

# **A Case for Assessment and UX Teams**

Emily Daly  
Duke University, USA

Michael Luther  
Emory University, USA

## **I. Introduction**

As assessment and user experience (AUX) functions become more complex and increasingly integrated into the administrative functions of academic libraries, some institutions have formed teams to focus on this important work. Two such institutions are the Emory University Libraries in Atlanta, Georgia and the Duke University Libraries in Durham, North Carolina. Both have combined the roles of assessment and user experience into dedicated AUX departments, and both define AUX broadly, to include physical and virtual spaces, services, collections, and programming. Beyond these similarities, the teams have grown organically, reflecting the goals and priorities of their library and university.

The decision to unite the functions of assessment and user experience may seem strange at first look. When viewed narrowly, assessment is about tracking performance or measuring outcomes. Whereas user experience—again, viewed narrowly—is usually associated with the IT world, with design, and specifically with user interfaces. So, why combine them? Because when you take a more holistic view, these two functions have a lot in common. They often use similar methods and techniques, and they can be applied in both the physical and virtual worlds. This holistic view allows a lot of flexibility in how you build an AUX team.

A holistic view also expands the potential scope of the work and compels AUX professionals—even a team of professionals—to make decisions about where to focus time, energy, and resources. It creates ample opportunity for collaboration across the organization, as members of an AUX team seek willing and capable partners to increase capacity and expand expertise. Scope, focus, and methodology can combine and recombine in a kaleidoscopic mix of potential AUX projects. Flexibility is an asset under these circumstances. With this complexity and the paramount need for adaptability in mind, the object of this paper is not to present a model for an AUX team. Rather, by presenting two examples of AUX teams at large research institutions, the authors hope to highlight some of the issues, opportunities, and potential pitfalls of a team-based approach to assessment and user experience work.

## **II. Our Stories**

The AUX teams at Duke and Emory did not spring fully formed onto the organizational chart. They arose by a process of evolution and an expansion of organizational needs. The most basic drivers of assessment include the need to report information or track performance. Over time, these often expand to include more fundamental drivers: informing decision-making or discovering unknowns, for example. Ultimately, libraries seek to better understand their communities in order to better serve them. Assessment and UX professionals play an instrumental role in this development by accumulating a body of relevant and meaningful evidence. A review of the origins and rationales behind the Duke and Emory AUX teams may be illustrative.

In 2005, ARL launched a program called Making Library Assessment Work, the purpose of which was to “assess the state of assessment efforts in individual research libraries, identify barriers and facilitators of assessment, and devise pragmatic approaches to assessment that can flourish in different local

environments.”<sup>1</sup> Emory University Libraries (EUL) participated in Phase II of this effort. Over a day and a half, Steve Hiller and Jim Self visited Emory Libraries. They gave a presentation on effective assessment practices, met with library stakeholders, and observed library operations and practices related to assessment.<sup>2</sup> Though EUL had conducted assessment studies such as LibQUAL prior to 2005, participation in this ARL initiative marked the beginning of assessment as a formal function at Emory University Libraries. The position of library assessment coordinator was filled in September 2005.<sup>3</sup>

During these early years, the work of library assessment was largely distributed across the organization, with the library assessment coordinator as the common link. This person partnered with several groups, including a Library Assessment Council, an Assessment Integration Group (AIG), and various councils focusing either on broad disciplinary areas (e.g., humanities) or stakeholder groups (e.g., undergraduates).<sup>4</sup> Together, they conducted annual surveys of local users, developed business plans and conducted focus groups.<sup>5</sup> In 2010, EUL hired a user experience librarian. This role was distinct from the assessment function.

Seeking to build on this rich history, EUL leadership united the functions of assessment and user experience within a single team in 2018. The UX function is often located in the technology division because of its close association with user interfaces. However, leadership situated the AUX team within the Research, Engagement, and Scholarly Communications (RESC) division. The idea was to put AUX in close proximity to library users.

Except for the team leader, all team members had worked at EUL for some time and were doing work related to assessment and/or UX. The team has two assessment coordinators, one for Emory Libraries as a whole and one for the RESC Division. The former is the assessment program coordinator, who collects data from around the organization, manages it within the LibPas data warehouse, and creates visualizations within Tableau. The assessment coordinator for the RESC Division (who also serves as the science librarian), leads the RESC Assessment Taskforce and represents the division on EUL’s Assessment Integration Group. On the user experience side, we have a service design librarian, who also serves as product manager for EUL’s Springshare platform. Rounding out the team of four original AUX members, is a collections analyst. This role works closely with both AUX and the head of collections management, analyzing and visualizing collections data. I was hired as the head of assessment and user experience in February 2019.

