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Health Sciences Assessment at UNC Charlotte:  
A Collection Development Fellowship

Stephen Krueger

Stephen G. Krueger is currently the Access and Outreach Services Librarian at Randolph College. He can be reached at skrueger@randolphcollege.edu

Introduction and Background

The Library

The J. Murrey Atkins Library at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte serves over 21,000 undergraduates and over 4,000 graduate students. Apart from the sole branch library (Arts & Architecture), all of the resources are housed in the main building. In 2016, a plan was developed for a comprehensive weeding project. Two primary factors made this necessary. One was the adaptive nature of the library’s philosophy; student needs and preferences were constantly assessed, and changes were made to the library’s services and spaces based on them. The creation of a makerspace, a family-friendly study room, and other student workspaces meant less room for shelving, as did additional staff offices. Another factor was the fact that the collection had not previously been systematically weeded. Shelves were overfilled, and parts of the collection were outdated or redundant. The combined needs for physical space and for a decluttered collection meant that a comprehensive rightsizing project was in order.

The Fellowship

In the summer of 2016, the Atkins Library offered its second round of full-time, short-term fellowships for library and information science students. These were designed to focus on projects that the staff had not had the time to do, simultaneously enhancing the library and providing practical experience. The six fellowships lasted eleven weeks; each fellow worked with library staff in a specific area. In this particular project, the fellow worked with the collection development librarian and the Health & Human Services librarian to assess part of the collection. This fellowship was something of an assessment microcosm, developing a process on a part of the collection to then apply to the library’s long-term rightsizing plan. Several different approaches were combined to address the different aspects of assessment. Collection development policies were drafted for the general collection and for the Health & Human Services subject area; these served as guides for collection decisions. Immediate assessment fell into two categories: purchase recommendations and deselection. The first concerned updating the collection, with a focus on electronic resources. A survey was created that asked health sciences librarians from peer institutions what databases and other online resources they and their patrons found most useful. For individual titles, core lists and LibGuides were used to assess the collection and to suggest additions. To start the much-needed weeding project, items were chosen for deselection based on age and use. Throughout the project, an annotated bibliography was kept for the reference of others doing similar projects in the future. Another survey was created that would go out to Health & Human Services faculty in the fall to gather their thoughts on electronic resources.

This fellowship focused primarily on health sciences resources, but the processes developed will be applied to other subject areas in the Atkins library. It can be viewed as a complete collection assessment project in miniature, with aspects that can inspire and help all sorts of different projects. The project was presented in the form of a poster at the 2016 Charleston Library Conference under the title “Efficient Deselection and Other Stories: A Fellowship at UNC Charlotte.”

Literature Review

General Collection Development

There are several books that provide overviews and general instructions on collection management. The work of Evans and Saponaro (2012) is suitable for students or librarians without much experience in the area; the chapters go through the various aspects of collection management in different types of libraries, and there are examples and suggestions for further reading. Johnson (2014) offers greater depth and specificity on similar themes, which is useful for a practicing librarian.

Collection Development Policies

Both of the books mentioned above include a section on general policy writing. Evans and Saponaro (2012) discuss the purpose, potential uses, and typical contents of such a document. Johnson (2014) gives more practical guidelines, supported with sample policies from different types of libraries. Scholarly articles go into more detail than the books on particular topics. In their case study of Texas A&M University, Pickett et al. (2011) cover the history of the collection development policy before describing the creation of their own. The balance of details and general information make it possible for similar institutions to follow their example. Part of that project involved the development of subject-specific policies, a topic that
McGuigan and White (2003) cover in more detail. They include sample documents from their own program. Ketterman (2012) describes a neuroscience policy designed in cooperation with the Health Sciences Library at East Carolina University in order to eliminate duplication between the two programs. Electronic resources are another area that is becoming more common in collection development policies. Mangrum and Pozzebon (2012) conducted a content analysis of policies across 41 institutions, looking for how and to what extent they included e-resources. Their criteria can be adapted into guidelines for writing an e-resources policy or section, as can the elements listed in the work on e-resource collection development by Johnson, Evensen, Gelfand, Lammers, and Zilper (2012). One oft-overlooked aspect is that of publicizing a new or updated collection development policy; Partanen (2015) demonstrates how to effectively inform the public in a brief announcement.

