



Assessing Librarian Expectations Before and After LibGuides Implementation

Katie E. Anderson
Rutgers University

Gene R. Springs
The Ohio State University

Abstract

This study evaluated librarian expectation and experience before and after the implementation of the LibGuides platform at an ARL member institution. Two surveys were distributed to librarians responsible for subject research guides, one to determine expectations before the introduction of LibGuides and one to determine if and how those expectations were or were not met following adoption of the platform. Findings indicate that, after implementation, LibGuides were updated more often and used more frequently for both instruction and reference than the previously used subject guides. This study can aid other libraries in planning similar implementations of LibGuides at their institutions.

Keywords: research guides; information literacy; library instruction; reference; assessment

Introduction

In order to assist students and faculty in locating subject-specific resources and information, academic librarians create subject guides and pathfinders. These subject guides and pathfinders, both physical and virtual, may come in myriad formats with a wide variety of organization and presentation. While a number of methods are used to create these guides, the emergence of Springshare's LibGuides in 2007 provided a platform for librarians not only to create content that can be displayed in a user-friendly format but also to collaborate and share this content with other librarians, both within their institution and among other library professionals. In addition to potentially sharing content, the ease of searching across the entire LibGuides universe can allow for benchmarking or the discovery of content culled from peer librarians at other institutions (Metcalf, 2013). The use of LibGuides has been increasing in academic libraries. At the time of writing this article, over 2,100 libraries at higher educational institutions in the United States are using LibGuides. Many academic libraries converted their existing web-based subject guides and pathfinders to the LibGuides platform, citing the ease of use for librarians and the user-friendly platform (Glassman & Sorensen, 2010; McMullin & Hutton, 2010). In 2010 Rutgers University Libraries began the process of evaluating and recommending the purchase of LibGuides as the new platform of delivery for subject research guides.

This paper discusses the implementation of LibGuides at Rutgers University Libraries, an Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member organization, and looks at the methods for measuring the implementation's success. During the implementation and training stage, a survey was sent to all the librarians in an effort to understand their knowledge of and expectations for the new platform. The results of this survey were taken into consideration during the planning for training and eventual implementation of LibGuides. Two years after the platform was adopted and static guides were migrated, librarians were surveyed regarding how their expectations were met and how they were actually using LibGuides. The results of this follow-up survey were useful in determining the focus of future training sessions as well as implementation guidelines for potential updates to the LibGuides platform.

This paper provides an overview of the implementation of LibGuides and focuses on the reference librarians who create them. The study attempts to measure changes in the creation, maintenance, and use of research guides by librarians after the use of LibGuides was established and also provides considerations for training and implementation. This paper also presents future considerations for continuing to assess and measure the impact of providing librarians

with a platform for creating, maintaining, and sharing content to assist patrons in their search for information. The results should be of interest to those who are considering adopting LibGuides or a similar platform as well as those in the early stages of implementation and those who are interested in assessing the potential success of implementation. This study tracks the changing attitudes and expectations of library faculty throughout the implementation process.

Literature Review

Research guides have been studied in detail, both in their previous forms as bibliographies, reader's aids, and pathfinders and in their current forms as web-based resources. An article by Smith (2008), providing a history of the library subject research guide, details the role of the bibliographer in American research libraries in the early twentieth century. Smith traces the evolution of bibliographies into booklists for reader's aids, their next iteration as pathfinders, through their form as electronic, web-based resources. Addressed in Smith's article is the research of Stevens, Canfield, and Gardner (1973), which discusses the work of the Model Library Program of Intrex at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Stevens et al. define the pathfinder, including what it is not, and stress that it is for the beginning researcher, not for those advanced in the discipline (p. 41). Their article discusses the use of the pathfinder in collaborative research support within a cooperative of libraries (p. 43), the inclusion of graduate students in library science as pathfinder authors under the supervision of professional librarians, and the steps taken to ensure that duplication of effort is avoided (p. 45). It is particularly interesting that these concerns are still present today in the adoption of web-based research guides and show that, in this instance, there is not a vast difference between how print and electronic work is managed.

