7-2-2008

Usability Study of the Coates Library Website at Trinity University: Two Years Later

Benjamin R. Harris

Trinity University, bharris@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/lib_faculty

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Repository Citation

Harris, Benjamin R., "Usability Study of the Coates Library Website at Trinity University: Two Years Later" (2008). Library Faculty Research. 7.
https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/lib_faculty/7

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Coates Library at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.
A Usability Study of the Coates Library Website at Trinity University:

Two Years Later

March 2007

Benjamin R. Harris, Reference/Instruction Librarian
Table of Contents

Introduction........................................................................................................3
Study Population Statistics..............................................................................4
Study Session Methodology...........................................................................4
Study Session Results: Tasks.........................................................................5
Study Session Results: Post-Exercise Survey.............................................13
Conclusion......................................................................................................14
Appendix I: Composition of the Study Population....................................15
App. II: Report of Specific Changes in Response to the 2005 Study..........17
Introduction

Purpose of Study

In February 2005, a usability study of the Coates Library website was conducted and a final report of findings was published at the digital commons website in March. This report was designed to be informational and to help guide the library’s web team in making revisions, additions, and deletions to the library web’s content, structure, and design.

In late 2005, a follow up report was posted to the digital commons that detailed student and faculty responses to a revised version of the website (published online in August 2005). This report also listed in detail the changes that were made based on information collected during the usability study. However, all of the changes that were made independent of the study were not cataloged, and responses of students and faculty related to those changed were not recorded.

In February 2007, as the web team began to make plans for revisions to the site to occur before the Fall 2007 semester, a small number of students participated in usability study sessions. This information will be used to determine what continues to work well after the web team’s summer 2005 revisions, and may suggest directions for current and future changes to the library’s website.

Process of the Study

The research process described in The Usability Study of the Coates Library Website at Trinity University: Final Report (March 2005) was followed for this follow-up study. While changes to the study were suggested in the initial report, for the purposes of following up on the 2005 results, no changes were made to the process.

However, while the original study included more than 70 participants (65 of which were used in the results), only 6 participants were utilized in this study. However, it was the opinion of both of the original study moderators that at an early point in the study progress, patterns and consistencies became set and with few exceptions, held throughout the course of the research project. Further, usability research (in particular, the work of Jakob Nielsen) supports the validity of smaller sample sizes.
Study Population

Recruitment of Study Population

The participants in this follow-up study were volunteers from the Computer Science department’s Computing Skills classes. This was the same population utilized in the original usability study.

Composition of Study Population

Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire offering basic information. This information is included in Appendix I.

As with the 2005 study, most students were in their first-year at Trinity and represented a variety of academic majors. All of the students are daily users of the internet and email, and a majority of them use the website on a monthly basis.

Aside from the difference in population size, most of the participants had received some kind of library instruction. While instruction by different librarians for different classes will probably focus on specific/varied topics, most students will have used the library webpage related to class exercises or specific assignments. This would not necessarily have an influence on the results of the usability study. While students may be more familiar with the page itself, it is unlikely that they would have received instruction in answering questions similar to a majority of those posed in the tasks.

Study Session Methodology

Study Session Process

The study session methodology used in 2005 was replicated in 2007.

Data Recording

Due to the small number of participants, results were not transferred into a database.
Study Session Results: Tasks

Students were asked to complete the following tasks. The first task was established as a sample task. Participants were allowed to ask questions about the task or the study in general only after the sample task.

Each of the following sections lists (a) the task itself, (b) a general process for how most participants attempted to find the answer, (c) statistics related to how participants attempted to find the answer and (d) possible changes that would improve the usability of the site in relation to this particular task in 2007.

In the drafting of this report, each question was to be accompanied by specific changes made in 2005 that may have led to improved use the site in relation to a particular question. However, since numerous factors could influence the usability of the site in relation to a particular task, assumptions were not made about which changes facilitated improvement. Instead, the complete list of changes made to the website as of August 2005 has been listed in Appendix II.

