If possible, program improvement recommendations</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Integrate SEP results with Transfer Student Project element of Engagement Fellow position</li> <li>● Organize data into compelling final blog post for Student Stories blog</li> </ul>
<p><b>Shared Values</b>  We...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ...are committed to user centered design, inclusivity, and flexibility. We operate with a bias toward action and thrive on collaboration.</li> <li>● ...want to hear people, but we also really want data to inform decision making.</li> <li>● ...are not afraid of being wrong. We test our assumptions early and often and apply what we learn from our findings.</li> <li>● ...trust what our users say about their experience with our website. If they are having problems, we don't blame them or the way of using our tool.</li> <li>● ...work together from a starting point of trusting each other's good intentions.</li> <li>● ...recognize the unexpected, uniquely challenging circumstances created by COVID-19, and treat each other, project participants, and our expectations accordingly.</li> </ul>



## Appendix C. Literature Reviews

### Transfer & Commuter Students Annotated Bibliography

Authored by: Marivi Sifuentes and Mary Rolfes (December 2019)

Research Topic: University libraries' efforts to support transfer students and commuter students. Keywords: transfer students AND library\*, university library renovation, university library student needs, transfer student information literacy. Resources used: Education Abstracts, Web of Science, The National Institute for the Study of Transfer Students, Library Literature & Information Science Index, Library & Information Science Abstracts

Citations generally cover two main areas: physical library space and library programs, services, and tools.

#### Physical library space

Brown-Sica, M. S. (2012)  
Habre, C. & Kammourié, H. (2018)  
Montgomery, S. E. (2013)  
Ojennus, P. & Watts, K. A. (2015)  
Sens, T. (2009)  
Sommerville, M. M. & Brar, N. (2010)  
Villa, J. (2012)

#### Library programs, services, and tools

Coates, L. R. & Pemberton, A. E. (2017)  
Lafrance, H. & Kealey, S. B. (2017)  
McBride, K. R. (2017)  
Robinson, M. et al. (2018)  
Roberts, L. et al. (2019)  
Sandelli, A. (2017)  
Whang, L. et al. (2017)

#### Other

NISTS. (2017)

---

Brown-Sica, M. S. (2012). Library spaces for urban, diverse commuter students: A participatory action research project. *College & Research Libraries*, 73(3), 217-231. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-221>

The researchers in this study utilized participatory action research to assess the library needs of a diverse population of commuter students with the goal of creating a Learning Commons to better fulfill student needs. Methods of data collection included: service desk journals, 'sandbox' projects, flip charts

placed at library entrances, web surveys, and spontaneous focus groups. The most prevalent suggestions for the space were a need for more/better computers, more/better furniture, an overall more attractive environment, more space/less noise, and electrical outlets. There were also implications of better advertising library services and providing more healthy food options for working students/students of lower socioeconomic status. Overall, the importance of the library as a place to meet for commuters was stressed, indicating the necessity for its ability to meet commuter student needs.

The population and school in this article are not comparable to U-M, as the library in question serves a population that is 99% commuter, very urban, and of lower average SES. However, I think it's important to consider the needs of this population at large may reflect those of our smaller subpopulation of commuter students. Moreover, the methods used for data collection could potentially be useful in our research; I was especially intrigued by the ideas of service desk journals and flip charts as a means of collecting quantitative data.

Coats, L. R., & Pemberton, A. E. (2017). Transforming for our transfers: The creation of a transfer student services librarian. *Reference Services Review*, 45(3), 485–497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-11-2016-0079>

The Randall Library at the University of North Carolina Wilmington, which has a student population of 15,000 and 25 librarians, created a Transfer Student Services Librarian position in order to better support transfer students at the University. Goals for this Librarian included: collaborating with the University to deliver information literacy instruction in a transfer seminar, establishing relationships between transfer students and university staff who work with transfer students (an example of this includes sending personalized emails to incoming transfer students to welcome them to the library and connect them with a librarian in their field), and create a library website for transfer students. This library also created an event in collaboration with a Student Success unit

called “#TRANSFERmation Tuesday,” where incoming transfer students were able to learn more about the university campus and resources.

Habre, C., & Kammourié, H. (2018). Redesigning spaces for effective learning: Challenges facing Riyadh Nassar Library in meeting users perceptions and expectations. *Journal of Library Administration*, 58(5), 519–544.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2018.1468674>

In order to evaluate the space design of the Riyadh Nassar Library of the Lebanese American University, three methods were used to collect data: surveys, behavioral observation, and statistics. The data gathered through these methods would serve to answer two research questions: (1) Is the Riyadh Nassar Library meeting its users’ expectations in providing adequate space and (2) is the space changing at the same pace of the users’ needs? The library created a Library Assessment Plan that details which methods would be employed for the outcomes the library sought. The plan also included collection agents, assessment agents, and starting dates. Through behavioral observation they were able to investigate the relation between student engagement and library space and determine if the students were using the library for research/study purposes or for socializing. Perhaps the size of the library will prevent us from doing this; however, I wonder if students would be interested in a space that is similar to the ones already here or if they are interested in a space that is completely different from those that are currently available. As an incentive for students to participate, 100 free pages were added automatically to the students’ printing balance. They also encouraged members of the Student Advisory Council to fill out the survey and encourage their peers to do this as well.

MLibrary could use additional printing pages in order to encourage students to participate in our project. I think that while we wait to schedule interviews or focus groups we could brainstorm other methods like those. These are especially attractive to me because they are quick to fill out.

Lafrance, H., & Kealey, S. B. (2017). A boutique personal librarian program for transfer students. *Reference Services Review*, 45(2), 332–345.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-10-2016-0066>

Similarly to Coats and Pemberton’s paper, this article focuses on the launch of a personal librarian program where librarians were assigned a set of transfer students in order to develop personal connections with them. One aspect of their position included sending personalized welcome emails during the first two weeks and offering introductory meetings in weeks 2 and 3 of the first quarter. Two more emails were sent, mostly focusing on reminding students of library resources available to them, such as the library’s 24 hour chat reference service and the library schedule during finals.

McBride, K. R., Gregor, M. N., & McCallister, K. C. (2017). Bridging the gap. *Reference Services Review*, 45(3), 498–510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-10-2016-0067>

This study assessed the evolution of library services for transfer students at Appalachian State University, a larger public university in rural North Carolina. This review found social and academic integration to be a predictor of transfer student success, and expounded that university initiatives could help provide this integration. The article also discussed partnerships between the library and other programs on campus directed towards transfer students, allowing librarians to share their input on the importance of the transfer student population. They discussed the failure of a First-Year Seminar course for transfer students that was not tailored properly to the needs and diversity of transfer students. Transfer students were more likely to be lacking in exposure to information literacy instruction. The authors claim librarian knowledge is essential to achieving successful outcomes; as such, they stress the importance of initiatives such as a transfer symposium, transfer workshops, and national conferences. Another important element identified in the research is the ability to partner with librarians at feeder schools.

This article relates more to the academic and social services provided by the library rather than physical/digital space. It gives a precedent for our partnership with other departments on campus and the importance of library staff in reviewing and researching. Ensuring library programming is considerate of transfer students' specific needs and tailored specially for them is crucial.

Montgomery, S. E. (2013). Library space assessment: User learning behaviors in the library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(1), 70–75.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2013.11.003>

Montgomery wanted to determine how the renovation of Olin Library changed users' perceptions of their learning behaviors in that space. While Olin Library is Rollen College's only library and serves about 3000 students, their assessment methods could be employed in our work at Michigan. Methods used include an ethnographic survey of space, student focus groups, and survey about learning behaviors in the planned renovated space. Surveys could be completed on paper, through an iPad, or online after scanning a QR code. In the results they found that students approved of spaces that allowed them to work collaboratively. An interesting point they mentioned in their Context section was that "the librarians' offices were hidden from view." This could be investigated in our work, especially because in our discussion with Steve about having a hub where students could seek information or assistance. Perhaps making library staff offices more accessible (if necessary) could encourage student engagement with library staff.