While there are other articles that discuss the history of the subject research guide (Reeb & Gibbons, 2004; Tchangalova & Feigley, 2008; Buczynski, 2009), the focus of this literature review will be on case studies and research articles that detail an institution's selection and implementation of LibGuides as their platform for the delivery of subject research guides. Gonzalez and Westbrook (2010) discuss their library's entire selection, planning, and implementation process of LibGuides at New Mexico State University. They outline the benefits of their library's shift to LibGuides, which include faculty collaboration, student involvement, real-time feedback, and the variety of needs the guides can meet. Gonzalez and Westbrook identify challenges as well, which include funding, a master template, marketing,

assessment, and maintenance. The authors include a set of best practices in an appendix that takes “into consideration all the challenges, benefits, and lessons encountered” (p. 656). Dalton and Pan (2014) similarly discuss their pilot of LibGuides at Trinity College Dublin, determining that concrete policies for librarians to follow at the outset are paramount to a successful implementation.

McMullin and Hutton (2010) take a similar approach in describing West Chester University Libraries’ decision to implement LibGuides at their institution. Similar to Gonzalez and Westbrook (2010), they found that establishing a consistent and standardized format, in particular naming the guides, is a challenge. McMullin and Hutton also address the use of LibGuides with an eye toward assessment. The authors note a spike in guide usage after an instruction session in which the guide was discussed, which is consistent with the findings of Staley (2007) in her case study of student use of web-based subject guides at San Jose State University. McMullin and Hutton single out ease-of-use as a major benefit of the LibGuides platform, allowing for multiple guide authors, faculty collaboration, and, in general, the speed with which work can be accomplished to meet diverse users’ needs.

Comparing two different subject guide delivery platforms at their respective institutions, Moses and Richard (2008) look at LibGuides at Acadia University and SubjectsPlus at Holland College in Canada. The authors note that the creation of a template was key in allowing a quick transition from static webpages to LibGuides and that prominent placement on the library’s website was key in directing users to the guides. After the LibGuides’ implementation, Moses and Richard note “[a] happier workplace. Use of subject guides has increased dramatically and librarians are pleased with the control and autonomy they have over their web content and the ability to communicate with our community” (p. 3). Though the article also discusses SubjectsPlus, a different platform, some of the findings at Holland College are applicable to LibGuides, in particular the personalization of librarian profiles appearing on subject guide pages and the ability to embed chat widgets and other Web 2.0 tools (p. 6).

Glassman and Sorensen (2010) examine the transition from pathfinders to LibGuides during a library website redesign at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine’s D. Samuel Gottesman Library. Since a goal of the website redesign was to encourage greater participation by librarians, members of the Web Committee selected LibGuides to meet this goal “largely due to its ease of use and ease of integration with the web site, and because it could be implemented without technical support from within the institution” (p. 285).

Glassman and Sorensen (2010) compile a selective list of advantages of the LibGuides platform, which include ease of use for librarians and end users, customization and

personalization, social networking, ease of use for LibGuides' administrators, online help, and content sharing. Similar to the findings of Moses and Richard (2008), Glassman and Sorensen note that librarians feel empowered by having control over their own work, and the interactive nature of LibGuides contributes to stronger connections between librarians and users (p. 290).

Verbit and Kline (2011) write about their selection of LibGuides after enduring several college-wide website redesign processes. Instead of using LibGuides just for subject or course guide content, the authors discuss their library's decision at the York College of Pennsylvania to use LibGuides as their entire library website. Verbit and Kline outline their approach to using the dynamic options within LibGuides to replace the static webpages of the old library site, including initial training, the design process, management of resource links, sharing of content, usage statistics, incorporating images and videos, catalog integration, and mobile services. The authors, echoing the findings of Glassman and Sorensen (2010), believe that LibGuides allowed their library website to be both student and librarian friendly (p. 25).

Involved in a library website redesign of their own, Judd and Montgomery (2009) discuss the selection of LibGuides to meet the needs of subject-specific web content at Eastern Kentucky University libraries. Ease-of-use, the integration of Web 2.0 tools, personalization, and its practicality are all qualities of LibGuides the authors extol. In particular, Judd and Montgomery note the benefits of using LibGuides for online courses, which allow the librarian to embed video content and distance-related content. The authors do note a few challenges with implementing LibGuides, including editorial oversight, deciding who authors a particular guide, and the on-going expenses of subscribing to LibGuides.