**Deselection**

Whether one chooses to call it weeding, rightsizing, or another name entirely, deselection has been written about fairly extensively. Johnson (2014) has a section on it that is a good overview. Ward (2015) devotes the entire book to her large-scale ‘rightsizing’ model for academic libraries. Case studies can be incredibly useful, as one can pull ideas from the procedure of a comparable institution. Describing a large-scale weeding project at the University of Ireland Maynooth, Murphy (2013) details collaborations with staff and, most usefully, reports on recommended changes and future plans. Soma and Sjoberg (2010) start in the early planning stages of another long-term project; they go into excellent detail and include some of the forms used to make decisions as well as the FAQ put on the library website. A very different example comes from Arbeeny and Chittenden (2014); it involves a rushed project at a smaller college. The authors share the specific spreadsheets and filters used to choose titles for deselection.

**Electronic Resources**

While many of the selection criteria for print apply to other formats also, the logistics of managing e-resources can be very different. Johnson’s (2013) book goes methodically through the steps involved in selecting, acquiring, and managing e-resources, including licensing and interacting with vendors. Collins and Carr (2008) provide a similar overview, from budgeting to working with patrons; they also use case studies for examples. In their study, Flatley and Proc (2009) researched how academic librarians made their purchasing decisions. Fieldhouse and Marshall (2012) compiled essays on different aspects of collection development; these include online journals in universities, collection development policies, and open access, often with concrete examples. Taking a different approach, Morrisey (2010) details how to accurately gather data on e-resource use for collection development purposes. Other authors focus specifically on ebooks. Blummer and Kenton (2012) synthesized the contents of 91 articles into a lengthy literature review on ebooks in academic libraries. Kaplan’s (2012) book includes library and publisher perspectives, collection management information, and case studies from several institution types. Polanka (2011) addresses purchasing, Open Access, e-readers, and digital textbooks. Reporting on a case study from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Tucker (2012) describes analysis of the ebook collection.

**Health Sciences Collection Development**

There are not many full books on this subject. The exception is Richards and Eakin’s (1997), which introduces the field and goes on to cover all aspects of it. With the exception of e-resources, where much has changed since its publication, the book remains a good resource. More current books on health sciences librarianship usually spend some time on collection development. Wood (2008) has a chapter each on journals, monographs, and access. Phillips (2014) provides a recent overview of health sciences collection development.

**Health Sciences Assessment**

A number of case studies have been published on assessment projects. In Shearer (2003), the Florida State University College of Medicine Medical Library created a points system based on core lists, rankings, and reviews for ranking journal titles; the article includes the resulting list. Shearer, Klatt, and Nagy (2009) took a different approach, assessing patron use of journals to measure its consistency with a core list. Moving away from journals, Ugaz and Resnick (2008) compared the use of print textbooks to their online counterparts, which resulted in a plan to purchase more medical textbooks online in future. Shisler (2007) presents guidelines for assessing nursing history books, which differ greatly from clinical texts. In a project at Michigan State University, Schroeder (2012) compared ebooks statistics to see whether those selected by the nursing librarian saw more use than those not specifically chosen, which turned out to be the case. Tobia (2002) describes a large-scale weeding project at an academic health sciences library, covering the philosophy of weeding in health sciences as well as the procedure used.

**Nursing Selection**

Title lists can be very helpful in assessing a collection or considering future purchases, and there are a number of these for nursing. The American Journal of Nursing publishes an annual recommendation list from the previous year (“Book of the Year Awards 2015,” 2016); the most recent edition had fifty titles spread over twenty subject areas. Several general texts have sections on nursing. One ALA guide (Kieft & Bennett, 2011) contains a chapter with citations and brief reviews of all kinds of nursing reference resources, from books to databases. The MLA’s guide to health sciences resources (Thompson, 2011) includes two chapters on nursing, one with theory and research (Thompson, 2011a) and one for specialties (Thompson, 2011b); it reviews books and journals and recommends them based on library type. Sherwill-Navarro and Allen
not meant to make specific collection decisions; that was left to the librarians). The fellow drafted the policy in consultation with the collection development librarian; it was then presented to the Collection Development Working Group (largely composed of subject librarians) for revision. One benefit of having a fairly generalized main policy was that then subject policies could be crafted to suit the specific needs of their areas. McGuigan and White (2003) offer excellent guidelines on what sections might be appropriate to a subject-specific policy (though that depends on the subject in question). The Health & Human Services policy (see Appendix A) was drafted in consultation with the Health & Human Services and collection development librarians. Then it was used as the basis for a template for other areas (see Appendix B). This made it easier for the subject librarians to fill out their own versions; it also ensured that the finished products would have a consistent style. The subject policies would ultimately go on the website with the main one, so they had similar goals. They were designed to contain only subject-specific information so that content from the general policy was not repeated.