Emory’s AUX team serves as the central hub for the collecting, processing, vetting, storage, and reporting of data for Emory University Libraries. Thanks in large part to this long experience, members of the team have attained considerable proficiency with the Tableau data visualization tool. This is a versatile skill set that can be applied to any number of projects.

Beyond strict data management, AUX leads a variety of recurring or special projects. For example, we work closely with EUL’s Assessment Integration Group to plan, develop, and implement a biennial library survey. We planned to launch the survey in March 2020, but it was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. AUX also submits an assessment report every two years to the Office of Planning and Budgeting. This report uses multiple measures/methods to assess five organization outcomes derived from EUL’s strategic framework. Examples of special projects will be detailed in the case studies section of these proceedings.

Lastly, Emory’s AUX serves a consulting role for our colleagues around EUL working on projects or processes related to assessment or user experience. As suggested earlier, there are limits to the number of projects that AUX itself can take on at one time. If we have colleagues in other areas with the time, skill, and motivation to take the lead on local assessment or user experience efforts, AUX can still play a

supporting role. We can lend our knowledge and experience and hopefully increase the likelihood of a successful outcome.

Like Emory's program, assessment at Duke Libraries goes back a number of years, with a dedicated library evaluation and planning position beginning in 2007. Assessment efforts were initially focused on external reporting, the LibQUAL user satisfaction survey, and working with faculty to assess student learning outcomes in their teaching. Between 2012 and 2014, as a result of staffing changes and retirements, we had an opportunity to re-think our approach to library assessment. Around that same time, user experience or "UX" was being talked about more in libraries, and I recommended that Duke Libraries devote more attention to this emerging field. The associate university librarian (AUL) for collections and user services, to whom I reported, supported this new direction. He and I successfully advocated for a new department of just two staff, a web developer with a strong interest in UX who was already at Duke Libraries, and me, to be department head of this small team. The UX web developer and I started as a team of two in January 2013 and soon after began advocating for a larger scope and more staff to help perform our increased responsibilities. For instance, we immediately realized the overlap between assessing library web interfaces, physical spaces, services, collections, and programs, and improving users' experiences with these spaces and services. From our perspective, it is not possible to improve UX without first conducting assessments of some sort. Similarly, assessment without a plan for action or resources to improve services is unsatisfying and useless to patrons. In August 2014, we hired an assessment librarian, bringing our two-person team to three and prompting a departmental name change from UX to Assessment & User Experience (AUX).

Another retirement and more organizational changes followed in early 2018, and in May 2018, AUX shifted organizationally from Collections & User Services to Digital Strategies & Technology (DST), a move that would help the library integrate assessment and UX practices more fully into library IT. It is worth noting that we considered a number of organizational homes for AUX. We determined that AUX could fit nearly anywhere in the organization due to our connections to virtually every aspect of library services, from optimizing staff workflows to improving user spaces to guiding web development and discovery of library resources. We ultimately decided that AUX would report to the AUL for DST, but left open the possibility for AUX to change divisional homes periodically in order to permeate assessment and UX mindsets throughout the organization. We also specified that the AUX department head would maintain close ties to Collections & User Services (CUS) operations and staff. To sustain these connections, AUX decided to split its office space between public services and library IT, with some AUX staff working alongside subject librarians and collectors and others working in close proximity to web developers and systems librarians. While others in the organization questioned this practice early on, it has proven extremely successful and helps us work toward our departmental goal of infusing user-centered practices and data-informed decision-making throughout the Duke Libraries.

AUX's move from CUS to DST prompted additional changes in scope and staffing. With five years under our belts, we had gained significant experience managing UX and assessment projects. Library administration asked that we formalize this function and support our colleagues leading projects throughout the library. We also expanded our staff, welcoming two librarians from other units who were interested in AUX's work and brought expertise in data analysis and visualization, web development, and project management. These staff helped us expand our capacity for assessment and UX work and grow into our newest area of support, project management. This function is closely tied to our interest in process improvement; not only do AUX staff strive to make things better for end users, we also improve workflows for library staff, which in turn, makes things better for library users.

