

# Reference Department



University of Maine at Fort Kent  
Reference Department  
Annual Report – FY 2006



# Table of Contents

<b>Bibliographic and Computer Instruction</b> .....	5
<b>Electronic Reference Service</b> .....	5
<i>Table 1</i> .....	6
<b>Exhibit Area</b> .....	6
<i>Table 2.</i> Exhibits on display for FY2006.....	7
<b>Indexes and Databases</b> .....	7
<i>Table 3.</i> Top ten databases from EBSCOHost .....	7
<i>Table 4.</i> Annual comparison of common databases. ....	8
<b>Maine Government Documents</b> .....	9
<b>Reference</b> .....	10
Collection.....	10
Computers.....	10
<i>Table 5</i> .....	10
Statistics .....	10
<b>Website</b> .....	11
New additions, changes, and future goals.....	11
Opinion Poll .....	11
Survey .....	11
Web Report .....	11
<b>Appendices</b> .....	13
A. Bibliographic Instruction Sessions.....	14
A.1 Bibliographic Sessions .....	14
A.2 Other Sessions – Other.....	14
B. Electronic Reference .....	15
C. Exhibit shows .....	16
D. Indexes and Databases .....	17
D.1 Complete list of EBSCO databases.....	17
D.2 Annual Comparison of UMFK databases (EBSCO).....	17
D.3 UMS % change using data from UMFK’s fiscal years.....	17
D.4 UMS and UMFK database use comparison .....	17
D.5 Details on databases kept, removed, and added.....	17
D.6 Budget .....	17
D.7 Committee minutes .....	17
E. Maine Government Documents.....	18
E.1 Non-cataloged item statistics.....	18
E.2 Cataloged items breakdown .....	18
F. Reference Statistics.....	19
G. Web Site: Polls and Results .....	20
H. Survey: summer hours .....	21
H.1 Summer Survey.....	21
H.2 Summer Survey Results .....	21
I. Formulas .....	22



## **Bibliographic and Computer Instruction**

In FY2006, 587 students attended 45 bibliographic instruction (BI) sessions, whereas in FY2005 there were 580 students and 46 instructions sessions. This is a very slight increase of 1.2% in the number of students and decrease of 2% in sessions. See appendix A for more detail.

This year the reference librarian noticed a significant number of students being able to find articles in the databases, specifically Academic Search Premier, without the help of the librarian. The students were a mix of old and new and most all would have attended a Bibliographic instruction session which specifically targeted HUM102, EDU327, and EDU304 in the last few years.

In FY2006 the Reference Librarian continued to reevaluate the presentation of the bibliographic instruction session. The reference librarian created tutorials previously and used them in COS103, but we wanted to utilize them differently in the HUM (FYE- First Year Experience) courses. The reference librarian began in the fall of 2005 to try a different approach. First, we asked instructors to hand out assignments a week before the actual lecture and asked students to complete and turn in the assignment on the day of the lecture. Second, during the actual lecture only 10 to 15 minutes was given to answering questions regarding the assignment and tutorials. Once we had answered all questions, the reference librarian spent the rest of the class time discussing advanced searching in Academic Search Premier, and showed the students other databases that were pertinent to their studies at UMFK. Finally enough time was available to discuss research methods and give a tour of the library specifically geared to the student's program of study at the university.

With regard to the tutorials used in the COS103 courses, we hoped the tutorials would be sufficient without librarians going into the class. After talking to some of the instructors of COS103, we were successful in our goals of using the tutorials. We decided our going into the COS103 classes was not an efficient use of our time. The course is geared more around computers and applications versus research. In addition, many of the students had already had our lecture during their HUM102 course. The tutorials were a good way for them to refresh their skills.

Finally besides the BI sessions offered, there are a variety of other sessions given across the year. This year the size (number of students) of the class grew by 27% but the number of classes dropped by 55%. These sessions vary from year to year so extrapolation of data is not always useful. The main reason we keep track of this data is to keep a record of where library staff time is used outside the library. See appendix A for more detail.

## **Electronic Reference Service**

Electronic Chat service continues to get very little use. In FY2005 there was a total of 9 chat sessions where only 6 were considered truly reference. In FY2006 there were 7 chat sessions where only 6 were reference. The reference chat sessions remained the same, but

the number of total sessions dropped by two (-22%). Unfortunately the chat sessions from FY2004 were not broken out by type of question as in FY2005 and FY2006. Going back and doing a cursory count, it looked like 13 out of the 19 chat sessions were strictly reference questions. The system has made chat services available through URSUS and Mariner Gateway, so we hope this will help increase the number of chat sessions we receive. Continued reasons for the lack of use could be people are still not aware the service is available, the service may be daunting to use for people who have trouble on the computer in the first place, or people simply don't want to use the service. The hours have been consistent, and with only a few exceptions we were available during our time slots.