Bowen (2012) examines in greater detail the use of LibGuides in the course management system Blackboard at California State University, Chico. The author details the process of inserting a LibGuides button into the Blackboard system for Communication 131, a large course composed of 25 sections. Bowen developed a survey for students in the course to complete after using library resources listed on the LibGuides to aid in their assignments. He found that placing a link within the students' space encouraged its use; students will use the research guide first, instead of Google or Wikipedia, if it is accessible with their assignment; and, given the first-year status of many of the students in the class, there is a huge potential for impact of a research guide on new researchers (p. 462).

Similarly, Adebonojo (2010) discusses the use of LibGuides at East Tennessee University's Sherrod Library to introduce undergraduates, particularly those in their first two years, to library resources. Noting LibGuides' ease-of-use and flexibility, the author found that

librarians used it to create research guides for each course in which library instruction occurred. Taking advantage of LibGuides' tools, Adebonojo notes that personalization through pictures and contact information in the profile boxes, facility of incorporating Web 2.0 content, and the use of the survey option all encouraged interactivity between students and librarians (p. 408).

Two different articles highlight the technological capabilities of the LibGuides platform. Becker (2009) discusses the possibility of using Jing, a free software that can record up to five minutes of onscreen action, to add value to subject LibGuides. Videos of how to use resources can be embedded on the same pages as the lists of recommended resources. Becker writes that using these tools should be a consideration for university libraries needing to support online students in particular (p. 209). Brandon, Sattler, and Tobias (2011) chronicle their work in customizing the LibGuides' interface to better match the Michigan State University Libraries website. The authors aimed to make the users' experience seamless between the library site and LibGuides by matching the color schemes, which enhances the sense of place. They provide a step-by-step process on customizing options within LibGuides. The authors note that "customization . . . gives research and course guides the look and feel of the library's website, aids the promotion of library resources to users, and enhances the users' experience by providing a sense of place in the research process" (p. 18).

Morris and Del Bosque (2010) undertook a formal evaluation of which Web 2.0 tools are used in subject research guides, by studying the library websites of member institutions of the Mountain West and Big 12 athletic conferences. Only two institutions were using LibGuides within the authors' sample, which may have had an impact on the overall low utilization of Web 2.0 tools (blogs, chat, RSS, tag clouds, tagging, user reviews, wikis, and YouTube videos) on subject guides. The authors note that freely available sources and services like LibGuides "demonstrate a significant potential for large-scale changes in how libraries approach access to subject oriented material on their web sites" (p. 191). In another study that analyzed library websites to gather data on subject guides, Ghaphery and White (2012) examined 99 American university Association of Research Library (ARL) institutions to record characteristics of any guides listed. The second part of their study involved a survey targeted at librarians at these institutions to discover how research guides were implemented and how they are maintained. The authors found that there is wide adoption of research guides but that there are no consistent management or assessment practices and that many library systems departments are not involved in their on-going support. Ghaphery and White note that the popularity of LibGuides and other Software-as-a-Service (SAAS) subscriptions may have an

impact on other library systems in the future. Their findings echo the diverse approaches to the implementation of LibGuides described by many of the authors above.

Selection and Recommendation of LibGuides

In March 2010, Rutgers University Libraries formed a task force made up of library faculty members to look at the possibility of implementing LibGuides. The charge of the task force was to

- articulate specific benefits and the rationale for Rutgers University Libraries to acquire and implement LibGuides;
- clarify the relationship between LibGuides and Drupal;
- recommend any aspects of LibGuides that we might like to uniformly include in our use of LibGuides (liaison, Meebo, Web 2.0);
- recommend what customizable aspects should be left to individual liaisons' discretion;
- reach out to any other individuals or groups who should be consulted;
- establish an implementation strategy with recommended assignments to individuals; and
- suggest a timeline for implementation.

Six faculty librarians, who represented all three campus areas of the library system, comprised the task force and produced a report addressing each of the issues in the charge, as well as providing an environmental scan of academic ARL institutions, 78 of which were using LibGuides at the time of this evaluation. The task force report was presented to a standing council in May 2010 and was approved. Once the subscription was finalized, the task force participated in the planning for implementation and training.

