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The Undergraduate Experience Team
Cognitive interviews: a simple plan

1. Recruit 25 UCSC undergraduate and graduate students
2. Test two modules:
   A. Role of the Library
   B. Library Space Planning (draft)
3. Perform cognitive interviews
4. Report our findings to Ithaka S+R
5. Get it done during fall quarter
Planning the project: the basics

- Create a common workspace
- Articulate individual responsibilities
- Define performance expectations for the group
Planning the project: prepare the interviewers

- Take the survey / break the survey
- Master the script
Planning the project: recruit students

- Cast a broad net
- Make it convenient
- Offer an incentive
Executing the project: complications

- Started late
- Underestimated student interest
- Overestimated student commitment
- Underestimated survey / interview length
- Co-editing Google spreadsheet proved problematic
Project outcome: success!

- Completed 31 interviews
- Broad participation
- Questions were generally well understood
What does “comfort” mean?

Question 24: “Overall how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following aspects of the campus library building you visit most often?”

(4): “The general comfort level”

CI question 13: “What did you think we meant by ‘comfort level’ in this statement.”
7 of 31 interviewees described comfort in terms of personal safety

❖ “Seating, environment (is it safe?), temperature”
❖ “I am able to do my work. I feel safe in the library”
❖ “A safe space”
❖ “Whether she feels safe coming to library and won’t be disturbed by anything”
❖ “Combination of physically comfortable seating as well as atmosphere—not people randomly creeping around in library”
❖ “Chairs, location, safety. If I feel like I am not going to be bothered.”
❖ “Feeling safe, physically comfortable, relaxed.”
CI project outcome: new questions

- LSP 4 (6): “The general level of safety”
- LSP 23: Location
- LSP 24: Hours
- LSP 25: Safe transit—day
- LSP 26: Safe transit—night
- LSP 27: Safety issues: text response
Spring survey experience

- 6 April to 5 June
- Collaborated with IRAPS
- Just undergraduates
- Incentives
- Student tabling
- 11.25% participation
Safety to and from: day

- Extremely unsafe: 0%
- Unsafe: 0%
- Somewhat unsafe: 1%
- Neither safe nor unsafe: 5%
- Somewhat safe: 5%
- Safe: 37%
- Extremely safe: 51%
Safety to and from: night

- Extremely unsafe: 3%
- Unsafe: 6%
- Somewhat unsafe: 15%
- Neither safe nor unsafe: 10%
- Somewhat safe: 23%
- Safe: 28%
- Extremely safe: 16%
Safety to and from: gender and library

Day-F: 6, 6, 6
Day-M: 6, 6, 6
Night-F: 4, 5
Night-M: 5, 6
Safety comments

- Poor lighting
- Forest environment
- Potential for assault
- Distance to bus stops, parking lots, campus housing
- Unreliable shuttle service
CI and survey project outcomes

- Team identity and direction
- Actionable data
- Campus partnerships