The Microsoft Word “Comments” feature has been used to help the reader make comparisons between this study’s results and the 2005 study. Responses from the 2005 study have been included in the comment, and information related to the 2007 follow-up is included beneath the underlined heading. In addition, statistics information is included for both years (2005 results on the left, 2007 results on the right).
Sample Task: *Find the name of the liaison librarian for Biology.*

**General Process**

This task remains troublesome for most participants. Consistently, searchers went to the Library Staff Directory to locate this information first. Three students then tried the Ask a Librarian feature but failed to notice the link for liaison librarians.

Students tended to steer clear of the Faculty Corner links, possibly based on the assumption that none of the questions posed to them would require the use of links designated for the faculty.

One student tried to use the home page “Multisearch” box to find the answer.

One student used the Where is...? link and found the Google search box. Interestingly enough, once she had used this successfully, she went back to the Google search box on the Where is...? page to answer 4 other questions.

One participant found the right answer in a way that I had never seen before. The participant went to the Library Instruction link under the Faculty Corner, then clicked on the Request Library Instruction button. The participant selected the Select Liaison Areas button and chose “Biology.” The librarian’s name automatically was entered into the line above and she had her answer.

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants completing the task</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants not completing the task</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time spent on task</td>
<td>1:56</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. clicks spent on task</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Changes**

1. Include liaison assignments on the directory page. This is the most obvious solution considering 6 out of 7 participants went there first.
2. Make the Ask a Librarian page less text oriented. Consider a grid or table format rather like the tables used on the Reserves pages.
3. Make the Google search box a home page item.

Ultimately, it is doubtful that students *must* be able to contact their liaison librarian. It can expedite matters, but since we’re a fairly small bunch, forwarding questions or appointments requests is handled fairly easily. Clearly, they could find “a librarian” if they needed one---regardless of liaison area.
Task #1: *Find out if the library owns the book Gallery of Maps in the Vatican.*

**General Process**

Students found this answer by using the Books and Media button or by clicking on the Find Books link. Overall, the speed of searching was improved (possibly due to changes made to the latter page). I also noted that more students were using the buttons as opposed to links, a change from the last study.

**Statistics**

| Participants completing the task | 57 | 6 |
| Participants not completing the task | 8 | 0 |
| Avg. time spent on task | .58 | .29 |
| Avg. clicks spent on task | 3 | 3 |

**Possible Changes**

None suggested.

**Task #2: Find out if the library subscribes to The Journal of Criminal Law?**

**General Process**

All of the students found the answer to this question quickly and with little effort. Most used the Journal button immediately to begin searching. In 2005, the number of students completing the task and those not completing the task was even. This is a clear improvement. Since TDNet now supports “The” as the introductory word of a title, this is the most likely reason for improved speed.

**Statistics**

| Participants completing the task | 33 | 6 |
| Participants not completing the task | 32 | 0 |
| Avg. time spent on task | 2:17 | :40 |
| Avg. clicks spent on task | 4 | 2 |

**Possible Changes**

None suggested.
Task #3: Find information on the library’s loan periods and overdue policies for Trinity students.

General Process

Most participants found the Services and Policies link quickly. From there, two used the Borrowing link to find the answer. Four went to Interlibrary Loan first---again, this is most likely due to the word “loan” in the question.

None of the participants used Circulation to find the answer. This, like Access Services, probably remains very much a “library” term---even though it is the more familiar of the two.

The shorter time spent on the task, and the number completing the task compared to the 2005 study suggests that changes made to the Services and Policies page have been successful.

Statistics

| Participants completing the task | 32 | 6 |
| Participants not completing the task | 33 | 0 |
| Avg. time spent on task | 2:17 | 1:16 |
| Avg. clicks spent on task | 6 | 5 |

Possible Changes

None suggested.

Comment: Most participants were able to navigate to the Services and Policies page in completing this task. Once there, they were not certain about their next step. If they read the descriptions of the link, they might go to access services. More often, they were not able to make the connection.