Prior to the implementation of LibGuides, static subject guides were available on the library website. These guides were updated and maintained by the Webmaster, with subject specialists and liaisons providing the content. The majority of these guides could be described as a list of links, often in outline format. Librarians submitted their content and any changes to the Webmaster. Links to the subject guides were provided on the library homepage under the heading "Research Resources." In determining training needs, the task force anticipated the use

of LibGuides in the following areas:

- subject research guides,
- class guides,
- liaison information,
- information literacy tool,
- outreach (chat, social networking, etc.), and
- additional portal to library contact and information.

In-person training sessions were scheduled and held at each of the campus locations. These were conducted by members of the task force, who followed up individually as needed in order to help colleagues transfer content or create content within the new format. These individuals continued to serve as the point of contact for questions, problems, and training needs. The authors of this paper were members of this task force and thus able to communicate the concerns of the survey's respondents and make recommendations for training based on these responses.

Questions, Methods, and Survey

The authors, as members of the LibGuides task force, wanted to determine whether or not the rationale for implementation was met following its completion. Were the expectations of the task force and the individual librarians met? How have the librarians been using LibGuides since their implementation? The authors sought to compare the previous method of delivery of research guide content to the method provided by LibGuides.

During the early implementation period and before the training, the authors created and distributed a survey using SurveyMonkey to all library faculty members via email to a listserv, which included a total of approximately 50 faculty librarians. The survey was open to all members of the library faculty, even those not currently maintaining research guides. The intent of the survey was to determine faculty librarians' perception of the pending implementation of LibGuides as well as their anticipated response to the newly adopted software platform. The survey included both quantitative and qualitative questions and was disseminated in August 2010. The formal implementation and training for LibGuides took place from August to October 2010. The majority of the 18 respondents was aware that the library was in the process of implementing LibGuides, but full training and implementation had not yet occurred when

the survey was taken.

A second survey was distributed 21 months later, in April 2012, to the same library faculty members via the email list. As with the first survey, the second survey was created using SurveyMonkey and consisted of both qualitative and quantitative questions. At the time of the second survey's distribution, over 500 LibGuides had been created. The purpose of the second survey was to assess the expectation versus the actuality of the use and implementation of LibGuides. Respondents were asked to provide insight into how their expectations were or were not met and how their interaction with their subject guides may or may not have changed (update more frequently, create more, etc.). The survey also sought to determine how LibGuides were being used beyond subject research guides. After the survey was distributed, the authors sent out reminders and also verbally requested participation from their coworkers. Of the 21 respondents, six stated that they had not taken the first survey and 15 did not recall. While it is not possible to know whether the same individuals completed both the first and the second survey, the results seek to demonstrate a general overview of the creation, maintenance, and use of research guides by the library faculty as a whole after the implementation and training.

Results

All but one of the respondents for the first survey had responsibility for a subject, research, or class guide. Half of these updated their guides yearly, with the other half responding with various updating times ranging from "as needed" to "continually." Overall there was a general consensus of a minimum of once a year with some updating as soon as new resources were discovered. Challenges that respondents faced in updating and maintaining their guides ranged from lack of time to frustration with the format. Finding the time to update the guides in the day-to-day workflow is challenging for many librarians. Some of the other challenges stated were the inability to make changes themselves and that the format was "uninspiring," lacking layout customization. Not all respondents felt they faced challenges and stated that there were none.

Since the state of the subject guides before LibGuides implementation required the contacting the Webmaster with any changes, authors did not have direct access to make changes. When asked how this affects updating, 69% responded that having direct access would likely increase the number of updates to the guide. The smaller percentage felt that access was

not necessarily a deterrent to updating and others felt that the current state of sending an email was not a problem. One respondent did have direct access to his/her guide(s). The results show a definite change in the rate of updating after implementation and support the contention that having direct access would likely increase the updates to the guides. Table 1 shows changes in frequency of updating after implementation. The responses provided when “other” was selected included “irregular,” “as needed,” “continually,” “as new resources are discovered,” “varies,” “every semester,” “twice a year,” and “weekly.”