**Table 1. Electronic Reference Chat Sessions**

	<b>FY2004</b>	<b>FY2005</b>	<b>FY2006</b>
Chat Sessions	19	6	6

The Electronic Reference Email service is also seeing a slight decline. In FY2004 there was a total of 49 email questions, in FY2005 there was a total of 65 questions answered, and in FY2006 there was a total of 40 questions answered; a decrease of 38%. Not mentioned last year was the fact that in FY2004 only 33 of the 49 questions were considered reference, in FY2005 29 of the 65 questions were reference, and in FY2006 26 of the 40 questions were reference. The UM System's use of Electronic Reserves is still young. We hope to increase both the chat and the email use significantly. See appendix B for more detail.

After Docutek upgraded the service in FY2005, we began to get erroneous email. We discussed this problem with Docutek, but do not currently know how or if this problem will be fixed. See appendix B.2 for an example.

The electronic reference policy, adapted by Sofia Birden from a policy at the New York Public Library, is published in a book called Reference Librarian's Policies, Forms, Guidelines And Procedures Handbook by Rebecca Brumley, (March 2006). During the summer of 2005, Ms. Brumley approached the reference librarian about using the policy in her book. Blake Library purchased and cataloged the book.

## **Exhibit Area**

A new art professor, Paul Gebhardt, was hired for FY2006. His first student show was in December, 2005. We will continue to show student work from Professor Gebhardt's classes. See Table 2 for a list of the shows.

<b>Table 2. Exhibits on display for FY2006</b>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Artist</b>
May 2005	UMFK student work (cont. from April)	Priscilla Daigle
June 2005	"Painting the Maine Landscape", UMFK Student work	Therese Provenzano
July 2005	None	
August 2005	"Seven Directions"	Joan H. Lee
September 2005	"Seven Directions" cont.	Joan H. Lee
October 2005	Down Syndrome Awareness Month	Erica Thiele
November 2005	"Ever Been to Sea, Billy?"	Steve Young
December 2005	UMFK student work	Paul Gebhardt
January 2006	UMFK student work (cont.)	Paul Gebhardt
February 2006	Black History Month	Ray Phinney/Library staff
February 2006	"Acadian Perspectives"	Thomas Bouchard
March 2006	"Tensional Integrity: from angles to curves"	Eric Thorsen and Edwidge Ouellette Michaud
April 2006	UMFK student work	Paul Gebhardt

See appendix C for more information regarding the exhibit space.

## Indexes and Databases

This year we continue to look at the number of sessions (logons) for each database. The session statistic is more reliable than the number of searches. The reason is a single person can create multiple searches until he or she constructs a search that produces good results. The number of sessions (logons), however, counts the single individual instead of the number of searches the individual may have created. Table 3 shows the top ten databases for the year and their coinciding number of sessions, searches, annual comparison, and percentage differences in sessions compared to the previous year.

<b>Table 3. Top ten databases from EBSCOHost</b>					
	<b>Databases</b>	<b>FY2006 # of Searches</b>	<b>FY2006 # of Sessions</b>	<b>FY2005 # of Sessions</b>	<b>% Change of sessions</b>
1	Academic Search Premier	20694	6232	6951	-10%
2	CINAHL	5187	1253	665	88%
3	ERIC	4286	943	1332	-29%
4	PsycINFO	3668	633		N/A
5	MEDLINE	2470	550	263	109%
6	Health Source: Nursing ed.	1810	509	235	117%
7	Nursing & Allied Health	1838	472	184	157%
8	Business Source Premier	773	331	305	9%
9	Health Source – Con. ed.	1162	261	185	41%
10	MasterFILE Premier	513	200	96	111%

A copy of the complete list including statistics on use can be found in appendix D.1.

Though we had a few databases that dropped in use, the total use (both sessions and searches) overall rose once again showing a 17% rise in sessions and a 36% rise in searches. The continued rise in use may be attributed to such things as better bibliographic instruction, better publicity regarding free printing at the public stations

where the Reference Librarian can steer patrons toward the databases and away from web sites, and once again a higher enrollment. The only databases that did not rise, but actually dropped in both sessions and searches were Academic Search Premier, Econlit, and NoveList K-8 (for the second year in a row). We were surprised to see Academic Search Premier drop. This is the first time since we have been able to gather campus data that ASP dropped.