Some students went to the interlibrary loan link on the services and policies page. The word “loan” was clearly being used as a keyword here, suggesting the important and crucial role keywords and buzzwords play at the site.

Once exposed to the “About the Library” link, a number of test subjects used the “Where is...?” link or the Site Index under the “More” link to find the answer.

Comment: 1. Extend or enhance the Access Services description on the Services and Policies page.
2. Offer an Access Services link, as well as other links on the services and policies page related to specific information. For example, there could be a link for “Loan periods and overdue policies” or a link for “Alumni circulation privileges.” This is a second level page, and because it is designed to offer guidance to services and policies, these services and policies should be more apparent on the second level. Listing departments when patrons expect to see services and policies may be confusing or cause misdirection.
3. Include a link to the Site Index on the home page.
Task #4: Find information on receiving a book from another library.

General Process

There was little consistency in the way participants answered this question. The Borrow Items and Get Stuff links were used, as was the link under Services and Policies. The Borrow Items under the Faculty corner was used by 3 of the 6 participants, but this may have more to do with the fact that it is on the left side of the page.

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants completing the task</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants not completing the task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time spent on task</td>
<td>:36</td>
<td>:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. clicks spent on task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Changes

1. None suggested by the study.

Comment: There is no doubt that the library home page is successful in many ways, including directing patrons to interlibrary loan services. Almost every participant answered this question correctly. A larger number of test subjects used the "Borrow Items from another Library" link under the faculty corner.

There is one challenge with this question. Subjects who completed task #3 using the "Services and Policies" page may have observed the "Interlibrary Loan" link along with its description. It could be surmised that those using this route actually learned the route by participating in the study.

Comment: In the future, if space is required for a new link, the "Get Stuff" link under the "Learn How to…" heading would be an option.
Task #5: Find a list of web resources related to Business.

General Process

This question seemed to cause more challenges during the follow up study. Two years later, the terms “web” or “electronic” or “online” have become even more conflated—they are interpreted as synonyms.

Half of participants went to the Articles and More page and generated the menu of Business databases. The distinction between online subscription databases and sites on the World Wide Web may not be important enough (to students) to distinguish. In the end, does it give them what they want? Or not?

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants completing the task</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time spent on task</td>
<td>:58</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. clicks spent on task</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Changes

There are a number of ways to make the librarians’ internet resource selections more prominent for students. I would assume that with our current issues concerning web page real estate, we are probably not going to spend much effort in advertising or directing visitors explicitly toward internet resources.

The question itself also poses problems—more so than two years ago. This means that we have to decide we accept the conflation of terms or if we spend more time and effort teaching people the differences between our electronic resources and web resources.

Comment: A large number of participants answered this question correctly. Most went to the “Resources by Subject” link and clicked on Business before finding the websites link.

Less often, there were two other avenues taken by users. Some clicked on the “Find” heading or “More” link under the “Find…” heading and found the link for web sites. A significant number went to Course Related links, were redirected to the Economics or Marketing course guides (due to the message next to Busn). While these were not links set aside for “business,” everything about the task completion process told the participant that this was the correct answer.

Comment: 1. For this specific situation, remove the “see” link from the BUSN entry on the Course-Related Links list.
2. Course-related research guide creators might be diligent in their presentation to clarify that the guide is for a specific course or situation. Further, links back to other home page resources might be helpful.
Task #6: *Find a scholarly journal article on diabetes that was published in 2004.*

**General Process**

More than half of participants tried the *Journals* link first, and even selected the “Articles” option on the search menu. I think they would have found an answer, except that they were not given a 2004 article.

No one used the *Resources by Subject* page to get the answer on this go-around. Participants also did not limit their database options once they had decided to use the *Articles and More* link. After failing at the “Journals” link, 4 out of 6 users went to the *Articles and More* page and then directly into Academic Search Premier.

**Statistics**¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants completing the task</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants not completing the task</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time spent on task</td>
<td>2:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. clicks spent on task</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Changes**

None suggested.