The Project

Collection Development Policy

Having a collection development policy simplifies assessment decisions by providing guidelines for what the library acquires and keeps. After a period of unpopularity, these documents have made a comeback in recent years (Pickett et al., 2011). UNC Charlotte did not have one, so an early step in the project was to draft it. The descriptions and samples from Johnson (2014) helped immensely, as did consulting the websites of peer institutions. The policy was designed to be a public document for the library website. There were two goals: first, the document would provide general information for community members about how the librarians make their decisions; second, it would be a framework for staff as they manage the collection. It did not need to be overly detailed or technical, which would have defeated the first goal and limited the second (it was not meant to make specific collection decisions; that was left to the librarians). The fellow drafted the policy with the collection development librarian; it was then presented to the Collection Development Working Group (largely composed of subject librarians) for revision. One benefit of having a fairly generalized main policy was that then subject policies could be crafted to suit the specific needs of their areas. McGuigan and White (2003) offer excellent guidelines on what sections might be appropriate to a subject-specific policy (though that depends on the subject in question). The Health & Human Services policy (see Appendix A) was drafted in consultation with the Health & Human Services and collection development librarians. Then it was used as the basis for a template for other areas (see Appendix B). This made it easier for the subject librarians to fill out their own versions; it also ensured that the finished products would have a consistent style. The subject policies would ultimately go on the website with the main one, so they had similar goals. They were designed to contain only subject-specific information so that content from the general policy was not repeated.

The whole project was designed to benefit the fellow as well as the library, and the collection development policy section was an excellent example of that. Staff members did not have time to devote to creating a policy, though it had been noted as something that needed doing. The fellow gained the invaluable experience of drafting a real-world policy and working closely with staff to make sure that it met the needs of the library. In addition, this step of the project was good preparation for the next step; having the collection guidelines so fresh made assessment easier.

Surveys

One of the goals of the project was to recommend health sciences databases and other electronic resources to add to the collection. With this in mind, it was determined that feedback from other programs would be helpful. Finding out from other health sciences librarians what electronic resources their users preferred would allow UNC Charlotte to make more informed decisions on future purchases. A survey (see Appendix C) was designed with the purpose of gaining relevant information without requiring too much time and effort to fill out. It was sent out as an email with a link to the Google Form; the recipients were librarians from peer or aspirational institutions who were listed in the directories as health sciences specialists of some variety (specifics varied by program).

The second survey (see Appendix D) was designed to get information from the program’s Health & Human Services faculty. This, in combination with the first survey and other tools, would help the subject librarian develop a multi-faceted plan for deciding which materials to purchase and which to replace. In recognition of how busy faculty were likely to be in the fall, the survey was as short and easy to fill out as possible.

The two surveys dealt with the same topic (the use of electronic library resources for the health sciences) but looked at it from two different perspectives. Information from peer and aspirational institutions can provide guidance and purchase ideas, while feedback from the program’s faculty is essential to understanding how they and their students actually use the resources.

Assessment

The first step in assessing any collection is to know who the users are. In this case, this meant primarily the students, faculty, and staff of the College of Health & Human Services (CHHS) at UNC Charlotte. The collection being part of the main library and the university being public, other community members had access to the materials as well, but there was no simple way to gauge use by people outside of CHHS. The four programs in CHHS were Kinesiology, Public Health, Social Work, and Nursing. The decision was made to focus on Nursing first; an assessment procedure would be easier to develop on a smaller scale, and it could then be applied to the other programs. Nursing
was a common enough program to allow for comparison with peer institutions; another benefit was that it had a more specific call number range than some of the other more interdisciplinary programs.

Several methods were considered. One was to assess the collection as it compared to standard core title lists; another was to compare it to peer or aspirational institutions. Both of these approaches had the potential to miss parts of the program. As the fellowship was a temporary position and the fellow was not familiar with the particular needs of the CHHS and UNC Charlotte, long-term assessment was best left to the Health & Human Services librarian. The surveys described above were designed to help with that process.

Instead of assessing the full collection, the fellow focused on two more easily quantifiable aspects of assessment. The first was purchase recommendations, which could be based on core lists and peer institutions. The second was deselection, which the collection badly needed.