The responses “weekly” and “as needed” were not originally provided as answer selections in the survey but are presented as separate categories in the results due to the number of times they were used in the “other” response. In some cases it is difficult to determine frequency from this response, but most “as needed” responses detail this as “for class, when new resources appear, and 2-3 times a year”. Thus, the authors’ interpretation of “as needed” is that this frequency is less than annual, given that “yearly” was a provided option. After implementation, 73.7% felt they updated more often compared with the 69% who anticipated a higher frequency of updating. Future considerations for this survey should include “weekly” and provide more guidance for use of the “other” category in order to avoid vague answers that include “as needed.”

Table 1: Frequency of Subject Guide Updates

	Before Implementation	After Implementation
Yearly	50%	14%
Quarterly	0%	10%
Monthly	0%	0%
Weekly	0%	14%
As Needed	36%	52%
Other	14%	9%

Some of the challenges, such as keeping track of resources and finding the time to maintain and update guides, remained the same both before and after implementation. However, the respondents noted that the new format made guides easier to update and maintain. The lack of consistency and design were mentioned as new challenges with LibGuides. Other new challenges included forgetting logins and passwords, having to relearn each time you log in, lack of flexibility in format and design, and the limitations of the printer-friendly function within LibGuides.

The survey also sought to compare changes in the use of the LibGuides by library faculty for both instruction and reference. Table 2 shows the change in use of subject guides during instruction. Description of the “as needed” response, as provided by the respondents, included research instruction sessions and special requests. Over half the respondents (66.7%) stated that they use LibGuides for instruction more frequently than the previous generation of subject research guides. Table 3 shows the use of subject guides for reference before and after implementation. A little over half the respondents (56.3%) felt this was an increase in their usage while less than half (43.8%) felt this was the same as before implementation using the previous subject research guides.

Table 2: Use of Subject Guides During Instruction

	Before Implementation	After Implementation
Daily	0%	13%
Weekly	20%	6%
Monthly	50%	18%
As needed / Instruction	10%	50%
Other	20%	13%

Table 3: Use of Subject Guides for Reference

	Before Implementation	After Implementation
Daily	18%	12%
Weekly	37%	47%
Monthly	18%	24%
Other	27%	17%

When asked how the implementation of LibGuides affected their approach to reference work, the respondents indicated there was a high referral rate to subject guides as well as an increased use by librarians wanting to become more familiar with subject areas outside their expertise. Almost all respondents (94.7 %) now use LibGuides for reference to consult outside their own subject area. One respondent stated that they were “essential in assisting users in the areas where I do not have the subject expertise.” Others felt there was an increase in subject coverage, thus making referrals easier. The majority of respondents felt that the ability to search a colleague’s research guide and refer a student to the guide was extremely helpful in providing reference assistance.

At the time of the first survey, half the respondents had used LibGuides and the

remainder had seen them or heard of them. The most anticipated uses for LibGuides pre-implementation were creation and maintenance for instruction (58.3%) and creating handouts (33.3%).

Expectations regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides all indicated that respondents were anticipating guides that were easier to update and to create with flexibility in design and layout. Additional features, such as embedding and sharing content, were also eagerly anticipated. Concerns regarding the technical aspects ranged from whether the content would be included in the library search engine to how remote access to databases and other resources would be addressed. For most respondents, specific technical concerns were unknown until training and use began.

Overall, when asked in the first, pre-implementation survey whether LibGuides may or may not meet expectations for outreach the responses were positive. Ease of use, potential for collaboration, and the ability to create and maintain guides all contributed to these positive comments. The general consensus among respondents was that LibGuides would allow them to easily make changes and updates and would be a useful tool for reference and instruction.

While there was a question on the second survey asking if the first survey had been taken, many respondents were unsure (71.4%) or stated they had not taken the survey (28.6%), so direct comparison of the two surveys was not possible on an individual basis. However, each survey provides a snapshot of the library faculty's views on creation, maintenance, and use of the research guides at the time the survey was presented. In the second survey, 85% of the respondents had responsibility for subject guides before implementation; 15% did not. Of those respondents who had responsibility for subject guides before implementation, 94.1% confirmed that they had converted their previous subject guides into LibGuides. Those who had not converted were planning on converting in the future. All the respondents planned on creating LibGuides in the future.