It would be disingenuous to stop describing the AUX team there. Since 2014, just a year after our department was formed, we have relied heavily on graduate students to help with usability testing, user studies, web content creation, data analysis, along with other tasks and projects. In 2016, we

serendipitously connected with Duke's PhD program in psychology and neuroscience and since then have had three outstanding graduate assistants from social psychology and cognitive neuroscience. The work is part-time (the current graduate assistant works just 5 hours per week), but these paid graduate student assistants have been an invaluable addition to the AUX department, helping provide a student perspective when we need it, and increasing our capacity to move projects forward.

In addition to paid graduate student assistants, we have benefitted from the energy and fresh eyes of more than 30 unpaid practicum students. Practicum students work with the AUX department for one academic semester in exchange for course credit in MSIS/MSLS programs or for resume-building experience without course credit. We have had up to three practicum students with us in a given semester, and they typically take the lead on usability testing, even helping us move our in-person usability testing program online when AUX staff and students began working remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is worth mentioning some of Duke's AUX departmental responsibilities that will perhaps further explain the need for five full-time staff plus students. In addition to performing functions that are typically associated with assessment and UX (e.g., external reporting, user testing, user satisfaction surveys, web design), we are responsible for the Duke Libraries website and books and media catalog. Other library staff provide support for the library website and catalog, but AUX staff oversee governance and maintenance for both applications.

In addition to well-resourced departments, Emory and Duke both benefit from cross-departmental assessment teams, referred to as the Assessment Integration Group (AIG) at Emory and the Assessment Core Team (ACT) at Duke. Both teams have been around for a number of years: Emory's AIG in its current iteration dates back to 2015, and Duke's ACT began in January 2010, well before Duke's AUX department was formed. Both AIG and ACT were convened to foster a library-wide culture of assessment and to promote data-informed decision-making. To accomplish these ambitious goals, AIG and ACT include staff members from across both organizations, representing the assessment interests germane to public services, technical services, archives and special collections, and library IT.

AIG at Emory is quite large, currently consisting of 20 members. The size of this group is due in part to Emory's many colleges, most of which have their own library. AIG is represented by librarians supporting business, law, theology, health sciences and the Oxford College campus. In addition, the AIG roster includes representatives from the five divisions of EUL and the manuscript, archives, and rare book library. As the head of assessment and user experience, I chair AIG. One of the great advantages of such a large group is that I and other members of AUX have a natural partner and ally in almost any area of the organization.

AIG meets monthly and serves several important functions on behalf of Emory Libraries. For example, we play a key role in the successful delivery of consistent and accurate organizational-level data. Given the number of metrics tracked and the nuances with assessment practices across libraries and divisions, this is a sometimes tedious and time-consuming occupation. Going forward, I hope to work with both AIG and AUX to reduce the administrative burden of this important job, freeing up both teams to focus their efforts and expertise on projects that complement our quantitative statistics and bring them to life.

AIG is also responsible for administering the biennial library survey. The group partners with AUX to develop and test the survey instrument and promote participation. When the results are in, group members contribute to the inherent meaning-making that follows such an endeavor. The process of distilling and communicating actionable information from the library survey is essential and not always as straightforward as it may seem. We must remain focused and vigilant and prepared to address the oft-heard refrain "yes, but what do we do with this information?"

Finally, AIG recommends new policies or changes to existing policies related to assessment and conducts special projects as needed. The current effort is a needs assessment of EUL, as discussed later in these proceedings.

Duke's Assessment Core Team (ACT) is considerably smaller than AIG, currently including seven staff members. Like AIG, the membership is diverse, with staff from electronic resources, special collections, research and reference, and library instruction, as well as the three AUX staff whose work is most closely connected to library assessment. Also like AIG, the AUX department head serves as the team's chair. The team communicates regularly and meets as needed, at least every other month, and as frequently as weekly when an ACT sub-team has been charged to lead a focused assessment project.