**Purchase Recommendations**

A number of different factors went into book purchase recommendations. The Health & Human Services librarian requested a manageable list of several titles per category. These, all under the umbrella of Nursing, reflected the organization systems of bibliographies and core lists; they included General Nursing, Administration/Management, Geriatrics, Health Policy, Informatics, Legal/Ethical Issues, Patient Education, Pharmacology, Research, and Theory. The number of recommendations varied due to the breadth of the subject and the emphasis of the program (Patient Education ended up with one title, for example, while Research had six). Google Sheets was used for organization, comparison, and easy sharing (see Fig. 1).

There were originally many more titles. These came from several different lists of recommended resources. *Doody’s Core Titles* (Doody, 2016), updated annually, provides sections for a variety of different specializations; it also stars highly recommended items, allowing libraries with limited budgets to prioritize. The Brandon/Hill list was last updated in 2003, so it lacks the currency of more recent resources, but many of the monographs on it have updated editions and the journals remain relevant. *The Medical Library Association’s Master Guide to Authoritative Information Resources in the Health Sciences* (Thompson, 2011) includes databases and serials as well as monographs and recommends resources particularly for health sciences libraries; it also notes when resources also appear on Doody’s or the Brandon/Hill list. The spreadsheet allowed for easy comparison of options within a subject area so the most relevant could be selected. When finished, the list was passed on to the Health & Human Services librarian for consideration.

The second tab on the spreadsheet contained titles found on recommended lists of nursing journals. Each entry showed whether UNC Charlotte owned the journal or accessed it through a collection, as well as print availability, subject, dates, and publisher. The third tab contained databases and other electronic resources along with notes on which peer programs subscribed to them. The subject librarian could use these lists when considering non-book items for purchase.

**Deselection**

The Atkins Library was in the planning stages of a large rightsizing project. The collection had not been methodically weeded in some time, and space was needed for study areas and special collections. The project was limited to print books; serials were going through a separate process, and ebooks did not affect the physical space issue in the library.

A pilot system was developed for choosing titles for deselection using the Library of Congress R class (which covers medicine). This was a large enough sample to demonstrate the effectiveness of different methods but not so huge as to be unmanageable. In addition, it included most of the subject areas that the fellow had worked with from the beginning. Health sciences were also easier to work with than some other subject areas might have been because of the importance of currency.

Books in the R class at the Atkins Library came to just over 26,000 titles. The information in the original list included title, author, publisher, edition, publication date, acquisition date, shelving location, genre, call number, holdings, format, number of checkouts, last checkout, OCLC number, and barcode. The list was originally sent as an Excel attachment. The size of the file was difficult for some computers to process quickly; one solution was to open it in Google Sheets and do the early filtering there. A smaller list could then be transferred to Excel, where the tools allowed for more complicated data manipulation.

To start, some simple criteria were set to get the easy candidates for deselection out of the way. One set was books where the library owned a duplicate or a more recent edition of the same title. Medical information should always be as current as possible, so outdated versions were prime weeding candidates, as were duplicates with low usage. The following procedure was applied to the original list:

1. Filter: Holdings - --- or Blank. This removes duplicate titles that are different volumes of one edition.
3. This is the point at which the whole document was copied into Excel.
4. Select the Title column. Use Conditional Formatting to highlight duplicates (call numbers might be a more precise method of checking for duplicates, but the different year on each edition makes it impossible to use in this way. There shouldn’t be too many missed by using the title).
5. Filter: Title - whatever color the duplicates are selected in.
6. Go through list and highlight older editions where newer one is owned in one color.
7. Highlight duplicate copies with low circulation in another.
8. Filter by one color at a time. Copy results into separate sheets (Duplicate copies, Newer edition owned, etc.)

There ended up being 79 duplicate titles with low circulation; these could be withdrawn immediately with no adverse effect on the collection. 365 titles were older editions where the library already owned a newer one. 80 of these had never been checked out and could also be withdrawn immediately. The others should be checked for use; those with no checkouts after the purchase of the updated edition could be withdrawn, while recent use might indicate that additional current copies should be purchased before the older one is removed.

Another set of titles was generated based on age and lack of use. The procedure was as follows:
1. Filter: Publication Date - before 2007 (This may vary by subject area. For health sciences, books over ten years may be outdated. Very old titles may be considered for special collections.)
2. Filter: Checkouts - 0
3. If moving from Google Sheets to Excel, copy and paste the document and begin work in the other program now.
4. Delete Last Checkout column (this is optional, but it is not relevant and removing it declutters the document).
5. If the range is large, this list may be unmanageable. Considering creating separate sheets for different publication date or call number ranges. That way, the smaller lists can be worked through in an organized manner.