---

¹ The 2005 statistics listed in the table total only 63 participants of the 65 recorded on all other portions of the study data. Data related to two participants were not fully entered into the database and could not be used. These two results were removed from the aggregate data.
Task #7: Find out if Professor Heather Sullivan has items on electronic reserves for her classes.

General Process

The success rate for this question improved and all of the participants completed the task. Oddly, half started by using the Place Materials on Reserve link. The reasoning for this—well, I leave it to you.

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants completing the task</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants not completing the task</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. time spent on task</td>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. clicks spent on task</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Changes

1. The suggestion that the Faculty Corner be removed and a link to a faculty page be included instead would help with clarity on a question like this. Were it not for the fact that the word “Reserve” was included in the Place Materials on Reserve link, participants would never have clicked there.

There is probably some confusion, also, for new students about what “Reserves” even are. The idea of electronic reserves is something of a holdover from print, so this may be related to the fact that students do not know what “Reserves” are until they actually have to find one.

Comment: This is a complex task, and answers were not always accurate due to specific problems with links on the home page. First, students may or may not have known how to define “reserves.” Second, many did not seem to grasp the fact that electronic reserves and print reserves were listed in separate locations. Methods for answering the question varied, primarily due to the reserves pages linked from the library’s home page. The “Reserve Readings” link under “Find” goes to a table with links to three types of reserves. The Reserves tab at the top of the home page goes to the print reserves list in Quest. There is an “E-Reserves” button underneath the search interface, but a link to “Tiger’s Lair” is on an equal level. The two buttons become lost. Further, one might assume that if the term “electronic reserves” is used, that a patron will assume that “e-reserves” means the same thing. It is still only an assumption. The Reserves tab at the top of pages on the second level goes to either the print reserves or the electronic reserves, but this path is inconsistent depending on the page from which the patron is linking. Finally, the Reserves link at the bottom of the home page goes to electronic reserves with little explanation for why this selection has been made.

One point of confusion rested on the use of the word “reserve” as a noun (“Reserves”), as an adjective (“Reserve Readings”), and as a verb (“Reserve Rooms”).

Comment: 1. Distinguish between print and electronic reserves. In fact, saying “print reserves” and “electronic reserves” would be helpful. 2. Offer a database that covers print and electronic reserves. 3. Reduce the number of home page options for finding reserves. Further, there should be a consistency in these links. Since they all go to different locations, the idea behind offering differing routes to the same information has become backward in this situation. Instead, you have the same route to different information. If patrons find reserves once, their chance of finding it again through the same route will be slim. 4. Edit the faculty corner link “Reserve Rooms.” The page itself is actually titled “Reserving Rooms.” This might be an alternative. “Room Reservation Request” is another way of keeping the same idea without using the word “Reserve” as a verb.
Study Session Results: Post-Exercise Survey

The following questions were posed to study participants after completing the study session exercise. Due to the smaller study population, all of the participants' responses have been quoted. However, any responses of "none" have been edited.

Question 1: What are the strongest or best characteristics of the library website?

"I liked the 'Where is…' part. It was very helpful when I was searching for something."

"Everything's worded simple and to the point, making it easy to understand everything."

"Has quick links for numerous things right on the front page."

"I feel that the home page is amazing at guiding you to the right spot for what you are looking for."

"The Journal Search."

"It is pretty easy to navigate and find things."

Question 2: How helpful is the design of the library website?

"I think it is laid out very well."

"Very helpful."

"Pretty helpful."

"I found the design extremely helpful."

"Very helpful. I like the bar with the (buttons) on the top."

"It is very helpful."

Question 3: Can you list or briefly describe problems that you’ve had in the past when using the library website?

"Sometimes I am not sure where to go but I don't know if that is me or the website."

"Just finding a specific article just now, but that was more of the search website and figuring that out."
“Finding reserves for professors.”

“I had trouble before finding things, but recently am having a lot less trouble. It helped to have a librarian work with one of my classes. I still don’t know everything that is at the page, but the librarian explained some things so there’s less to wonder about.”

“Difficulty finding resources.”