Ojennus, P., & Watts, K. A. (2015). User preferences and library space at Whitworth University Library. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 49(3), 320–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000615592947>

This study was conducted by librarians at Whitworth University, a private liberal arts college in the Pacific Northwest, to understand students' library space needs and opinions on potential library renovations. Their research investigated three questions: what formats do their user groups prefer for the content types

provided by the library; what aspects of library spaces do their patrons identify as most important; and what social or cultural spaces in the library do their patrons identify as ones they would use. Researchers gathered data from a survey, with many of the questions being adapted from surveys published in the literature (example source: American Association of Law Libraries ALL-SIS Student Services Committee, 2011). Ojennus and Watts divided 30 questions into three categories: “how students currently use the library space and collections, what personal benefit students perceive from proposed changes, and what students would like to see improved in the library” (324). The survey drafts were tested by student library employees. This could be replicated here because of the connection we have with this population of students; however, their answers will likely not be representative of the transfer student population. Methods of survey distribution included a paid ad on the library’s Facebook page with a link to the survey, two iPads with the survey page were available in the library, and small flyers with a printed link were distributed. Given that transfer and commuter students are very busy, it would be useful to use a combination of tools to retrieve student feedback. Ojennus’ and Watts’ work found that there was a need for diverse study spaces and technology. Library furniture and space should be “comfortable” and acceptable of “informal meetings” (331). They also found that many students suggested table sizes should be larger to accommodate their materials and more electrical outlets should be added so they can charge their devices.

Roberts, L., Welsh, M. E., & Dudek, B. (2019). Instruction and outreach for transfer students: A Colorado case study. *College & Research Libraries*, 80(1), 94-122. Retrieved from <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16925>

This study approached the previously under-researched role of libraries in transfer student success, and the reality of institutional obstacles and college systems as the largest factor in retention and integration. Academic libraries are posited as a potentially useful resource in increasing transfer student success,

but many libraries do not offer specific instruction for transfers; moreover, few librarians believed in the necessity of transfer student instruction. Cooperation between community colleges and academic libraries is recommended, such as through a resource-sharing network. They surveyed a population of libraries at both two- and four-year institutions in Colorado to assess engagement and perceived need for engagement with transfer students at their institution. Overall, the data showed discrepancies, speaking to the possibility of confusion or unawareness regarding both transfer programming and transfer populations. The majority of participants reported they had not considered offering transfer specific programs, despite having the resources to do so. Nonetheless, limited resource availability was reported as a barrier. In general, the vast majority of respondents indicated academic libraries, in cooperation with other institutions, are beneficial to transfer students. Still, priorities for these students differ between two- and four-year institutions. The authors conclude that increasing dialogue within and between institutions would be beneficial.

This source speaks to the importance of assessing both students and staff when researching library needs and resources. Ensuring staff are aware and engaged with the creation and facilitation of transfer student programs could potentially contribute to increased positive outcomes. Additionally, this source also supports the idea of considering collaboration with U-M feeder schools, should such a set of schools exist. This will need to be researched further, possibly with support from financial aid/admissions.

Robison, M., Fawley, N., & Marshall, A. (2018). How can librarians aid transfer student integration?: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(6), 864–871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2018.09.001>

In this article, researchers examined the impact of information literacy (IL) instruction on transfer students' sense of academic integration and investigated when and how to deliver this instruction to incoming transfer students. Through the survey data they collected on students, they found that IL instruction does

not build on transfer student capital but that the students do value information about the library and believe IL instruction is more beneficial in the beginning of the academic year, specifically in the first 1-2 weeks they are on campus. Students agreed that information about how to utilize the library and library resources for research at the new institution was essential. However, a majority of the students preferred to learn about the library on their own and online because this is flexible as they have busy schedules. This article also discussed the diversity of the transfer community; specifically, the type of institutions transfer students came from, how long it had been since they were last enrolled in a university or college, and their status at their past institution (full-time vs. half-time). This could be useful information to have as we previously mentioned working with librarians at feeder schools. In regards to academic integration, they found that the number of hours that students worked during the week influenced their academic integration, with students who worked more than the median number of hours reported feeling less connected to an academic support system.

Suggestions we can take for our project: they found that orientation events did not have a large impact on research skills but these events tend to reach a larger proportion of the target audience. Events that are hosted for transfer students should also entail some sort of community building exercises that help students develop connections with one another and the university.

Sandelli, A. (2017). Through three lenses: Transfer students and the library. *Reference Services Review*, 45(3), 400–414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-10-2016-0074>

Like Roberts, Welsh, and Dudek (2019), Sandelli seeks to research the previously under-examined element of academic libraries in transfer student success. She begins by discussing the complex definition of ‘transfer student’ and the many diverse subpopulations that exist within this group. She discusses social and academic factors to transfer student success, including connectivity, institutional support, housing options, and campus culture. Barriers to



transferring may continue to impact student success at their new institution. The difference between lateral and vertical transfers and their relative success rates is noted, with lateral transfers tending to perform worse. Ultimately, identifying these and other subgroups may help to produce more targeted and effective solutions. Discussion of the involvement of academic libraries includes ASU's workshop mentioned in McBride, Gregor, and McCallister (2017), specialized courses, and one-on-one consultation programs, such as one at UNC-Chapel Hill. Overall, academic libraries' previous lack of engagement with transfer students may be due to a lack of resources, a perception of the population as too small, or the failure of previous attempts at outreach; however, barriers to the success of academic libraries in working with transfer students can be overcome.

This source gives potential ideas for what may be preventing or hindering academic library involvement in transfer student life at U-M. It also serves to stress the importance of identifying and understanding subpopulations of transfer students on campus, aided by the information provided by NISTS (2017). The performance of lateral transfers to U-M is especially relevant; considering the prestige of the school, we likely experience a large transfer presence from lower-ranked four year universities both in and out-of-state.

Sens, T. (2009). Twelve keys to library design. *Library Journal; New York*, 134(9), n.p.

This short article provides twelve overarching guidelines to designing physical library spaces. Especially relevant keys include: including students in the design; facilitating collaboration; infusing spaces with relevant technology; making the library a hub for other campus services; integrating a commons area in order to maintain the libraries function as a center on campus; and sustainability. These guidelines could potentially be useful in translating transfer/commuter student needs into practical services, and for contributing our research to the redesign of the third floor of Shapiro. For one, our focus groups can be oriented to draw out student input on future library design. We can also consider which technologies and campus partnerships in the library would be

most beneficial to transfers, as well as consider transfer student engagement with the social aspect of the library.

Somerville, M. M. & Brar, N. (2010). From information to learning commons: Campus planning highlights. *New Library World*, 111(5/6), 179–188.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/03074801011044052>

This paper provides insight on the process of inclusive planning. In this case, it is in light of a library's transition from information to learning commons, one at Cal-Poly SLO. Libraries in general are moving away from being knowledge warehouses, instead becoming centered on multidisciplinary collaboration that aligns with and enacts the goals of the university. Students recommended a blend of formal and informal learning. In order to keep libraries relevant, they must be established as hubs of active programming and social gathering. Moving collections to create more space for collaboration was critical, as was social programming to attract students to the library. The authors conclude that the library must embody the more active, collaborative style of learning which higher academia has moved into.

While this article does not necessarily provide information to transfer students, it is important to consider the ways in which collaborative learning and socialization may be different for transfer populations. Inclusivity of these needs is crucial in planning truly comprehensive spaces and programming at the library. This information would be especially pertinent in potential collaborations with the Third Floor Shapiro project.

The National Institute For The Study Of Transfer Students. (2017). A beginner's guide to gathering transfer student data on your campus [PDF File]. Retrieved from

<https://www.nists.org/guide-to-gathering-transfer-student>

This resource is a general guideline to gathering data specific to the transfer student population on our campus. It gives a fairly comprehensive list of all the quantitative and qualitative data of a transfer student population that should be considered, including demographics and diversity, academic

backgrounds, and success at the current institution. It also explains each data point's importance and potential use, and gives recommendations for resources in collecting this data (e.g., Admissions, Financial Aid). I included this source because I think it will be helpful in planning and justifying our data collection methods.

Villa, J. (2012). Positioning collegiate libraries for the future: creating a distinctive learning commons to meet student population needs. *Planning for Higher Education*, 41(1), 310–325. Retrieved from <https://link-gale-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/apps/doc/A325092246/AONE?u=umuser&sid=AONE&xid=c57f8f88>

Like Somerville and Brar (2010), Villa also focuses on the importance of the library as a 'learning commons' to meet student needs. Villa specifies that these spaces must be flexible and technology rich. Libraries are one of the most important institutions that attracts potential students to certain schools. As such, the library as a student-centered commons, focused on teamwork, is critical. The 'learning commons' model corresponds to the current education revolution and represents the academic library of the future. The library presents an unmatched opportunity to integrate support, technology, and spatial resources into one space, establishing libraries as a hub on campus. The design of the learning commons should consider student demographics and behaviors, the university's mission statement, and the inclusion of student groups, faculty, and library staff. Villa considers this design process specifically for a community college library in St. Louis County, Missouri. In the initial assessment many factors arose as pertinent to this institution's population: technology resources; financial and staffing resources; academic and social assistance; space for collaboration and downtime between classes; presence on campus; and accessibility, restrooms, daylight, and other structurally related elements. Short-term recommendations included flexible spaces and furniture, lockers and mobile charging stations, and IT support at the circulation desk. Long-term

solutions create a stronger connection between the library and the student center, as does redesigning the space to be more open and collaborative.