The second survey included questions about how respondents' expectations were met regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides (i.e., easier to update, does not require programming skills, etc.). Here, 71.4% of respondents indicated the guides were easier to update and that expectations were met or exceeded. Several respondents mentioned the support and structure of training and instruction by the task force as reasons for those expectations being met. Reasons why the implementation did not meet expectations ranged from wanting more help with additional features, such as embedding images and screen shots, to a lack of options regarding formatting and design. As noted earlier, one of the ongoing challenges was remembering details about the system when respondents were not creating or editing guides

on a regular basis. Of the 29% who said they had concerns regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides, 80% felt their concerns had been addressed after the implementation. The personal challenge of remembering to update the guides was stated as not having been addressed.

Given the opportunity to comment overall on LibGuides in an open-ended question, all of the statements were positive. It was suggested that LibGuides editors meet more often than previously to compare notes and share tips and solutions.

Discussion: Were Expectations Met?

The survey conducted before training and implementation indicated that all respondents had some familiarity with the platform, either from viewing LibGuides at other institutions or from logging in to explore the platform before the formal training. This information was useful in determining that the formal training did not need to include a detailed explanation of the software platform and its uses. A general description and link directing users to more information was sufficient. The technical concerns focused more on the integration of LibGuides with the library website than with the actual software. This allowed the training team to look into these concerns and address them before implementation. The survey was useful in preparing for discussions regarding frequency of updates as well as expectation of use.

It was expected that the frequency of updating would increase when librarians gained direct access to the content of the research guides. Many respondents (69%) anticipated an increase, and, indeed, after implementation 74% of respondents reported an increase in updating frequency. The most dramatic change shows in the yearly updates (50% before implementation, 14% after implementation) and in the “as needed” updates, which were more frequent than annual, based on the details and description provided in the survey (36% before implementation, 48% after). The increased frequency of “as needed” updates can benefit end users of the subject guides as it allows them to access more current content and resources and will likely reduce their possible interaction with outdated content or nonfunctioning links.

At the time of the first survey, when static subject guides were the norm, respondents indicated they used these guides for instruction, predominantly on a monthly basis, which indicates use for classroom instruction. After implementation most respondents indicated they used them when needed and for instruction. While used primarily for classroom instruction, a 29% increase in the use of guides for instruction might indicate that more guides are being

created specifically for instruction. A major change provided by LibGuides is the ability to create course-specific research guides for classroom instruction. Prior to implementation, course-specific content was often provided to classes through supplemental paper handouts. As of November 2014, 243 course guides have been created by librarians at Rutgers University Libraries. A future research question might explore how LibGuides course guides have replaced handouts and pathfinders for specific classes.

The use of LibGuides for reference was more surprising to the authors than the use for instruction, as subject guides have historically been used in a classroom setting. Before implementation, 79% of respondents indicated they used the subject guides for reference, usually on a weekly basis. After LibGuides were implemented, 95% of respondents say they are using the guides for reference on a weekly basis with an increase in using them “when needed.” While not included in the survey, anecdotal feedback to the LibGuides team indicates that this increase is due to the ease of searching the research guides within the LibGuides system and within the library website’s search option. Reference librarians can consult the subject-specific guides for areas outside their specialty in order to answer reference questions. This is particularly useful for those librarians providing virtual and offsite assistance.

Since the time of the first survey, the library homepage has undergone a major redesign. Research guides are now found under several headings or subheadings on the homepage, including “Find” and “Help.” Links to course guides are often posted to the course management software of the class or shared via email and are also available from the main LibGuides page, separated by campus location. Increasing LibGuides discoverability is an ongoing topic within the LibGuides task force and the library standing council.

Conclusion

After selecting and implementing LibGuides as the platform for the delivery of subject guides content, and providing training, librarians at Rutgers University Libraries are updating their guides with greater frequency and generally have found LibGuides to be easier to update once they become comfortable using this new software for content management. The implementation of LibGuides has increased the use of subject research guides for both reference and instruction. In particular, instruction has been enhanced by the ability to create and customize course-specific guides. Overall, the implementation of LibGuides has been

deemed successful given the increase in updating by librarians and use of the guides. The survey results indicate that concerns regarding the transition to a new method of providing subject-specific content were addressed during the implementation. The training team was able to use the feedback acquired from the survey to customize instruction as well as prepare for future concerns with the transition and possible software updates.