**Question 4: What suggestions do you have for improving the library website?**

“Put a few more quick links on the main page for navigation ease.”

“Have a help option.” (*I love this response for so many reasons.*)

**Question 5: Do you have any thoughts or observations related to this usability exercise?**

“I thought it was a great exercise. I think I actually learned some helpful tips.”

“Some tasks seem hard to accomplish right from the start if there is no obvious link to it on the home page.”

“It was good to see how my skills were and showed me new things on the library page.”

**Conclusion**

As a follow up to the original study, this report shows that the usability of the website was improved after changes made in summer 2005. It also shows that for most of the tasks considered “most common” among students (and probably faculty and staff as well), visitors to the site can find the answers they need in a short amount of time.

A new study should be devised after the next major revision of the website. New questions should be drafted that correct some of the problems described in the original usability study report. In addition, some tasks may change in relevance or importance over time.

While this small study is appropriate as a follow up, the next analysis of the library website’s usability should include more participants. A sample population of 20 people should be appropriate for this research.
### Appendix I: Composition of the Study Population

#### Age of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sex of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Status of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Participants' Major Areas of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Areas</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Participants' Use of the Library Website (lib.trinity.edu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a semester</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participants' Use of the Web

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a semester</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants' Use of E-mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a semester</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants Receiving Library Instruction (at some point prior to the study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Report of Specific Changes in Response to the 2005 Study

The following is a brief catalog of changes made to the library’s website as they appear in the August 2005 iteration. Changes are defined in three ways: structural changes, labeling changes, or content changes. In those cases where a link is new or the linked content is unique to the August 2005 revision, changes are not divided by category.

The following titles correspond to links at the library’s home page (lib.trinity.edu):

I. Home Page
   a. structural change: links focused on the left and right margins
   b. structural change: library image located in center column
   c. structural change: rearrangement of buttons in top and bottom toolbar
   d. labeling change: label change for two links in the top and bottom toolbar
      i. “Quest” label is now “Books & More”
      ii. “Databases” label is now “Articles & More”
   e. labeling change: links renamed under “Faculty Corner” heading
   f. content change: news located in center column beneath image
   g. content change: search box included at bottom of middle column
   h. content change: “First Year Seminar” link removed from “Find” column
   i. content change: “Library Instruction” link added under “Faculty Corner”
   j. content change: Reserves links on homepage made more consistent

II. Articles & More (Databases)
   a. structural and labeling change: “Wondering Where to Start?” button moved and renamed to “What Subject Do I Want?”
   b. content change: revision of links in the “Sort Databases by Subject” tool
   c. content change: link added for “New Databases”

III. Reserves … Reserve Readings (Find Reserve Materials)
   a. labeling change: “E-Reserves” is now “Electronic Reserves”
   b. content change: simplified, clarified instructions for patrons

IV. Quest (Course Reserves Search)
   a. structural change: links to “Electronic Reserves” and “Blackboard” made more obvious with button and font color
   b. labeling change: “E-Reserves” is now “Electronic Reserves”
   c. content change: “Blackboard” link corrected

V. Journals, Articles, Newspapers (Find Journals, Articles, Newspapers)
   a. labeling change: “Wondering Where to Start” link changed to “What Subject Do I Want?”

VI. Books (Library Catalogs)
   a. structural change: link to Quest simplified, clarified, and highlighted
   b. structural change: tables simplified

VII. Course-Related Links (Course Guides)
   a. structural change: links organized by category

VIII. Library Instruction
   a. all new link with all new content
IX. Request Equipment & Rooms (CLT)
   a. labeling change: link name changed and location name changed from IMS to CLT (departmental name revision)

X. Cite Sources
   a. all new content

XI. Hours
   a. structural change: simplified introductory matter

XII. Services and Policies
   a. structural and labeling change: single table split into separate tables labeled “Services” and also “Policies”

XIII. Ask a Librarian
   a. content change: link added for chat reference service

XIV. Where is...?
   a. labeling change: link name changed and location name changed from IMS to CLT (departmental name revision)