While this source also doesn't specify transfer students, it does give a comprehensive, step-by-step design process for learning commons that could be expanded to other physical, digital, and social spaces. The population at a community college may not be similar to U-M, but it is important to consider that many students at our institution may have long commutes to campus or inconsistent access to transportation, making the library similarly useful to them as to commuter students and community colleges.

Whang, L., Tawatao, C., Danneker, J., Belanger, J., Weber, S. E., Garcia, L., & Klaus, A. (2017). Understanding the transfer student experience using design thinking. *Reference Services Review*, 45(2), 298–313.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-10-2016-0073>

These researchers employed a user-focused methodology to understand the transfer student experience at the University of Washington. They conducted interviews and focus groups with 8 transfer students and 4 University staff members. During the interview phase the team investigated general issues faced by the students rather than focusing on issues related to the library. During the ideation phase the team did not initially formally code interviews, rather, they looked at common themes, generated ideas to address themes, voted on them, and selected a single idea to prototype. Originally they decided on a transfer student panel event hosted by the libraries, however, a similar event was already hosted on campus and the team decided to not move forward with that idea. They decided that they needed to help transfer students identify resources and places of support rapidly. As a result, they created a series of library tours that were led by transfer students and introduced new transfer students to available library spaces and services. Another initiative included a social at the Undergraduate Library in collaboration with librarians, advisors, the Undergraduate Research Program. The event was designed to be informal,

transfer students were able to meet other transfer students, subject librarians and advisors and were able to view a presentation on research opportunities for transfer students. One of their findings was that students wanted to have a clear understanding of what they would get out of an event as they have other priorities and needed to determine beforehand if the event was worth their time.

## Student Engagement Programs Assessment: A Literature Review

Prepared by Mary Rolfes (2020)

Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66(2), 123–155. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2943909>

This article describes ‘the other curriculum,’ referring to student involvement that takes place outside of the classroom. This investigation builds on two frameworks: the involvement principle and the impact model. The involvement principle premises that more time and energy spent in purposeful activities creates more benefit for students. Engineering, business and physical science students generally expend less in such activities and benefit less; humanities majors engage and benefit the most. The college impact model focuses on external environment and sociological conditions. The researchers asked students 5 questions about their college involvement and how they benefited from it. Leadership experiences, such as those involving planning, organizing, and managing, had the most reported benefits. The strongest gain was reported in interpersonal competence; practical competences (e.g., planning a budget, clarification of vocational goals) was the weakest. Gains reported from faculty contact were low, but when contacts developed into mentoring relationships, more benefits were reported. Employment on or off campus was also highly beneficial. The article also emphasizes that reported experiences and

benefits differ significantly by gender and race. Ultimately, the most powerful experiences demanded dedicated effort to complete varying tasks, and leadership and work experiences contributed most significantly to practical competence, encouraging the development of skills necessary for success in the workplace.

This article provides general categories and specific skills in which the impact of the SEP programs can be assessed. We must also consider what type of activity the programs are. Additionally, this article reminds us to consider differences between genders, majors, and races.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 683–706.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0099>

Kuh describes student engagement as representing both student devotion to activities linked to the desired outcomes of college, and what institutions do to get students to participate. Applying learning to concrete (real-world) situations is especially important. Desired outcomes include cognitive development, self-esteem, and 'locus of control.' The experiences which lead to the most desired outcomes are those which engage students in educationally purposeful activities. Working was again found to be beneficial, but at a threshold of twenty hours per week. Student development is measured by reasoning and problem-solving ability, inquiry, intercultural effectiveness, leadership, and integration of learning. As is found consistently in Kuh's work, some students

benefit more than others from engagement. Engagement is described as a two way street; both institutions and students must be devoted. Kuh believes student affairs professionals do not interact enough with students between matriculation and graduation.

This article provides some general classifications for possible benefits of impacts and outcomes. It also brings in the consideration for if SEP programs are considered in any capacity to be work experiences, and if so, how the time requirement balance can be met. Again, it is important to consider differences in impact and outcome correlated with gender and race.

Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2015). The role of the academic library in promoting student engagement in learning. *College & Research Libraries*. 76(3), 359-385.

<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.3.359>

Although the library remains a central aspect of the college campus, the shift from teaching to learning at many universities, libraries must embrace this learning paradigm to remain relevant and effective. Experiences with academic libraries should make contributions to the desired outcomes of college.

Information literacy is the focus of this particular article, including the gain of relevant career information, using technology, and self-directed learning. Use of the library, again, differs based upon major, gender, and race/ethnicity. The authors advocate librarian partnerships with student affairs and other academic departments.



Given the library must continue to remain relevant in the new university paradigm, it would be good to consider if impacts and outcomes of the SEP programs are aligning with the desired outcomes of college for participants. We may also look to what these general collegiate outcomes are to inform questions about program specific outcomes. Being a library program, the outcome of information literacy is likely important to consider.

Meyer, N. J., & Miller, I. R. (2008). The library as service-learning partner: A win-win collaboration with students and faculty. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 15(4), 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691310802554879>

This article describes a service-learning experience that took place at Eastern Washington University, in which students designed a marketing strategy and teaching presentation for a library software called RefWorks. This was completed as a partnership between the university's Teaching & Learning Center and faculty/staff. The goal was to bridge the gap between classroom knowledge and real-world client expectations. Students were required to write a project proposal, publish promotional materials, and give a hands-on workshop for other students. A quarter of students reported learning new skills or practicing skills; other reported benefits were all quite weak. The authors conclude that they believe they made a positive connection with this cohort of students.

In my opinion, this article is an excellent example of a highly ineffective student engagement experience. For one, the students were required to complete the program for a class; it was not a true involvement experience. The project

framework, goals, and requirements were very rigid, leaving students little room to explore vocational interests or to develop practical skills such as through leadership experience. Finally, beyond engagement with the library, the project doesn't truly develop a connection with the community; it remains within the bubble of campus rather than the real-world. I think this is reflected in their low number of reported benefits. Noting this program's shortcomings can help to compare the varying levels of success across different SEP participants, and what could have been adjusted to avoid failure.

Pun, R., Xiong, S., & Nauk, V. (2017). Doing technology: A teaching collaboration between Fresno State and Fresno County Public Library. *College & Research Libraries News*, 78(6), 303–315. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.78.6.303>

This article describes a partnership between California State University-Fresno and the Fresno County Public Library, in which student ambassadors led technology training workshops in FCPL branches. The goal was to demonstrate the library's commitment to support the community. The one-year community engagement program trained 10 student ambassadors from different majors and language proficiency. The authors report excitement at recruiting students invested in community support. One student reported that they got out of their academic bubble and became more in touch with their community, which was a humbling experience considering the areas' socioeconomic trends. They mentioned cultural awareness as necessary in successful communication. Another student reported he felt truly fulfilled being

able to help a community member. A third student reported the collaboration was a learning experience for both the student ambassadors and community members.

This article provides an excellent contrast to Meyer & Miller's article, demonstrating that service-learning can be a rewarding and beneficial experience, and that community involvement does not need to be on a large scale to have positive impacts. For one, recruiting students who are genuinely passionate about the cause and community involvement led to much better outcomes. I think considering why SEP participants enrolled in the program and what they expected is actually critical to truly gauging the impact and outcomes, so this background assessment should be included in our project. Moreover, community engagement also was important to project success. Understanding what SEP students hoped to provide to their target communities, and how much of that was achieved, is an outcome that should be assessed. Cultural competency skills may also be important to consider as both an interpersonal and practical skill.

Schlak, T. (2018). Academic libraries and engagement: A critical contextualization of the library discourse on engagement. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(1), 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2017.09.005>

Schlak seeks to clarify what the terms 'student engagement' and 'engagement' mean in the context of the library. Schlak contextualizes three theories of student engagement through a literature review of library

engagement: Kuh's behavior based approach, Kahu's psychological perspective, and Leach & Zepka's conceptual schematic. In his literature review, he notes five categories of library engagement: student learning, citizenship & service-based learning, library as engaging space and place, engagement through technology and programmatic learning experiences, and relational engagement. In Kuh's behavior-based approach, libraries are a place for students to engage in learning activities. From Kahu's psychological perspective, student engagement is understood as student investment in completing research projects that are of genuine interest to them. For Leach & Zepka's, libraries are involved in student engagement when they support students in active citizenship through service projects and work. Ultimately, Schlak concludes that engagement in the library is an intangible aspect of student engagement that should be uniquely valued across campus.