In order to get a more accurate look at the growth of use, we have to look at the data from only the common databases used from year to year. In addition, because we do this, it is next to impossible to look at more than the most recent two year span. Also, each year the previous year's data will be different. For example the FY2005 total session figure of 10,901 will not be the same for comparison in the 2006 fiscal year as seen in Table 4. The common database growth was 11% this year and our searches increased by 26%. For more details on what databases were common, see appendix D.2.

**Table 4. Annual comparison of common databases.**

<b>FY2005 Sessions</b>	<b>FY2006 Sessions</b>	<b>% Change</b>
10,833	12,047	11%

Interestingly enough our increase in numbers does not reflect that of the UM System. Though the whole systems searches increased by 38% the number of sessions saw a decrease of 16%. See appendix D.2 for more details.

Unfortunately, we continue to only be able to gather Fort Kent statistics on the databases subscribed to through EBSCOHost. The University of Maine System provides statistics on databases subscribed to from other vendors, but all the participating libraries are lumped together in these statistics. However the statistics provided by the system do enable us to calculate the percentage of searches and logons our patrons contributed to each of the EBSCOHost databases. Blake Library's patrons accounted for 4.1% of system wide searches as opposed to 4.0% in FY2004 (only a slight increase) and 4.9% of system wide logons (sessions) as opposed to 3.4% in FY2004 (a 44% increase). More detailed statistics on system wide searches compared to Fort Kent searches can be found in appendix D.3.

In FY2006 two licensed databases were eliminated, two database name changes, and three databases were added. The two databases the system eliminated were Biosis Previews and Zoological Record. The vendor for these databases did not want to provide consortium pricing anymore and wanted each campus to purchase back issues. The system left the decision up to the individual libraries to purchase or not. Blake Library staff chose not to do so.

One of the three new databases added was Cochrane Library. The Cochrane Library was licensed by the system and provided an excellent source of data for the nursing divisions. Though the database was purchased for fiscal year 2007, we gained use in April of 2006. The other two databases were licensed with Blake Library moneys. One was the Marquis Who's Who which replaced not only all the Who's Who books from 1985 on, but added a large number of other Who's Who categories we did not have in print, such as Who's



Who in American Nursing. The licensing price of this database was only slightly more than the print volume we get each year. The other database we licensed was the Smithsonian Folkways Recordings Online. We were able to pay for the license through Inez Day.

Last year we reported there were 69 unique licensed databases. This year in an attempt to recreate that count, we actually counted 68. This number does not include different named links to the same resource or resource center links which go to a collection of databases (the individual collections were counted). This year, FY2006, we counted 69 unique licensed databases. A complete list of the databases to which Blake Library patrons have access can be found in appendix D.4.

The estimated expenses for databases this past year, without adding any new resources, was \$141,888. The estimated cost for the same databases for FY2007 is \$148,491. This year we found we had not only the money to pay for our current databases, but we were able to add some new databases due to an approximate addition to our budget of \$50,000. The database committee decided to keep the current list of databases and add PsycArticles, HSUS (Historical statistics of the US), Cochrane Library, and RILM Abstracts of Music Literature. The Cochrane Library Database was included in FY2006 database statistics because it came on board in April. The database budget and committee minutes can be found in appendix D.5.

## **Maine Government Documents**

In FY2006 the number of documents cataloged continued to decrease. 281 government documents were cataloged in FY2006 whereas 503 were cataloged in FY2005; a 44% reduction. Out of the 281 cataloged, 192 were unique titles and 89 items were additional volumes. 630 government documents were removed from the collection as opposed to last year's 124 items, an overwhelming increase of 408%. One reason for this is we cleaned out the government document files that were older than five years.

Last year we predicted that our number of cataloged items would remain in the 450 to 550 range. However that prediction did not hold true. We believe the number of incoming government documents was a lot less than last year, and many government documents are available only online.

This year the total number of government documents was 525. Last year the number of government document inserts was 565 items. This is a slight reduction of 7%. There were no reference inserts which is unusual since every year for at least the past five years the reference inserts, which are always the Maine Lakes and Ponds maps, have come to our library. There may have been a delay this year.