The process resulted in over 7,000 records acquired over ten years ago and never checked out. These were split by publication date into sections of several hundred titles each, which made the project easier to break down and complete in discrete segments. Not everything on the list should be automatically weeded - the subject librarian should go over it, and faculty should be consulted - but the titles are definitely candidates for deselection.

These two sets of records are the lowest of the low-hanging fruit, but a project this large must begin somewhere. Often the scale is intimidating enough to deter potential weaders; breaking down tens of thousands of titles into sets of a few hundred gives them a place to start. Next steps, depending on the subject area, might include items with few or no recent checkouts. In time-sensitive subjects, titles with older publication dates and recent checkouts might need to be replaced with more current versions. Once the data is available, the sorting and filtering options are multitudinous and can be adapted to suit any subject or collection.

Discussion

Past Work

This project was designed to meet specific needs with practical solutions, but it is relevant to any academic library. The pressure to maintain a current collection in a limited physical space is a typical challenge. While situations vary enough that one method cannot be applied across the board, case studies can be adapted or used as inspiration. The collection development policy history and outlines laid out by Pickett et al. (2011) helped greatly with the general policy, while McGuigan and White's (2003) work on subject-specific policies was influential in that area. Ideas for what to include in a policy can be picked and chosen from such articles, while important parts might be overlooked if one were constructing the document in a vacuum.

For the deselection process, case studies were invaluable. Some of the inspiration for the Excel methods came from Arbeeny and Chittenden's (2014) work, though the specifics of their situation were quite different. Soma and Sjoberg (2010) specifically describe some of the things that they would change in future, which saves other librarians from wasting time on similar mistakes. Deselection projects often involve a fair amount of trial and error before the most effective approach is solidified, and reading about what has or has not worked for others allows the whole profession to move forward. It is hoped that this paper will add to the canon and support future endeavors in the same vein.

Future Work

For the Atkins Library, there are a number of logical next steps that can be based on this project. Two collection development policies, one general and one for Health & Human Services, were completed. The subject template can be used to write policies for all other areas that the library covers; these can be published on the website to create a complete overview of the library's approach to collection development. A message announcing the new policies can be sent out to the community. All of this sets a precedent of transparency and consistency for the public as well as the library staff.

The faculty survey can be dispersed when the autumn semester starts and the recipients have returned to campus. It was written for the Health & Human Services department about electronic resources, but other subject librarians can adapt it to reflect the priorities of their faculty. The other survey, which went out to health sciences librarians at twelve peer institutions, can be sent out to more to get further information. Its questions were less generalizable than the ones on the faculty survey, but other subject librarians can rework them to meet their needs if they want to see what resources other programs find the most valuable. Ideally, the results of the two surveys will add to...
librarians’ understanding of their patrons’ needs and how best to meet them.

The deselection aspect of the project is largest and most immediately relevant to the library’s goals. As the whole collection needs heavy weeding, an efficient system for doing so will be extremely useful. Some of the methods described above, such as finding duplicate copies and redundant editions with low use, can be directly applied to any subject. Topics with currency needs similar to those in the health sciences can use the system of finding older unused titles. Where currency is not as important a factor, such as in literature or history, slightly different methods may have to be developed to reflect the appropriate priorities. In either case, establishing a precedent of systematic deselection will make a very large project manageable. In addition, the criteria could be applied to ebooks. Physical space is not an issue for them so they often get ignored in deselection projects, but currency and usability of the collection is just as important for electronic resources as for print. Usage statistics may not be generated the same way, so particulars of the methodology would differ, but an organized system could be developed just the same.

More generally, the Atkins Library can use the work to demonstrate the value of the fellowship program as a whole. Next summer’s fellows can build on previous projects or start in new areas as necessary. Other institutions can see how UNC Charlotte ran the program and how it benefited the library and the students alike. Almost all libraries have projects that the regular staff does not have time for, and the temporary fellowships set an example of how they might be accomplished. They also provide an excellent opportunity for LIS students to put their education into practice.