This article provides an excellent framework for understanding student engagement through the library. While Leach & Zepka's schematic relates most directly to the SEP assessment, much of my research has been on Kuh; I believe it's possible to find a balance between behavioral, psychological, and citizenship-based engagement with the library. Because SEP programs are an involvement experience offered through the library, they have a unique opportunity to combine the engagement impacts of both.

Yates, F. (2014). Beyond library space and place: creating a culture of community engagement through library partnerships. *Indiana Libraries*, 33(2), 53-57.

This article suggests library partnerships with their campus and the community through service-learning centers hosted in the library, creating a new social contract between libraries and users. Using Indiana University East, the article's points contextualizes Giles & Eyley's 5Cs of service learning in the library: connection, continuity, context, challenge, and coaching. The article also points out that service-learning and information literacy improve student outcomes, and the library is uniquely equipped to handle both. Integrating service learning in the library provides an opportunity to advance curriculum development, form faculty relationships, and provide direct impact, while getting students involved in service learning.

Yates provides a strong argument for the link between libraries and funding programs like SEP which get students involved while also increasing academic skills through library exposure. The 5 Cs of service learning are also important to keep in mind when examining former participants; did they feel these crucial aspects of service learning were met, and what impact did that have on them?

NOTE: Original, abbreviated literature review was conducted in May 2019 by Lynsey Wall.

## Appendix D. Survey Questions

### Transfer & Commuter Student Survey

#### Introduction

Thank you for volunteering to take part in our survey. As part of the U-M Library Engagement Fellows program, this survey aims to assess transfer student experience with the University of Michigan Library. The survey will ask a series of questions about your experience with library spaces, services, and programs.

This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time. All responses will be kept confidential and reported at an aggregate level only. Data collected will be used to understand and improve transfer student experience with the library.

Completing the survey will enter you into a drawing for a prize of up to \$100 at the Computer Showcase. Two winners will be selected and notified by email after February 7th, 2020. At the end, you will also be asked if you would be interested in participating in further research, such as interviews and focus groups.

Beginning this survey indicates your consent to participate.

**Q1.** When is your expected graduation date?

▼ May 2020, August 2020, December 2020, ... December 2023

**Q2.** Which type of higher education institution did you attend immediately before transferring to the University of Michigan?

- 2-year U.S. Community College/Technical College
- 4-year U.S. Public College/University
- 4-year U.S. Private College/University
- International College/University (non-U.S. based)
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q3.** Which best describes your typical commute to campus?

- I live in Ann Arbor, less than a 15 minute walk from campus
- I live in Ann Arbor, more than a 15 minute walk from campus
- I live outside of Ann Arbor, and I drive or use public transportation to commute to campus
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q4.** On average, how often do you physically visit at least one of the University of Michigan Libraries?

- Never
- Once a semester
- Once a month
- A few times a month
- Once a week
- A few times a week
- Most days each week

**Q5.** Which library do you consider to be your primary library?

- Taubman Health Sciences Library
- Music Library
- Art, Architecture & Engineering Library (Duderstadt Center)
- Fine Arts Library
- Shapiro Undergraduate Library (UgLi)
- Hatcher Graduate Library
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q6.** What day(s) do you typically visit your primary library? Check all that apply.

- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday
- Saturday
- Sunday

**Q7.** In general, when during the day do you most frequently visit your primary library?

- Morning
- Afternoon
- Evening
- Late night/overnight

**Q8.** What reason(s) do you visit your primary library? Check all that apply.

- Individual study or homework
- Check out items (books, media, supplies)
- Browse library items
- Use specialized library resources (e.g., course reserves, Special Collections, maps)
- Meet with other students to study or complete course work
- Meet with other students to relax or socialize
- Meet with library staff

- Attend library events
- Purchase food
- Use computers, printers, or other technology resources
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please answer the following questions about using *any* of the libraries at the University of Michigan, including your primary library.

**Q9.** What reason(s) do you visit any of the University of Michigan libraries? Check all that apply.

- Individual study or homework
- Check out items (books, media, supplies)
- Browse library items
- Use specialized library resources (e.g., course reserves, Special Collections, maps)
- Meet with other students to study or complete course work
- Meet with other students to relax or socialize
- Meet with library staff
- Attend library events
- Purchase food
- Use computers, printers, or other technology resources
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q10.** How important are the following **accessibility** factors in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Hours of service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proximity to where I live	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proximity to where I have class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proximity to where I work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Proximity to where I park my car

**Q11.** How important are the following **environmental factors** in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
The library's physical design (e.g. furniture placement, interior design)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library's space design (e.g. room size, windows, lighting)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An atmosphere that allows for collaboration, conversation, or more casual work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An atmosphere that allows for dedicated individual or quiet study/work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q12.** How important are the following **service factors** in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable

The library's collection (books, magazines, journals, media, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library offers tools, software, and technology that I need	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library offers staff, such as librarians and subject specialists that are helpful to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library offers events, programs, and workshops that are relevant to my needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q13.** How important are the following **library services** to you?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Online services (website, catalog, research databases, Ask a Librarian, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Physical library collections (books, magazines, journals, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In-person staff or  
librarian service

**Q14.** How important are the following **library spaces** to you?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Collaborative working areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual working areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quiet or distraction free areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comfortable furniture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Private study rooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q15.** How important are the following **library resources** to you?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Computers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Scanning & copying

Electrical outlets and/or  
charging stations

Private study rooms

**Q16.** Are there any other library services, spaces, or resources that are important to you?

**Q17.** The library offers a variety of resources, services, and events for transfer students. Which of the following have you used? Check all that apply.

- Fall Welcome & Library Expo during Welcome Week
- Library Basics Workshop & Tour
- Library Services for Transfer Students website
- Library Guide for Transfer Students
- 'Welcome to the Library' video
- Ask a Librarian service or other research help

**Q18.** For those events that respondents attended, they were asked to respond to this question: Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the [name of event]?

**Q19.** Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience with the University of Michigan Library? We welcome any constructive feedback, new ideas, or suggestions for areas to improve.

Last part! Please enter your email below if you'd like to be entered into the drawing for a \$100 purchase at the Computer Showcase. You may also indicate if you're interested in helping us further by participating in an interview or focus group.

Clicking Next will submit your survey and your name into the drawing.

**Q20.** Are you interested in participating in further research with this program, such as participating in an interview or focus group? Y/N

*For those respondents that indicated they did not visit the Library, the following questions displayed.*

You mentioned that you do not physically visit any University of Michigan library. Reflect on why you don't visit a library and answer the following questions.

**Q1.** Which of the following library **accessibility factors** contribute to your response?

	Agree	Disagree	Not Applicable/No Opinion
The hours of the libraries do not work with my schedule	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The libraries are not close to where I live	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The libraries are not close to where I have classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The libraries are not close to where I work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The libraries are not close to where I park my car	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q2.** Which of the following **library space factors** contribute to your response?

	Agree	Disagree	Not Applicable/No Opinion
The physical design (e.g. furniture, interior design) is unappealing to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The space design (e.g. room size, windows, lighting) is unappealing to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The atmosphere does not allow for collaboration, conversation, or casual work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The atmosphere does not allow for dedicated individual or quiet study/work

**Q3.** Which of the following **library resources factors** contribute to your response?

	Agree	Disagree	Not Applicable/No Opinion
Materials in the library's physical collection (books, magazines, journals, media, etc.) are not necessary for my coursework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library does not offer services, tools, software, or technology that I need	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The library staff, such as librarians and subject specialists, are not necessary for my work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My coursework does not require me to visit the library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q4.** Related to **library services**, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Online services (website, catalog, research databases, Ask a Librarian, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Physical library collections (books, magazines, journals, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-person staff or librarian service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.** Related to **library space**, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Collaborative working areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual working areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quiet or distraction free areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comfortable furniture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q6.** Related to **library resources**, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	No Opinion/Not Applicable
Printers (black & white, color, 3D, posters)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Computers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scanning & copying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Electrical outlets and/or charging stations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q7.** Are there any other library services, spaces, or resources that would increase your usage of the library?

## Mini Grant Program Participant Survey

### Introduction

As a current or former Library Mini Grant recipient, we invite you to participate in a brief survey about your experience with the Library in this unique program. In this survey we ask you a series of questions about the Library’s impact on your Mini Grant project. Your feedback is helpful to our research and will be used in the development of future library programming and support of mini grants.