ACT's work is largely driven by the Duke Libraries' biennial user satisfaction survey.<sup>6</sup> ACT helps plan nearly every aspect of the survey and then promotes participation when the survey is live. After the survey closes, ACT members work with AUX staff and students to code free-text comments and conduct a library-wide staff workshop to analyze findings and develop recommendations for improvement, additional marketing and outreach, or follow-up assessment based on survey data. ACT members then participate or lead sub-teams to conduct further assessment to learn more about what was suggested by survey respondents. ACT spends a little over a year following up on survey recommendations and findings, at which time they begin to plan the next iteration of the user satisfaction survey. Members are well positioned to refine and add questions because they have just spent the previous year digging into survey data and conducting follow-up assessment to learn more. Because ACT's composition changes as members' interests, roles, and capacity for committee work evolve, we have a mix of new and seasoned members during each survey cycle. This helps provide both continuity and a fresh take on things as we revise the survey instrument, develop marketing strategies, and then plan ways for all library staff to review and respond to findings.

ACT's other major role is to identify four to six assessment projects for the library to conduct and report to Duke University's assessment committee each fiscal year. Library staff conduct more assessments that are not reported to the university-wide assessment committee, but we are strongly encouraged by Duke to report several high impact assessments each year. AUX members often take the lead on these projects, but ACT members are encouraged to contribute (e.g., by serving as liaisons to the library departments who have a stake in the project).

### **III. AUX in Action at Emory and Duke**

The AUX teams at Emory and Duke regularly lead projects that support numerous areas of library operations. The following examples illustrate both the variety and the scope of our work. Some of these efforts are more assessment focused, others are more UX focused, and several represent a blend of the two. It should be noted that these projects are in addition to the routine tasks and processes that our teams perform. For example, we collect, vet, and report data from across the Emory and Duke Libraries to ARL, ACRL, and IPEDS; we report assessments of library outcomes to our universities; and we support platforms used throughout our libraries, including Springshare, Qualtrics, and Drupal.

In one example of an AUX project at Emory, collections analyst, Douglas Slaughter, created a collections management dashboard in the Tableau data visualization tool. This dashboard presents a cost per use analysis for firm order data through a series of views: subject, discipline, publisher, and fund code. Each view combines a table, a graph, and a series of filters, allowing the user to set parameters, spot outliers, and determine areas of high and low performance. The dashboard presents a separate set of views for items with zero circulations. The firm order dashboard is an efficient and versatile tool, informing the budget allocation process and helping a collection manager determine strengths and gaps.

In a second effort, members of Emory's AUX team conducted a UX study to support a new library website launched in January 2020. This project was in some ways a bookend to a study conducted by the contractor Viget during the design phase of the website. Members of AUX ran 14 participants from three user groups (faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students) through 24 tasks. The project combined direct measures of success or failure for each task with technical observations of which route(s) the participant took in completion of the tasks. We also included in the final report many illustrative comments in an effort to flesh out the participants' thinking. Based on the data for each of the 24 tasks, we identified themes and noted areas where the site wasn't performing as intended.

Finally, Emory's AUX team conducted a study of 14 database types. This study was a survey that mimicked a card-sorting activity and it was administered to a group of subject librarians and to library users. We wanted to understand the extent to which users and librarians would sort a specific resource into the same database category. For example, given the prompt "the current issue of the Washington Post," would participants sort the resource into *Archival/Primary Sources*, *E-Books*, *Journal Articles*, or the *News* category? We learned that in some areas there was a lot of agreement between the two groups and in other areas, much less. While very narrowly focused, a project such as this one can become part of a broad base of knowledge about user behavior. There are potential implications for several areas of the library including how databases get sorted by type and how information is communicated in Libguides and during library instruction sessions.

Duke's AUX department has also led numerous projects that demonstrate the natural connections and overlap between assessment and UX. As noted earlier, AUX and ACT lead a biennial user satisfaction survey, which on the surface sounds like an assessment activity but actually has UX woven throughout, from initial user testing of the survey instrument to implementing changes based on what we learn. The UX emphasis is perhaps most pronounced once the survey closes, when ACT and AUX analyze survey data and develop recommendations for improvement, marketing/outreach, and follow-up assessment. We then lead a library-wide staff workshop to review findings and develop and prioritize recommendations that relate to functional areas or user groups. In the July 2020 staff survey workshop (held by Zoom, of course) 70 staff from across the library worked in 10 small groups to discuss topics ranging from the needs of first-year students or the particular interests of Black students at Duke, to physical spaces/furniture, to accessing online resources. These small groups developed additional recommendations and prioritized possible follow-up activities, and ACT members then worked with library leadership to determine how best to implement recommendations. ACT also charged four short-term project teams to conduct follow-up assessments in fall 2020 and early 2021.