Prior to implementation of LibGuides, librarians forecasted that they would update their subject guides more often if they had instant access to the sites. There was hope that the training and information provided before implementation would ease the process of change. The results support these expectations while also providing data for further exploration into how the use of LibGuides impacts the creation and maintenance of subject and course-specific research guides by librarians.

Further research on this topic might include exploring the increased use of LibGuides as course guides. Are they replacing the handouts and pathfinders or being used in conjunction with the traditional printouts? Is there evidence of LibGuides being used in other ways beyond subject-specific and course guides (Baker, 2014; Scull, 2014)? This survey primarily addressed the implementation of LibGuides as a replacement for static subject guides and an anticipated use for course guides. With over 950 guides currently in the system, the creation and use continues to grow. Following implementation, LibGuides are also being used for internal communication and organization, presentations, and other forms of information sharing beyond subject and course guides. Further research into these various uses of LibGuides by reference librarians could contribute to the literature since a majority of the literature on subject guides, class guides, and LibGuides focuses on the use by the intended audience and not on those creating the content. While assessing the use of LibGuides by students and patrons is essential in determining best practices and insuring the delivery of information, it is also important to look to the needs, expectations, and challenges of those creating the content.

References

- Adebonojo, L. G. (2010). LibGuides: Customizing subject guides for individual courses. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 17(4), 398-412.
- Baker, R. L. (2014). Designing LibGuides as instructional tools for critical thinking and effective online learning. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*,

8(3-4), 107-117.

- Becker, B. W. (2009). Subject guides 2.0: A look at LibGuides and Jing. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, 28(4), 206-209.
- Bowen, A. (2012). A LibGuides presence in a Blackboard environment. *Reference Services Review*, 40(3), 449-468.
- Brandon, J., Sattler, K., Tobias, C. (2011). LibGuides interface customization. *Online*, Jan-Feb, 14-18.
- Buczynski, J. A. (2009). Online web development platforms enable all reference staff to work on subject guides. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 14(3-4), 61-66.
- Dalton, M. & Pan, R. (2014). Snakes or ladders? Evaluating a LibGuides pilot at UCD Library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(5), 515-520.
- Ghaphery, J. & White, E. (2012). Library use of web-based research guides. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 31(1), 21-31.
- Glassman, N. R. & Sorensen, K. (2010). From pathfinders to subject guides: One library's experience with LibGuides. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 7(4), 281-291.
- Gonzalez, A. C. & Westbrook, T. (2010). Reaching out with LibGuides: Establishing a working set of best practices. *Journal of Library Administration*, 50(5-6), 638-656.
- Judd, C. & Montgomery, N. M. (2009). LibGuides and librarians: Connecting content and community. *Kentucky Libraries*, 73(3), 14-17.
- McMullin, R. & Hutton, J. (2010). Web subject guides: Virtual connections across the university community. *Journal of Library Administration*, 50(7-8), 789-797.
- Metcalf, S. (2013). Good stewards in trying times: Benchmarking peer collections of sociology reference sources using LibGuides. *The Reference Librarian*, 54(2), 134-142.
- Morris, S. E. & Del Bosque, D. (2010). Forgotten resources: Subject guides in the era of Web 2.0. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 27(2), 178-193.
- Moses, D. & Richard, J. (2008). Solutions for subject guides. *Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 3(2), 1-9.
- Reeb, B. & Gibbons, S. (2004). Students, librarians, and subject guides: Improving a poor rate of return. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(1), 123-130.
- Scull, A. (2014). Fostering student engagement and collaboration with the library: Student creation of LibGuides as a research assignment. *The Reference Librarian*, 55(4), 318-327.
- Smith, M. M. (2008). 21st century readers' aids: Past history and future directions. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 2(4), 511-523.
-

- Staley, S. M. (2007). Academic subject guides: A case study of use at San Jose State University. *College & Research Libraries*, 68(2), 119-140.
- Stevens, C. H., Canfield, M. P., and Gardner, J. J. (1973). Library pathfinders: A new possibility for cooperative reference service. *College & Research Libraries*, 34(1), 40-46.
- Tchungalova, N. & Feigley, A. (2008). Subject guides: Putting a new spin on an old concept. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 9(3). Retrieved from <http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/>
- Verbit, D. & Kline, V. L. (2011). LibGuides: a CMS for busy librarians. *Computers in Libraries*, July/August, 21-25.