The survey will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time. All responses will be confidential and reported at an aggregate level only. Data collected will be used to understand and enhance future Library student engagement programs in general.



Completing the survey will enter you into a drawing for a small prize of Library-themed items. Three winners will be randomly selected and notified by email after April 13, 2020, and prizes will be mailed.

Beginning this survey indicates your consent to participate. If you have questions about this survey or the data gathering process, please contact Mary Rolfes (morolfes@umich.edu), Library Research Assistant.

**Q1.** Which semester did you receive a Library Mini Grant? (Select the most recent semester you received an award.)

Fall 2018 (1)

Fall 2019 (2)

**Q2.** Please briefly describe the project(s) you completed during the period of your Mini Grant award. Please indicate if this particular project is a continuation of a previous Mini Grant award, if applicable.

**Q3.** Which type of degree were you pursuing at the University of Michigan during your participation in the Mini Grant program?

Bachelor's degree (BA, BS, BSE, BBA, etc.) (1)

Master's Degree (MA, MS, MSW, MPH, etc.) (2)

Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) (3)

Other (please explain): (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Unsure/don't know (5)

**Q4.** Prior to your participation in the Mini Grant program, were you paid to work in any other roles for the Library?

Yes (1)

No (2)

If Q4 = Yes, display this question:

**Q5.** When were you employed by the Library? (For example, "Fall 2018" or "September through December 2018")

If Q5 = Yes, display this question:

**Q6.** Briefly describe your position and indicate which department.

**Q7.** During or after your participation in the Mini Grant program, were you paid to work in any other roles for the Library?

Yes (1)

No (2)

If Q7 = Yes, display this question:

**Q8.** When were you employed by the Library? (For example, "Fall 2018" or "September through December 2018")

If Q8 = Yes, display this question:

**Q9.** Briefly describe your position and indicate which department.

**Q10.** Do you believe that your experience with a Mini Grant project **helped you grow** in any of the following skill areas?

	Yes	No	Not Applicable
Communication skills (e.g. written communication, communicating with co-workers)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional skills (e.g. ability to work in an office, meeting deadlines, teamwork ability)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Critical thinking (e.g. problem solving, analytical thinking, evaluating outcomes)

  

Academic skills (e.g. researching, analytical reading, applying theory to practice)

  

Humanitarianism (e.g. cultural awareness, community engagement)

  

If Q10 = No, display this question:

**Q11.** You answered "no" to one or more of the listed skill areas. Please use the space below to share more.

**Q12.** Are there other skill areas not mentioned above that you would like to mention as part of your Library Mini Grant experience?

As you continue to reflect on your project experience and your connections to the Library during the project award period, you will be presented a series of statements and asked to indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

**Q13.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements. (Section 1 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
My use of library spaces impacted my project positively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My use of library resources impacted my project positively.

My library mentor impacted my project positively.

My library mentor provided me with appropriate support to complete my project to my satisfaction.

**Q14.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements. (Section 2 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
I practiced my public presentation skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced professionalism.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I practiced effective interpersonal communication.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced effective problem solving.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced effective teamwork.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced intercultural competence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q15.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements. (Section 3 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
I became more aware of library resources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I enhanced my library research skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have more confidence in using library resources, services, and spaces.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have more confidence in contacting and/or working with Library staff.

**Q16.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements. (Section 4 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
Participating in the Library Mini Grant program was a meaningful part of my educational experience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participating in the Library Mini Grant program motivated me to explore or clarify my career goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If asked, I would recommend participation in the Library Mini Grant program to my peers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q17.** Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience with the Library Mini Grant program and your project(s)?

**Q18.** Please enter your email below if you'd like to be entered into the drawing for a small prize of Library-themed items. You may also indicate if you're interested in helping us further by participating in a short online interview in April 2020. Clicking Next will submit your survey and your name into the drawing.

**Q19.** Are you interested in participating in further research with the Library Mini Grant program, such as taking part in a short online interview in April 2020? (Y/N)

## Library Engagement Fellows Survey

### Introduction

As a current or former Library Engagement Fellows program participant, we invite you to share your experience about this unique learning and employment opportunity in a brief survey. Your feedback is helpful to our program research, and will be used in the development of future Library Engagement Fellows projects and student support. The survey will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time. All responses will be confidential and reported at an aggregate level only. Data collected will be used to understand and enhance future Library student engagement programs in general, and the Library Engagement Fellows program specifically. Completing the survey will enter you into a drawing for a prize of Skullcandy earbuds. One winner will be randomly selected and notified by email after May 3, 2020, and the prize will be mailed.

Beginning this survey indicates your consent to participate. If you have questions about this survey or the data gathering process, please contact Mary Rolfes ([morolfes@umich.edu](mailto:morolfes@umich.edu)), Library Research Assistant.

**Q1.** Please indicate which semester(s) you worked as a Library Engagement Fellow. Select all that apply.

- Fall 2018
- Winter 2019
- Fall 2019
- Winter 2020

**Q2.** Please briefly **describe the project(s) you completed** during the period you were employed as a Library Engagement Fellow.

**Q3. Which type of degree were you pursuing at the University of Michigan during your time as an Engagement Fellow?**

- Bachelor's degree (BA, BS, BSE, BBA, etc.)
- Master's Degree (MA, MS, MSW, MPH, etc.)
- Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD, etc.)
- Other (please explain: \_\_\_\_\_)
- Unsure/don't know

**Q4. How did you find out about the Library Engagement Fellows program? Select all that apply.**

- Library website ([www.lib.umich.edu](http://www.lib.umich.edu))
- Campus student employment website
- Referred by a friend
- Encouraged to apply by my academic department, faculty, staff, instructor, etc.
- Became aware while utilizing library services, resources, programs, etc.
- Other (please explain): \_\_\_\_\_
- Unsure/don't know

**Q5. Prior to your employment as a Library Engagement Fellow, were you paid to work in any other role(s) for the Library?**

- Yes
- No

If yes, display this question:

When? Select all that apply.

- Before Fall 2017
- Fall 2017
- Winter 2018
- Spring/Summer 2018
- Fall 2018
- Winter 2019
- Spring/Summer 2019
- Fall 2019
- Winter 2020



Please briefly describe that library position.

**Q6.** During or after your employment as a Library Engagement Fellow, were you paid to work in any other role(s) for the Library?

- Yes
- No

If yes, display this question:

When? Select all that apply.

- Fall 2018
- Winter 2019
- Spring/Summer 2019
- Fall 2019
- Winter 2020

Please briefly describe that library position.

**Q7.** Do you believe that your experience working as a Library Engagement Fellow helped you grow in any of the following broad skill areas?

	Yes	No	Not applicable
Communication skills (e.g. written communication, communicating with co-workers)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional skills (e.g. ability to work in an office, meeting deadlines, collaboration or teamwork ability, project management, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Critical thinking skills (e.g. problem solving, analytical thinking, evaluating outcomes, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic skills (e.g. researching, analytical reading, applying theory to practice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Human skills (e.g. cultural awareness, partnership building, global engagement, diversity/equity/inclusion practices, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If no for any response, display this question:

You answered "no" to one or more of the listed skill areas. Please use the space below to share briefly explain.

**Q8.** Are there **other skill areas not mentioned above** that you would like to mention as part of your Library Engagement Fellow experience?

As you continue to reflect on your experience as a Library Engagement Fellow and the projects in which you participated, you will be presented with a series of statements and asked to indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

**Q9.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements **about your learning**. (Section 1 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
I understood how to effectively use library spaces.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I became aware of how a Library operates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned how to effectively use library resources (media, databases, websites, online journals, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned how to employ appropriate research methodologies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I learned how to use new software, technology, and/or equipment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q10.** Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements **about your project supervisor and/or mentor** (the person that hired you and/or directed your work). (Section 2 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
My supervisor/mentor provided an appropriate level of job training.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor/mentor communicated with me regularly about my role, duties, project work, deadlines, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor/mentor provided me with appropriate regular support to successfully complete my Library Engagement Fellow project.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor/mentor connected me to other Library staff that had an interest or a role in my work/project.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor/mentor helped me incorporate diversity, equity, inclusion, and	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

accessibility values  
into my work.

**Q11.** Continuing to reflect on your experience as a Library Engagement Fellow, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements **about your employment.** (Section 3 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
I practiced public presentation skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced professionalism.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced effective interpersonal communication.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced written communication.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced effective problem solving.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced effective teamwork.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I practiced time management.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I practiced intercultural competence.