Another project Duke's AUX department was closely involved with was developing a new library catalog.<sup>7</sup> The lead developer is a member of AUX, and the AUX department head serves as product owner. Worth noting is that we retained these roles even after the new catalog went live in January 2019, because we know that a web platform as critical to library services as the catalog must be actively maintained and governed. This multi-year project made use of our department's expertise in website UX: we aimed to develop a catalog that was aesthetically pleasing and highly usable for novice and advanced researchers alike. Throughout development, AUX staff conducted regular UX testing and made decisions about the catalog's design and features based on user research. The catalog project also exemplifies the agile project management methodology<sup>8</sup> we have adapted for Duke Libraries. For nearly all website and software projects, we designate a product owner and scrum master, work in two-week sprints, conduct sprint planning where the team identifies and assigns story points to issues, and conduct sprint retrospectives. UX testing and structured development cycles of work helped keep catalog development on track and resulted in a highly functional catalog that staff and end users praise for its clean, user-centered design.

To close out our example projects, like academic library staff across the country, Duke Libraries staff were tasked with developing new workflows and operations in order to reopen in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Because of AUX's extensive work with students, spaces, and online interfaces, and our experience managing complex projects, AUX took the lead on several aspects of reopening the Duke Libraries in August 2020. One of these projects was to implement a seats reservation system,<sup>9</sup> which involved rethinking how students interact with the library's online and physical spaces. The Seats Implementation Team considered every step of the journey that users would take to reserve a study seat or piece of equipment and then made decisions about policies, signage, seat descriptions, floor plans, seat labels, and email notifications. Because the team had to make decisions quickly and in many cases in the absence of user feedback, we planned a number of assessments for after we launched the new service. During the fall 2020 semester, we analyzed usage data and created dashboards to aid in decision-making. We reviewed the analytics of the webpages students use to book study seats and conducted user feedback surveys, remote usability testing, and discussion groups. We rolled out numerous improvements based on what we learned.

#### **IV. Privilege, Tribulations, and Lessons Learned**

There is a certain privilege that comes with having a team of five people dedicated to the work of assessment and user experience. First, Emory and Duke are well-resourced institutions. Many organizations have a single assessment and/or UX professional to navigate this vast field of play, which encompasses (at least in theory) every branch of the organizational tree and employs a host of techniques, methods, practices, and modes of inquiry. Secondly, AUX work is still something of a fledgling enterprise in libraries. It does not belong (in a categorical sense) in any of the traditional library silos. Our work touches on all aspects of our organizations but is also apart from them. Our impact comes from the value we add to the organization and its component parts rather than through *direct* services to users or *direct* processing of resources, for example. This makes the significant investment of a five-person team even more noteworthy. While acknowledging this privilege, a team-based approach to AUX work comes with both joys and potential hazards.

In terms of joys, a team-based approach allows team members and library leadership alike to draw on a broader set of skills and perspectives when planning, solving problems, and executing assessment and user experience projects. There is an opportunity for some specialization among team members and, therefore, for some division of labor. Additionally, an AUX team fosters a culture of assessment throughout the organization by expanding the communication networks, and a department tends to speak with a louder voice than an individual, which is an asset when seeking support from library leadership. Indeed, having an AUX team presupposes a degree of administrative buy-in.

An implicit hazard lurks among the joys: that the AUX team has the time and bandwidth to take on any project; that other library divisions can essentially outsource tasks and projects related to assessment or user experience to the AUX team. Admittedly, this notion might come from outside the AUX team, but it can also be something that the team unrealistically expects of itself. There are times when we need to manage expectations and share the responsibility with our very capable colleagues. Prioritization, coordination, and effective communication at all levels are key.

User experience and assessment work is endless—there is always *something* to evaluate, improve, modify, reassess, and so on. It can be tempting to approach work on a “first-come, first served” basis or address what seems easiest or least controversial. We have found, however, that it is far more effective to be strategic, to prioritize work and consider what will have the highest impact on users, and then determine how best to resource a particular project. It is also crucial to be realistic about the potential for scope creep and focus projects narrowly. Otherwise, a project might never end.