**Conclusion**

This project turned out to be an excellent pilot for the upcoming library-wide deselection. In addition, it demonstrated the different stages of assessment. Having a long-term plan is essential to informed collection development. From the collection development policy that guides decisions, through the deselection needed to clear shelfspace, to the recommendations for new resources, this project provides that overview. The individual parts or the whole system can be drawn from and adapted to suit the needs of a subject area or library.
Figure 2: Duplicates and Multiple Editions

Figure 3: Age and Disuse
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Appendix A

Collection Development Policy: Health & Human Services

J. Murrey Atkins Library  Health & Human Services Collection Development Policy
Health & Human Services Librarian: Mendy Ozan
mozan@uncc.edu

- **Statement of Purpose:** Collection development in all subject areas follows the guidelines in the Atkins Library General Collection Development Policy. This policy is for resources relevant to health and human services.

- **Programs Supported:** The College of Health and Human Services includes the Department of Kinesiology, the Department of Public Health Sciences, the School of Social Work, and the School of Nursing. There is also a PhD program in Health Services Research. There are approximately 2,500 undergraduates and 450 graduate students enrolled as full-time equivalent. The collection specifically serves these students and the faculty and staff of the College of Health and Human Services as well as all other members of the campus community.

- **Collection Description:** These resources are part of the general collection at Atkins Library. The collection also includes electronic resources such as ebooks, online journals, databases, and other tools related to the subject.
  - LC Call numbers:
    - Nursing materials are in the RT subclass, though many materials for this program can be found elsewhere in the R’s (e.g. RM for Pharmacology).
    - Public Health materials are in the RA subclass.
    - Kinesiology materials can be found in GV (Recreation, Sports, and Leisure), QM (Human Anatomy), QP (Physiology), and RC1200-1245 (Sports Medicine).
    - Social Work materials are in the HV subclass.

- **Time Period:** Currency is essential to a good health sciences collection, especially for clinical resources. Whenever possible, materials containing outdated information are removed and replaced with more up-to-date versions. Exceptions may include classic texts or those with historical value; decisions are made by the Health & Human Services Librarian.

- **Format:** In order to make resources easily accessible, the library acquires ebooks, e-journals, and other electronic resources as cost and licensing permit.

- **Textbooks:** Print textbooks are not purchased for specific classes, but some core texts may be added to support the general curriculum.

- **Duplication:** Duplicate materials are not purchased unless urgently needed.

- **Disclaimer:** Information from this collection is for academic research purposes. It should not be used as a substitute for advice or treatment from a health care professional.

Appendix B

Subject Policy Template

J. Murrey Atkins Library  [SUBJECT] Collection Development Policy
[SUBJECT] Librarian: [NAME]
[EMAIL ADDRESS]

- **Statement of Purpose:** Collection development in all subject areas follows the guidelines in the Atkins Library General Collection Development Policy. This policy is for resources relevant to [SUBJECT].

- **Programs Supported:** [PROGRAM] includes the Department of [DISCIPLINE], [Repeat as necessary]. There are approximately [NUMBER] undergraduates and [NUMBER] graduate students enrolled as full-time equivalent. The collection serves these students, the faculty and staff of the [PROGRAM], long-distance students, and all other members of the campus community.

- **Collection Description:** These resources are part of the general collection at Atkins Library. The collection also includes electronic resources such as ebooks, online journals, databases, and other tools related to the subject.
  - LC Call Numbers:
    - [SUBJECT] materials are in the [CALL NUMBER] subclass.
    - [Repeat as necessary for different disciplines within subject]
Appendix C

Health Sciences Electronic Resources Survey

1. What institution do you represent?
2. What factors (cost, curriculum, content, usability, etc.) were most important in selecting the electronic resources you have?
3. Are there any databases or other electronic resources that you would like to have but do not currently subscribe to?
4. With the exception of CINAHL and PubMed, which databases see the most use?
5. Which resources would you recommend to other libraries? Consider Nursing, Public Health, and Kinesiology programs in particular.
6. Are there any that you would not recommend?
7. How do you promote these resources to your students and faculty?
8. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding health sciences resources?
9. Would you be interested in answering follow-up questions? If so, please provide a contact email address.

Appendix D

Faculty Survey

1. What is your department and position title?
2. What classes do you teach?
3. What databases or other online resources do you and your students use?
4. How do you promote resources to students? Select all that apply.
   a. Syllabus
   b. Assignments
   c. In-class recommendations
   d. Moodle or Canvas
   e. Other ________
5. What are the most useful types of online resources for you and your students? Select all that apply.
   a. Ebooks/Databases
   b. Electronic journals
   c. Other ________
6. Are there resources that you would like the library to provide access to that are not currently available?
7. Are there other ways in which the library could better meet the needs of you or your students?
8. Would you be interested in answering follow-up questions? If so, please provide a contact email address.