I practiced my computer or technology skills and literacy (e.g. G suite, Microsoft Office, Qualtrics, OCLC, etc.)

I practiced project management.

**Q12.** Continuing to reflect on your experience as a Library Engagement Fellow, please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements **about your overall experience**. (Section 4 of 4)

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
Participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program provided me with useful skills for future employment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program was a meaningful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

part of my U-M educational experience.

Participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program motivated me to explore or clarify my career aspirations.

Participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program allowed me to develop a lasting relationship with my supervisor/mentor.

If asked, I would recommend participation in the Library Engagement Fellows program to my peers.

**Q13.** Is there anything else you would like to share about your employment experience with the Library Engagement Fellows program?

**Q14.** Please enter your email below if you'd like to be entered into the drawing for a prize of Skullcandy headphones. Clicking Next will submit your survey and your name into the drawing.

# Appendix E. Transfer & Commuter Student Focus Group Protocol

## Goals of Assessment Project and of Focus Groups

Learning Programs & Initiatives staff provide library support to University of Michigan transfer students on the Ann Arbor campus. Our assessment project goal is to assess transfer student library needs for the purpose of practical library programming, library resource allocation and development, and library service design initiatives. We are interested in discovering more about the transfer student engagement with the Library spaces, services, and resources over the last 1-2 years, and perhaps the impact of that engagement on their learning outcomes. Our goal is to use focus groups to learn about this population's experiences, as first revealed in a targeted survey which was distributed in January 2020.

## Methodology and Participants

The assessment project team (Mary Rolfes, Alex Deeke, and Karen Reiman-Sendi) conducted two small focus groups (4 people total) on April 16 and April 17, 2020. Each focus group session was approximately 60-minutes long, and was held online via BlueJeans video conferencing due to building and service closures related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants were identified by responses to the survey sent to transfer students in January 2020; they were invited to participate in these focus groups via email. (See email invitation in Appendix A.) Each participant virtually signed a consent form presented in a Google form before the questions were posed (see Appendix B). Each participant was sent a link to the "Library Guide for Transfer Students" to review beforehand in preparation. Ten dollar gift cards were offered by the Library's Assessment Specialist as incentive. (Note: everyone received a \$15 gift card.)

## Focus Group Interview Script

### **Welcome/Introduction**

Interviewer will welcome everyone to the online format, acknowledging the inherent challenge to conversation in an online environment. Ask everyone to briefly introduce themselves, specifically sharing name, major if known, and previous institution (from where they transferred). And then ask them to mute their microphones if they are participating in a less-than-private place.

### *Interviewer:*

"Thank you for your time in coming to talk with us about your experience as a transfer student on the U-M Ann Arbor campus. Because you took our Library survey for transfer students earlier this year, the purpose of this group interview is to gather additional feedback, comments, and

ideas so that the Library can continue to support your unique needs while discovering future program, service, or space ideas that may not have been revealed in our survey questions and your responses.

To help us all share in this conversation, I'd like to outline some logistics and conversation norms. I will be asking you questions and my partner [name] will be taking notes about your comments. We won't be recording this conversation (audio or video), and we've locked down the ability for any one in the group to record. Even though I'm asking questions, I encourage you all to react and comment on anything that anyone says during our session. We want this to be a conversation as much as possible. Please be aware that there are no right or wrong responses to these questions. If at any time there is a question that you would prefer not to answer, we can skip that. You may also end the interview at any point. At one point in the conversation, I'll share my screen with you, to show you a web page that we'd like to get some feedback on.

During this conversation, you will be asked questions related to your individual experience as a transfer student. I'll ask that you reflect on that identity from Fall 2019 to present when answering these questions. Our informal conversation will last no longer than 60 minutes, and everything you say will be treated confidentially. Your comments will be grouped into themes for our final report. In our email invitation, we shared our consent form, which indicates that you agreed to participate in this focus group. Thank you.

Do you have any questions? Let's begin with the questions we have for you."

### Questions

1. I'd like you to reflect on your previous institution, the place you transferred from. Could you say a little bit about what you thought about your library at that institution?
  - a. *What comes to mind when you think of the library there?*
  - b. *How would you describe your use of that library?*
  - c. *What did you like about that library? Didn't like?*
2. According to our earlier survey, individual study and work were the number one reasons students use the University of Michigan library. How would you describe your library use here?
  - a. *What library spaces best support the ways you use the library (prior to pandemic?)*
3. Let's say you were in charge of designing a new library space aimed at transfer and commuter students. What would that space look like?
  - a. *What are the features or characteristics of that space?*
  - b. *What would you prioritize for such a space? (Location, furniture, lighting, nearby services, access to library staff, electrical outlets, WiFi hubs, etc.)*
4. Our survey found that some of the most important factors in choosing which campus library to visit are the tools, software, and technology the library offers. Does that ring true for you? Why?
5. The survey also found that the library's physical collection of books, magazines, DVDs, journals, etc., is the least important factor. Does that ring true for you? Why?



6. The Library has library experts and subject/discipline-specific experts available to help you with your academic research. Have you asked for library-specific help from library staff this academic year? Why or why not?
  - a. *What would make you interested in contacting library staff or librarians in the future?*
7. What would you suggest to improve availability to library resources for transfer students?
8. I'm going to share my screen with you now. One of the resources that the library provides is this online research guide, named "Library Guide for Transfer Students." You would have seen a link within our previous email. While we're looking at this together, I invite you to tell me where to navigate.
  - a. *What do you find helpful? Are there any changes you would make to this resource (tools, links, text, videos, design, sections, etc.)?*
9. What motivates you to attend certain university-sponsored activities and events hosted on campus? This includes things such as speaker lectures, panels, academic department symposia or colloquia, exhibits, film viewings, and university-hosted lunches or dinners.
  - a. *What type of events do you not like to attend on campus, and why?*
10. What transfer student-specific events do you like to attend? This could include transfer student dinners, transfer-specific advising presentations, and transfer student social events.
  - a. *Would you be interested in attending similar events hosted by the library? What event could the library host that would encourage you to attend?*
11. We're interested in knowing what motivated you to respond to our library survey. What about the focus group? Could you share a reason for your participation?
  - a. *What motivated you to sign up for a follow up focus group?*
12. Is there anything else you'd like to share about your experiences with the library?

### **Questions Specifically for Commuters**

13. Do you think your identity as a commuter student impacts your library experience? If so, how?
14. Many commuter students who took our survey reported visiting the library mainly on Mondays through Thursdays, and in the afternoons, based on proximity to their classes. Does this capture your library use preferences? Why/why not?
15. What changes or enhancements to the library would be beneficial to you as a commuter student?

### **Conclusion Script**

Interviewer:

"Thank you again for participating in this conversation. We appreciate the time that you have taken to talk with us. We'll be in touch with you about your \$10 gift cards in the next few days. If you have further questions or thoughts about the library as experienced by transfer students, please feel free to contact us."

## Appendix F. Email Invitation to Focus Groups

Hi there,

Happy Transfer Student Appreciation Week! Having recently completed the Transfer Student Library Survey, you are receiving this email because you indicated an interest in participating in further research with this Library project. We are reaching out now to invite you to participate in a focus group.

We will hold focus groups (that is, small group interviews) during March 9th - March 20th. Each focus group session will last no more than 1 hour, and food will be provided at each meeting. Please fill out the following form indicating your availability. The form also includes a question on transfer student identity; this question helps us organize focus groups by specific populations within the transfer student community.

Please follow the link to the form here: [\[link to form\]](#)

We will follow up with you within the next two weeks to schedule your focus group session.

Thank you for your continued interest in this research project and for sharing your experiences. Your input is very helpful in our assessment of transfer student experience with the Library.

Sincerely,  
Alex Deeke & Mary Rolfes  
Library Research Team

## Appendix G. Transfer Student Informed Consent Statement



### Transfer Student Research Project: Focus Group Informed Consent Statement

Thank you for agreeing to participate in a focus group about the library needs of transfer students. Your responses will be used to better understand aspects of the library programs, spaces, and services as experienced by transfer students on the Ann Arbor campus.

During our conversation, you will be asked questions related to your experience as a transfer student. You have the right to decline to answer any question or to end your participation in this focus group at any time.

No identifiable information will be shared beyond the participant group.

*I agree to participate in this focus group.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (Please print.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Appendix H. Survey Invitations

### **Transfer student participants:**

Hello,

The University of Michigan Library is conducting a study on transfer student experience with the library. You are invited to share your experience by filling out a short online survey. The purpose of the study is to better understand library spaces, services and programs for transfer students. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes.

