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How Do We Assess this Mess?

Assessing Webscale Discovery at FIU and UNF
Background Information

- In July of 2011, the Florida Virtual Library provided the option of placing the Primo Central Index underneath the Mango Catalog Interface.
- In July of 2012, Florida International University decided to “activate” this feature of Mango to trial our first use of a Web Scale Discovery system.
Implementation of PCI/Mango

- Informed FLVC that we would like to implement Primo Central Index in our library on a trial basis.
- Set up our profiles within the Primo Central Index Administration Module.
- Made the "Books and Articles" tab, with the Primo Central Index, the default tab for searching the catalog.
- Included a "Discovery Beta" seal to let our users know of the new service.
Initial Problems and Changes

- Too much information!!!
- Changed the default tab to "Books" instead of "Books and Articles".
Florida Virtual Library collects Google Analytics for Mango.

When reviewing the statistics from August – January, I was especially interested in the statistics after we had moved the default tab back to books:

- Books = 450,602 page views
- Books and Articles (PCI and Catalog) = 145,094 page views
- Articles (PCI Only) = 245,406 page views
- E-Journals = 37,639 page views
- Total = 878,471

These numbers show that our users clicked on the Primo Central Index Tabs 45% of the time.
User Focus Groups

- The Google Analytics shows that our users are clicking on these tabs and performing searches but we cannot determine whether this kind of service is helpful to their research.
- To gather this information we are assembling three focus groups: undergraduates, graduates, and faculty.
- We will ask three questions:
  - What do you use the catalog for? Books? Articles? Both?
  - Have you used the Books and Articles or Articles (only) tabs? If so, did you find useful information?
  - What do you think of having one place to search both books and articles?
Task Analysis

- In addition to the Focus Groups we are also going to performing one on one task analysis with randomly selected users.
- By doing this task analysis we hope to find out if and how our users are using the Webscale Discovery option.
- Questions:
  - Where would you go to search for an article?
  - How would you narrow down your search in the catalog?
  - Where would you go to search both books and articles?
Roadblocks to Assessment

- Change in administration
- Focus on website redesign.
- Low Priority
- Change from FCLA to FLVC
Next Steps

● Review results of the User Focus Groups and Task Analysis

● Bring results to our Information & Research Services Department to determine if:
  ○ We want to continue with Primo Central Index under the Mango interface OR
  ○ Start researching other WSD options for FIU.

● Stay alert for the recommendation from the state on a statewide discovery service.

● After a year, check our vendor provided usage statistics to see if there are any noticeable increases in usage.
What Am I Doing?

How do I figure "it" out?

How do I measure impact?

Which method is the best?

What Am I Doing?

Am I dealing with real numbers?

How do I analyze non-Counter reports?

Will there ever be a standard method of measurement?
4. **When does repeated search in scenes involve memory? Looking at versus looking for objects in scenes.**


   One might assume that familiarity with a scene or previous encounters with objects embedded in a scene would benefit subsequent search for those items. However, in a series of experiments we show:

   Subjects: Episodic Memory, Visual Perception, Visual Search; Male, Female

   Database: ProARTICLES
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5. **Advanced Search in Retreat.**


   Subjects: Internet; Information Retrieval; Search Engines

   Database: CINAHL Plus with Full Text
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6. **Professional Microsoft search [electronic resource] : FAST search, SharePoint search, and Search Server / Mark Bennett ... [et al.].**

   Indianapolis, Ind.: Wiley, c2010, 01/01/2010 xiv, 464 p. ; 24 cm. Language: English

   An electronic book accessible through the World Wide Web; click to view

   Subjects: Microsoft SharePoint (Electronic resource): Query languages (Computer science) -- Computer programs; Management information systems; Internet programming; Search engines -- Computer programs; Internet searching -- Computer programs; Electronic books.

   Database: UNF eBook Collection
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAA</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier (Comm and Mass Media Comp)</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAIA</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>18998</td>
<td>14751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mergent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newrank</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Music</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>2803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>3938</td>
<td>4901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Direct</td>
<td>4752</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>4766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **AAA***: 2010
- **ACS**: 2011
- **Cambridge**: 2012
- **Elsevier (Comm and Mass Media Comp)**: 2010
- **Emerald**: 2011
- **IAIA**: 2012
- **JSTOR**: 2010
- **Mergent**: 2011
- **Nature**: 2012
- **Newrank**: 2010
- **Oxford Music**: 2011
- **Oxford**: 2012
- **Sage**: 2010
- **Science Direct**: 2011
- **SIAM**: 2012
- **Wiley Online**: 2010

**Note:** The above table and graph represent the impact of various databases over different years.
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