In FY2005, 360 inserts were discarded because they were dated, replaced, or irrelevant. This year's discards totaled 881 items, an increase of 145%. We are unsure of why the discarded number went up as high as it did. It's possible there were documents that still needed some cleanup, but this was dealt with, for the most part, in FY2005. New staff may have been a factor, in that knowing what and what not to count as a discard might

have been at issue. For example it's possible the laws and rules inserts may have had the individual pages counted rather than the full insert (I was questioned about this in April). In February 2006, a whopping 340 items were discarded. Until the reference work study comes back in the fall, we won't have an answer for this high increase.

Finally the number of duplicates has significantly reduced this year from 17 inserts last year to just 2 this year. Inserts (newsletters, senate and house sessions, minutes, etc.) are not reflected in computer generated reports that calculate "cataloged" items but are tabulated manually. More detailed statistics on Maine documents can be found in appendix E.

## Reference

### Collection

The New York Times index was moved out of the reference area to the wall by the Special Collections. We did this to make space available for audio books on tape and CD. We also felt the move would be a good fit since the New York Times on Microfilm is on the same wall.

### Computers

Printing articles and book lists from the three dedicated searching stations continues to be free. Last year we only had data from November 5, 2004 to April 30, 2005 where 5,948 print jobs and 36,924 pages printed. This year, FY2006, looking at the same date range there were 3,143 print jobs and 18,987 pages printed; close to a 50% drop for both. The reduction in printing is not surprising since we had a drop in library use overall. See Table 5 below.

	<b>FY2005: Nov04-Apr05</b>	<b>FY2006: Nov05-Apr06</b>	<b>FY2006: Full Fiscal Year</b>
Jobs	5,948	3,143	4,497
Pages	36,924	18,987	31,660

At the end of the summer in 2005, the reference area housed several pieces of hardware which we used to digitize the Pardis folklore tapes. We moved the hardware from the reference area to the web services office once the digitization project was complete.

### Statistics

The statistics on reference questions sent to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) is broken down only by Reference and Directional questions. However, Blake Library statistics breaks down Directional into two categories: Directional and Computer/Support. Computer/Support is further broken down to: General and Instructional. This allows us to collect data specifically on computer oriented questions helping us to determine how much time we spend troubleshooting computer problems and/or instructing patrons on the use of equipment/software.

The FY2006 statistics for reference questions fell dramatically from 979 questions in FY2005 to 548 questions this year; a 44% drop. In addition the total number of questions

answered from the reference desk dropped by 45% (1,281 in FY2005 and 706 in FY2006). The figures this year were disappointing but may have some explanations behind them. Though the campus enrollment rose again this year, the number of people who actually used the library did not seem to parallel the enrollment figures. Staff noticed a significant change in the use of the library for FY2006, especially in the spring. The evening hours were very quiet, even on Mondays and Tuesdays. Unfortunately because of the new way we count people, we can not get a full year's comparative data from FY2005 to FY2006. However if we look at and compare February to April of 2005 to the same months of 2006, we do see there was a significant drop in people coming into the library, especially in April. For example, in April of 2005 we had 9,394 people entering whereas in 2006 there were 7,060; a 25% reduction.

Additionally, the reference librarian noticed that though many people used the reference stations to get articles, not many asked questions, even when prompted. However, the reference librarian noticed the students were successful in finding articles they wanted. We hope the success is attributed to successful bibliographic instruction sessions. Finally, the noticeable drop in stack checkouts help to show a reduced use of the library overall. Detailed statistics on reference transactions can be found in appendix F.

## **Website**

### **New additions, changes, and future goals**

- Annual Report link added to the menu at the top of the library page.
- Moved the database list page to the Orono server due to security issues.
- Would like to add voice and interactive features to tutorials.
- Plan to revamp the web site to include quick access to URSUS services.

### **Opinion Poll**

Last year's addition of the opinion polls on the front page was useful. We asked a variety of questions and got a number of responses. We continued the poll with additional questions until closer to the end of the spring semester when the 24 hour lab question was reposted. See appendix G for results.

### **Survey**

In April 2006 we developed an online survey to question students regarding summer hours. We knew the first half of the summer had a number of three week courses mostly in the education department. Because of this, we wanted to provide more access to the library during this time. In the past we were never quite sure what evenings to stay open later, so this year the survey was created and a link was posted on the front page. Only 18 students responded, but we chose to go by what the 18 submitted. See appendix H for details on the survey as well as the front page link. See Book 3, Attendance, for details on summer hours.

### **Web Report**

This year web reports are not be available.