By completing the survey and providing your email address, you will be entered in a drawing to win 1 of 2 prizes of up to \$100 at the Computer Showcase.

Please click this link if you wish to participate: [\[link\]](#)

If you have any questions or concerns, please email Mary Rolfes at [morolfes@umich.edu](mailto:morolfes@umich.edu).

Thank you for your contribution!

The Library Engagement Fellows Research & Evaluation Team

### **Mini grant program participants:**

Hello,

The University of Michigan Library is conducting a study on the Library's Student Mini Grant program. As a participant in this program, you are invited to share your experience by filling out a short online survey. The purpose of the study is to evaluate and develop future library programming. The survey will take no more than 10 minutes.

By completing the survey and providing your email address, you will be entered in a drawing to win one of three prizes of Library-themed items. Prizes will be mailed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please email Mary Rolfes at [morolfes@umich.edu](mailto:morolfes@umich.edu).

Please click the link below to begin the survey. Thank you for your contribution, and please stay healthy and well.

**Library Engagement Fellows participants:**

Hello,

The University of Michigan Library Research & Evaluation Team is conducting a study on the Library Engagement Fellows program. As a current or former participant in this program, you are invited to share your experience by filling out a short online survey. The purpose of the study is to evaluate and develop future library programming. The survey will take no more than 10 minutes.

By completing the survey and providing your email address, you will be entered in a drawing to win a prize of Skullcandy earbuds. The prize will be mailed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please email Mary Rolfes at [morolfes@umich.edu](mailto:morolfes@umich.edu). Please click the link below to begin the survey. Thank you for your contribution, and stay healthy and well.

## Appendix I. Transfer & Commuter Student Survey - Detailed Tables

When is your expected graduation date?

May 2020	1%	2
August 2020	0%	0
December 2020	0%	0
May 2021	42%	85
August 2021	2%	4
December 2021	10%	21
May 2022	36%	74
August 2022	1%	2
December 2022	3%	7
May 2023	4%	9
August 2023	0%	0
December 2023	0%	0
Total	100%	204

Which type of higher education institution did you attend immediately before transferring to the University of Michigan?

International College/University (non-U.S. based)	17%	41
2-year U.S. Community College/Technical College	37%	86
4-year U.S. Private College/University	8%	19
4-year U.S. Public College/University	38%	89
Total	100%	235

Which best describes your typical commute to campus?

I live outside of Ann Arbor, and I drive or use public transportation to commute to campus	14%	34
I live in Ann Arbor, more than a 15 minute walk from campus	20%	46
I live in Ann Arbor, less than a 15 minute walk from campus	64%	150
Other	2%	5
Total	100%	235

Other answers: "on campus housing in the dorms"; "I live in Ann Arbor, but far enough away to where it is a 15-20 minute drive to get to campus"; "I live on the outskirts of Ann Arbor; roughly a 15-20 min drive"; "I live on campus"; "I live outside of campus, and drive more than 20 minutes from school and try to find parking"

On average, how often do you physically visit at least one of the University of Michigan Libraries?

Answer	Percentage	Count
Most days each week	24%	57
A few times a week	23%	55
Once a week	10%	23
A few times a month	22%	51
Once a month	9%	22
Once a semester	6%	14
Never	6%	13
Total	100%	235

Which library do you consider your primary library?

Shapiro Undergraduate Library (UgLi)	54.3%	120
Hatcher Graduate Library	22.6%	50
Art, Architecture & Engineering Library	20.8%	46

(Duderstadt Center)		
Other:	1.8%	4
Music Library	0.05%	1
Taubman Health Sciences Library	0.0%	0
Total	100%	221

What day(s) do you typically visit your primary library? Check all that apply.

Monday	17%	135
Tuesday	17%	135
Wednesday	18%	144
Thursday	18%	141
Friday	11%	86
Saturday	8%	67
Sunday	11%	85
Total	100%	794

In general, when during the day do you most frequently visit your primary library?

Morning	6%	14
Afternoon	43%	96
Evening	41%	91
Late night/overnight	9%	21
Total	100%	222

What reason(s) do you visit your primary library? Check all that apply.

Individual study or homework	37%	187
Check out items (books, media, supplies)	6%	30
Browse library items	2%	12
Meet with other students to	20%	103



study or complete course work		
Meet with other students to relax or socialize	6%	29
Meet with library staff	0%	1
Attend library events	1%	7
Purchase food	7%	37
Use computers, printers, or other technology resources	17%	89
Use specialized library resources (e.g., course reserves, Special Collections, maps)	2%	12
Other:	1%	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>511</b>

Other: "Office hours"; "Shop at the computer showcase"; "I'm in the area and need somewhere nice to spend the time between my classes"; "work"

What reason(s) do you visit any of the University of Michigan libraries? Check all that apply.

Individual study or homework	32%	196
Check out items (books, media, supplies)	7%	41
Browse library items	4%	25
Meet with other students to study or complete course work	19%	116
Meet with other students to relax or socialize	6%	34
Meet with library staff	0%	2
Attend library events	2%	14
Purchase food	9%	55
Use computers, printers, or other technology resources	17%	101

Use specialized library resources (e.g., course reserves, Special Collections, maps)	4%	22
Other:	0%	0
Total	100%	606

How important are the following accessibility factors in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/Not Applicable		Total
Hours of service	8%	18	7%	15	27%	59	57%	126	2%	4	222
Proximity to where I live	10%	23	5%	11	26%	57	55%	122	4%	9	222
Proximity to where I have class	5%	11	9%	19	24%	52	61%	134	2%	4	220
Proximity to where I work	29%	63	10%	22	13%	29	17%	37	31%	69	220
Proximity to where I park my car	32%	70	7%	16	10%	21	15%	34	36%	80	221

How important are the following environmental factors in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/Not Applicable		Total
The library's physical design (e.g. furniture placement, interior design)	9%	21	15%	34	36%	80	38%	85	1%	2	222
The library's space design (e.g. room size, windows, lighting)	6%	14	12%	26	32%	72	49%	109	0%	1	222
An atmosphere that allows for collaboration, conversation, or more	10%	22	17%	37	25%	56	47%	104	1%	3	222

casual work											
An atmosphere that allows for dedicated individual or quiet study/work	3%	6	5%	10	16%	35	76%	168	1%	3	222

How important are the following service factors in determining your choice of library?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/Not Applicable		Total
The library's collection (books, magazines, journals, media, etc.)	28%	62	25%	55	23%	51	22%	48	3%	6	222
The library offers tools, software, and technology that I need	9%	21	12%	26	34%	76	43%	96	1%	3	222
The library offers staff, such as librarians and subject specialists that are helpful to me	16%	35	21%	46	35%	77	26%	58	2%	5	221
The library offers events, programs, and workshops that are relevant to my needs	24%	52	25%	54	32%	71	16%	36	3%	7	220

How important are the following library services to you?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion /Not Applicable		Total
Online services (website, catalog, research databases, Ask a Librarian, etc.)	10%	21	15%	33	29%	64	45%	99	2%	4	221
Physical library collections (books,	19%	42	24%	52	34%	76	21%	47	2%	4	221

magazines, journals, etc.)											
Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	27%	59	16%	36	25%	54	15%	33	17%	37	219
In-person staff or librarian service	16%	36	24%	53	32%	70	22%	49	6%	13	221

How important are the following library spaces to you?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/ Not Applicable		Total
Collaborative working areas	7%	16	15%	34	32%	71	44%	98	1%	2	221
Individual working areas	2%	5	3%	6	12%	27	81%	180	1%	3	221
Quiet or distraction free areas	2%	4	4%	8	16%	35	78%	172	1%	2	221
Comfortable furniture	2%	4	5%	11	24%	54	68%	150	1%	2	221
Private study rooms	4%	8	11%	24	23%	50	61%	134	2%	5	221

How important are the following library resources to you?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/ Not Applicable		Total
Printers (black & white, color, 3D, posters)	3%	7	5%	12	18%	40	72%	160	1%	2	221
Computers	11%	25	17%	37	29%	63	42%	93	1%	3	221
Scanning & copying	8%	18	15%	34	22%	49	52%	116	2%	4	221
Electrical outlets and/or charging stations	2%	4	3%	6	14%	30	81%	189	0%	1	221

Which of the following library accessibility factors contribute to your response?

	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable/ No opinion		Total
The hours of the libraries do not work with my schedule	8%	1	77%	10	15%	2	13
The libraries are not close to where I live	69%	9	31%	4	0%	0	13

The libraries are not close to where I have classes	50%	6	50%	6	0%	0	12
The libraries are not close to where I work	17%	2	42%	5	42%	5	12
The libraries are not close to where I park my car	23%	3	31%	4	46%	6	13

Which of the following library space factors contribute to your response?