Additionally, we have learned to be realistic about our colleagues' expectations for and interest in AUX work. While some staff will be natural allies and find assessment and UX projects exciting and refreshing, others might feel threatened by the changes that frequently follow from assessment. It can be helpful to acknowledge that projects initiated by AUX, ACT, or AIG nearly always lead to more work for our colleagues. We realize that for many, assessment is viewed as a "tack on" or "nice to have" facet of a project, so we have learned not to push too hard when our colleagues are feeling overwhelmed by other aspects of their jobs. We work collaboratively to set goals and scope projects that are well worth the efforts of all involved. AUX relies heavily on staff throughout Emory's and Duke's libraries to conduct assessments and implement improvements, so it is critical that we communicate effectively and garner library leadership's support to charge yet another project team or to evaluate library services or spaces that they oversee.

Emory and Duke are fortunate to have well-staffed departments dedicated to assessment and UX, but there are ways to advance this work without designated departments or positions. For instance, some libraries form assessment teams with staff who are interested in doing this work and who already have assessment as part of their job responsibilities, like Emory's AIG or Duke's ACT. It is also possible to incorporate phases for assessment or UX research into existing or new projects, or leverage consulting as a service. Finally, developing informal communities of practice can be an excellent, cost-effective way to share ideas, build support, and learn from others' challenges and successes.

## **V. What's Ahead for AUX at Emory and Duke?**

The AUX departments at Emory and Duke have evolved to meet the needs of their organizations and end users. We anticipate that AUX's flexible and responsive nature will be all the more important as libraries continue to respond to changing campus needs and budgetary constraints brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic. Following is a brief synopsis of what we anticipate in the coming years at Emory and Duke.

At Emory, AUX and AIG are in the middle of a libraries-wide needs assessment. The object is to determine the assessment and UX needs for the different areas of EUL and for EUL as a whole. Proposed solutions will come later. Every participating library or division has formed a needs assessment team comprising the AIG representative(s), the director/associate dean, and other library/division members as warranted for the success of the project. This academic year, each of the nine needs assessment teams are participating in the following activities:

- An inventory of assessment and UX practices in their areas over the past three years
- A survey of perceived areas of strength, weakness, challenge, and opportunity
- A 90-minute interview with the AUX team

By summer 2021, we will have accumulated a sizable body of evidence from across the library organization. Central to the philosophy behind this project is the idea that AUX, AIG, and the participating division or library will likely view this evidence differently. For AUX, the key questions may be, "where are the common areas of need that we are uniquely positioned to take on for EUL?" AIG might ask "where are the thorny areas that require an in-depth cross-functional study?" Finally, the library/division can look to their unique challenges and opportunities, knowing that they have the support of AUX and AIG. The potential number of projects that will arise from the needs assessment is difficult to calculate, but this work will surely occupy us for the next several years.

At Duke, we have been able to continue our successful AUX practicum program and paid graduate assistantship, even while working remotely. AUX staff are actively working to recruit from underrepresented populations, and we hope to increase the number of students from minoritized user groups we mentor each semester. Additionally, we are in the beginning stages of a third in-depth user



study,<sup>10</sup> this one of international undergraduate and graduate students at Duke. Also, AUX staff are responsible for migrating the Duke Libraries website from Drupal 7 to 9, and we will take this opportunity to streamline web content and ensure it is clear and inclusive of all users. Of course, we will continue to assess library spaces and services that were developed in response to the pandemic, and we anticipate continuing some of the new library services (e.g., mailing books to users who live more than 100 miles from Duke; enabling students to reserve study seats) after the threat of COVID-19 subsides. In collaboration with our colleagues, AUX staff will continue to assess and improve these services as they evolve.

The Emory and Duke Libraries built their AUX teams to suit organizational objectives. However, the nature of assessment and user experience work is such that it can be configured in any number of ways and performed by any number of individuals. Whether forming a team or dividing the work across the organization, it is crucial to remain focused on the needs of the institution and take into account the skills, aptitudes, and interests of library staff. Wherever these align, there is an opportunity to conduct effective AUX work.