Appendix A—Survey 1, June 2010

1. Do you currently have responsibility for a Subject Research or Class Guide? (Y/N)
2. How often do you update your guide? (yearly/quarterly/monthly/other)
3. What challenges have you faced in updating your guide? Please describe in the space provided.
4. Would you update your guide more often if you had direct access? (Y/N)
5. Do you use Subject/Class Guides for Instruction? (Y/N)
6. If yes, how often do you use them? (daily, weekly, monthly, other)
7. Do you use Subject/Class Guides for Reference? (Y/N)
8. If yes, how often do you use them? (daily, weekly, monthly, other)
9. Are you familiar with LibGuides? (Yes, I have seen examples/Yes, I have used LibGuides, No, I have heard of them/No, I have never heard of them)
10. If you have used LibGuides, how have you used them? (accessed a guide, created a guide, other)
11. Based on what you knew before you gained access to LibGuides, what are your current expectations regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides? (i.e.; will be easier to update, does not require programming skills, difficult learning curve.)
12. What are your questions or concerns regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides?
13. If you have received your login and have looked at LibGuides, please share your thoughts so far on how you think LibGuides may or may not meet your technical expectations.
14. How do you personally plan on using LibGuides? (check all that apply): create and maintain subject guide/create and maintain class guide/create and maintain class handouts/access subject guides/instruction
15. If you have received your login and have looked at LibGuides, please share your thoughts so far on how you think LibGuides may or may not meet your expectations for outreach.

Appendix B—Survey 2, March 2012

1. Did you take the first LibGuides survey? (Y/N/Don't Recall)
2. Did you have responsibility for any Subject Research or Class Guides? (before LibGuides Implementation) (Y/N)
3. Did you convert these to a LibGuide?
4. Please let us know why any guides were not converted. (a colleague converted the guide/I chose to retire the guide/I have not yet converted but plan to/I do not know how/other)
5. Do you currently maintain any LibGuides? (research, course, instructional, etc.) (Y/N)
6. How often do you update your guide(s)? (yearly/quarterly/monthly/other)
7. Has the frequency of your maintenance/updating changed now that you have direct access to your guide(s)? (Yes-I update more often, Yes-I update less often, No- Frequency has not changed)
8. Do you face similar challenges in updating your LibGuide(s) as you did with your previous subject guides? If so what are they?
9. Do you face any new/different challenges? If so, what are they?
10. (If not already using LibGuides): Do you plan on creating any LibGuides? (Y/N)
11. Why would you be creating LibGuide(s)?
12. Why not?
13. Do you use LibGuides for Instruction? (Y/N)
14. How often do you use them? (daily, weekly, monthly, other)
15. Is this frequency more/less/same as with previous guides? (more/less/same)
16. Do you use LibGuides for Reference? (consult outside of your subject area, refer, etc.) (Y/N)
17. How often do you use them? (daily, weekly, monthly, other)
18. Is this frequency more/less/same as with previous guides? (more/less/same)
19. How has the implementation of LibGuides affected your approach to your reference work? (i.e., searching LibGuides outside your subject specialty, referring students to guides)
20. Did you have concerns about the technical aspects of LibGuides before implementation? (Y/N)
21. How did the implementation of LibGuides meet your expectations regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides? (i.e., will be easier to update, does not require programming skills, difficult learning curve.)
22. How did the implementation of LibGuides NOT meet your expectations regarding the technical aspects of LibGuides? (i.e., will be easier to update, does not require programming

skills, difficult learning curve)

23. Were these concerns addressed? (Y/N)

24. Please describe your outstanding concerns that have not been addressed.

25. Have you created a LibGuide profile? (Y/N)

26. What accounts are linked to your LibGuides profile (check all that apply)? (email, Meebo widget, LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, Skype, Google Talk)

27. Do you use the same profile picture on LibGuides as you do on social networking sites? (LinkedIn, ALA Connect, Facebook, Twitter, Google+, etc.) (Y/N/I do not use social networking sites)

28. Which sites?

29. Is there anything else we did not ask or something you would like to say about LibGuides or this survey?