	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable/ No opinion		Total
The physical design (e.g. furniture, interior design) is unappealing to me	31%	4	54%	7	15%	2	13
The space design (e.g. room size, windows, lighting) is unappealing to me	38%	5	46%	6	15%	2	13
The atmosphere does not allow for collaboration ,conversation, or casual work	38%	5	54%	7	8%	1	13
The atmosphere does not allow for dedicated individual or quiet study/work	38%	5	46%	6	15%	2	13

Which of the following library resources factors contribute to your response?

	Agree		Disagree		Not Applicable /No opinion		Total
Materials in the library's physical collection (books, magazines, journals, media, etc.) are not necessary for my coursework	46%	6	38%	5	15%	2	13
The library does not offer services, tools, software, or technology that I need	31%	4	54%	7	15%	2	13
The library staff, such as librarians and subject specialists, are not necessary for my work	62%	8	23%	3	15%	2	13
My coursework does not require me to visit the library	77%	10	23%	3	0%	0	13

Related to library services, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/ Not Applicable		Total
Online services (website, catalog, research databases, Ask a Librarian, etc.)	8%	1	15%	2	31%	4	46%	6	0%	0	13

Physical library collections (books, magazines, journals, etc.)	15%	2	38%	5	23%	3	23%	3	0%	0	13
Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	8%	1	38%	5	15%	2	31%	4	8%	1	13
In-person staff or librarian service	8%	1	23%	3	38%	5	31%	4	0%	0	13

Related to library space, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/ Not Applicable		Total
Collaborative working areas	23%	3	23%	3	8%	1	46%	6	0%	0	13
Individual working areas	8%	1	8%	1	8%	1	15%	2	69%	9	13
Quiet or distraction free areas	8%	1	0%	0	8%	1	85%	11	0%	9	13
Comfortable furniture	8%	1	0%	0	15%	2	77%	10	0%	0	13

Related to library resources, how important would the following be in increasing your future engagement with the University of Michigan libraries?

	Not Important		Slightly Important		Moderately Important		Very important		No opinion/ Not Applicable		Total
Printers (black & white, color, 3D, posters)	8%	1	15%	2	15%	2	54%	7	8%	1	13
Computers	8%	1	0%	0	46%	6	46%	6	0%	0	13
Scanning & copying	8%	1	15%	2	8%	1	69%	9	0%	0	13
Electrical outlets and/or charging stations	8%	1	8%	1	8%	1	77%	10	0%	0	13

Are there any other library services, spaces, or resources that would increase your usage of the library?

- "A more inviting setting. It needs to be updated"
- "No"

The library offers a variety of resources, services, and events for transfer students. Which of the following have you used? Check all that apply.

Fall Welcome & Library Expo during Welcome Week	18%	38
Library Basics Workshop & Tour	14%	31
Library Services for Transfer Students website	10%	21
Library Guide for Transfer Students	15%	32
"Welcome to the Library" video	14%	30
Ask a Librarian service or other research help	30%	64
Total	100%	216

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the Fall Welcome & Library Expo event?

- *Pair the transfers with a big brother/sister.*

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the Library Basics Workshop & Tour?

- *It will help more people if there is an online version of the introduction in video form.*
- *Pointing out where some collections are would be helpful.*

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the Library Services for Transfer Students website?

- *I know some students are older and might not understand the workings of the website as easily as I can, so possibly a quick online tutorial video might help!*

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the Library Guide for Transfer Students?

- *Further help on how to utilized lib.umich.edu*
- *No. Maybe a map*
- *More quiet study space at Shapiro*

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the 'Welcome to the Library' video?

- *No, I loved it!*

Do you have any comments, thoughts, or ways to improve the Ask a Librarian service or other research help?

- 24/7 librarians available
- extend hours on weekends
- No, very good.
- Not really... but when I expended the knowledge of the employee they simply referred me to the online catalog (which I knew of already).
- Overall I have found it very helpful! I have used it for smaller questions that can be answered fairly quickly.
- It's really great. Staff are always ready to help.

Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience with the University of Michigan Library? We welcome any constructive feedback, new ideas, or suggestions for areas to improve.

- *The University of Michigan Library is a critical part of the university and is currently performing at a very high rate of efficiency.*
- *I love all Michigan libraries. Shapiro is a little noise and distracting for me, good to socialize though*
- *I very much enjoy quiet areas where individual work can be accomplished*
- *Y'all are doing great*
- *I wanted to go on some of the tours in the beginning of the year but I couldn't make any of the times.*
- *More comfortable chairs on second floor of the UGLi*
- *Duderstadt is very confusing to locate specific places and materials*
- *I honestly love the libraries. I go there all the time, to either get food or print something out or chill with friends OR the most important aspect—studying! I do group studies and private studying. I do casual studying in the library that's essentially just sitting on a couch lazily writing an essay, and I do all-nighter intense studying in the Ugli. Possibly having more therapy lamps would help!*
- *The libraries are nice and very convenient*
- *I always get lost in Shapiro, and I don't like how the computer expo is always trying to sell stuff there. I don't get down to Central campus very often but when I do I try to avoid Shapiro Library- It seems kind of exclusionary, like the vibe makes it seem like I'm not welcome there, either as an engineering student, a poor kid, or something else. It makes me seem like an outsider. And the bathrooms were closed on the first floor every time I went there, which was really frustrating because it left me having to pee without knowing where the nearest other bathroom was- Put directions on the "bathroom closed for construction" signs. It's not so hard, and it really makes the whole bathroom being closed experience significantly less painful for newcomers at least.*
- *I wish it was quieter.*
- *I found it very hard to find a book I was looking for, and I also returned the book late, only to be confronted with a \$90 late fine without being alerted that I was being fined. It was shocking and I doubt I will ever check out another book from the u of m library.*
- *I really would like new chairs in those carrels. I do understand that there many but I believe it is a much needed quality of life improvement. Personally I have spent upwards*



*of 12 hours in one day in those hard old wooden chairs on the 5th floor and it is truly very uncomfortable.*

- *Vending machine that works 24 hours, has bottled coffee/energy drinks and snacks.*  
*Better chair and seating*
- *Maybe put in more whiteboards*
- *More plugs/outlets/charging stations*  
*More chairs with tables, not just couches or chairs without tables*
- *I would prefer more quiet space as my attention deficits worsens when there is noise.*
- *Please keep hatcher open later or offer ssd rooms in more than just the hatcher building.*
- *I did not know a lot about the resources the library offered. I would do more to explain all of the resources to transfer students*
- *I really appreciate the wide variety of foreign language books you offer (especially the 4th floor Asian languages section in Hatcher) but as someone in the intermediate level learning the language I have a hard time searching the online database and the physical library for a section of good books for intermediate level readers. If you guys could provide or develop a list online of suggested books for someone studying a language that would be really helpful!*
- *I transferred from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the libraries at which are significantly better than those here at Michigan. Given the enormous size of alumni endowment and absurdly expensive tuition fees this school charges from international and out-of-state students, I was appalled to see how few decent libraries there are here when I arrived. After a few visits to Ugli, I entirely quit the idea of studying there, where no private study space can be found and people talk out loud with each other on every floor, also the bathrooms are poorly maintained. Now I only go to the Hatcher Library, on the fourth of which houses a few small study cubicles, and the environment is quiet.*
- *I would love to see more individual study spaces, especially in the UGLI, on the weekends tables fill up with only two people when there are four seats and it denies students their own place to study away from distractions.*
- *As previously stated: it is a little strange to have handicap inaccessible ramps on the North side of the Hatcher library.*
- *Have pamphlets that explain library layout/features and include noise levels as information*
- *I appreciate that the UGLi has a cafe in it. I feel like there could be a few more tables on the 3rd floor.*
- *Sometimes students are too loudy in study carrel section at Hatcher.*
- *My experience has been wonderful at the libraries.*
- *They are simply tooooooo noisy. Everybody is talking even in quiet area!*
- *Have more fun activities for transfer students throughout the first semester*
- *If possible adding more tables and chairs on the ground floor*
- *Maybe advertise the study spaces better? Being a transfer student, you don't know a lot of good places to study unless you stumble upon them or meet someone there. So having a guide to study spaces in the libraries would be helpful.*
- *Need more accessible outlets in the ugli*

- *Not that I can think of. Maybe more information about workshops and events happening as I am not familiar with any*
- *As a transfer student starting my second semester, I am not even sure where the library is. This in part indicates that the library was not very present in the orientation process.*