—Copyright 2021 Emily Daly and Michael Luther

## **Author Biographies**

### **Emily Daly**

Head of Assessment and User Experience  
Duke University

Emily Daly is head of Assessment & User Experience at Duke University Libraries in Durham, NC. She coordinates Duke Libraries' Assessment Team and plans and conducts user research related to the Libraries' website, services, collections, and spaces. Emily also co-leads the Libraries' Digital Preservation and Publishing Program and helps coordinate the Libraries' web interfaces teams. Prior to working at Duke, she taught high school English and then served as the teen librarian at Natrona County Public Library in Casper, Wyoming, and as librarian in Durham's Southern High School. She received a BA in English/secondary education from NC State and an MS in library science from UNC-Chapel Hill.

### **Michael Luther**

Head of Assessment and User Experience  
Emory University

Michael Luther is the head of Assessment and User Experience at Emory University Libraries in Atlanta, GA. Leading a team of four, Michael seeks to integrate a robust mix of assessment and user experience techniques and methodologies throughout the Libraries in order to learn from users, track progress, and better steer the organization to meet the needs of the community. Before coming to Emory in 2019, Michael served as Assessment Librarian at Kennesaw State University for 6 years. He earned his MSLIS from Syracuse University in 2010.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Steve Hiller and Stephanie Wright, “Turning Results into Action: Using Assessment Information to Improve Library Performance,” Slide #5, accessed December 7, 2020.
- <sup>2</sup> Hiller and Wright, “Turning Results into Action,” Slide #6.
- <sup>3</sup> Susan Bailey, “The Library Assessment Journey at Emory,” Slide #5, accessed December 7, 2020.
- <sup>4</sup> Bailey, “The Library Assessment Journey at Emory,” Slides 6–8.
- <sup>5</sup> Susan Bailey, Jon Bodnar, and Frances Maloy, “Voice of the Customer (VOC) Emory Libraries,” (Presentation, Southeastern Library Assessment Conference, Atlanta, GA, October 21–22, 2013), Slide #5, accessed December 7, 2020.
- <sup>6</sup> “Biennial User Satisfaction Surveys,” Duke University Libraries, accessed December 7, 2020, <https://library.duke.edu/about/depts/assessment-user-experience/biennial-surveys>.
- <sup>7</sup> “Duke University Libraries Catalog,” Duke University Libraries, accessed December 7, 2020, <https://find.library.duke.edu/>.
- <sup>8</sup> “About Scrum Alliance,” Scrum Alliance, Inc., accessed December 7, 2020, <https://www.scrumalliance.org/agile-organizations/about>.
- <sup>9</sup> “Reserve Study Seats, Equipment, or a Spot to Visit Galleries,” Duke University Libraries, accessed December 7, 2020, <https://library.duke.edu/using/library-spaces/booking>.
- <sup>10</sup> “In-depth User Studies,” Duke University Libraries, accessed December 7, 2020, <https://library.duke.edu/about/depts/assessment-user-experience/user-studies>.

## Bibliography

- Assessment & User Experience Department. “Biennial User Satisfaction Surveys.” Duke University Libraries. Last modified September 2020. <https://library.duke.edu/about/depts/assessment-user-experience/biennial-surveys>.
- Assessment & User Experience Department. “In-depth User Studies.” Duke University Libraries. Last modified August 2020. <https://library.duke.edu/about/depts/assessment-user-experience/user-studies>.
- Bailey, Susan B., “[The Library Assessment Journey at Emory](#),” (Presentation, ALA Midwinter Conference, San Antonio, TX, January 20–25, 2006).
- Bailey, Susan, Jon Bodnar, and Stephanie Maloy, “[Voice of the Customer \(VOC\) Emory Libraries](#),” (Presentation, Southeastern Library Assessment Conference, Atlanta, GA, October 21–22, 2013).
- Duke University Libraries. “Duke University Libraries Catalog.” Duke University Libraries. Last modified December 7, 2020. <https://find.library.duke.edu/>.
- Duke University Libraries. “Reserve Study Seats, Equipment, or a Spot to Visit Galleries.” Duke University Libraries. Last modified December 7, 2020. <https://library.duke.edu/using/library-spaces/booking>.
- Hiller, Steve & Stephanie Wright, “[Turning Results into Action: Using Assessment Information to Improve Library Performance](#),” Slide #5.
- Scrum Alliance, Inc. “Say Hello to the New Way of Working.” About Scrum Alliance. Last modified November 2020. <https://www.scrumalliance.org/agile-organizations/about>.