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Study Design

Study: Assess value of libraries & librarians on clinical decision-making

1. Assess value of electronic resources
   **Method:** survey

2. Assess value of librarians (mediated searches, etc.)
   **Method:** interviews

3. Gain additional insight
   **Method:** librarian focus groups
Research Study Overview

- **Survey**
  - Sent by librarians to physicians, residents, nurses

- **Interviews**
  - At selected institutions
  - Limited number of interviewees

- **Librarian focus groups**
Survey

- Use of information for patient care decisions, no matter where information came from

- “Critical Incident”
  - Think of one occasion during past month when respondent needed info related to patient care.
  - Answer based on that occasion
Survey Questions

- What type of information did you need?
  - Drug info
  - Diagnosis info
  - Patient safety
  - Etc.

- What resources did you use?
  - List to choose from (check all that apply and add others not listed)
Survey Questions

- How did you get to the resources you used?
  - In your institution’s library
  - On institution’s library web site
  - Intranet
  - Search engine such as Google
  - Etc.
Survey Questions

- From what physical location did you conduct your search?
- Did you find the information you needed?
- Which resources(s) contained the information (choose from list)
Survey Questions

- Agree or Disagree with statements. Information:
  - Was relevant, current, etc.
  - Refreshed memory, provided new knowledge, etc.
  - Resulted in better informed clinical decision, higher quality of care, etc.
  - Saved time
Survey Questions

- As a result of the information:
  - Did any of these change?
    - Diagnosis, choice of tests, choice of drugs, advice given to patient, etc.
  - Were any of these avoided?
    - Hospital admission, readmission; surgery; language/cultural misunderstanding; hospital-acquired infection, etc.
Survey Process

- Univ. North Carolina researchers
  - Working with survey programmer
  - Writing instruction manual for library participants
  - Getting “blanket” IRB approval from UNC
  - Analyzing data, writing reports
  - Making overall results available on web
Survey Process

- Library Participants
  - ALL MAR hospital or academic health center libraries will be invited to participate
- Must have support of an institutional “champion” – a high-level administrator
Survey Process

- Librarian participants will:
  - Register and complete library profile
  - Sign agreement
  - Possibly, arrange for incentives (still not sure how this will work)
  - Get additional IRB approval if required by institution (with UNC instructions)
Survey Process

- Librarian will send survey invitation via email to physicians, residents, nurses
  - Will contain survey URL (specific to each participating library)
  - Must follow through with reminders
- Librarians will receive results report specific to their institutions
# Research Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Best Practices</th>
<th>Real World Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need email addresses of all physicians, nurses at hospitals</td>
<td>Number emailed is (maybe) possible, but not lists themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• survey co. emails survey invitations directly • physicians, nurses log in to survey with personal credentials • survey co. does individual follow-ups &amp; reminders</td>
<td>• librarian sends invitation and reminders to all on list • no log in; would create barrier • track participants with separate URL for each participating library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No bias: physicians, nurses contacted only by survey co. | Potential positive bias because librarians sent out survey invitation |
## Research Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Best Practices</th>
<th>Real World Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use incentives for participants</td>
<td>Hard to do; participants spread out across many hospitals and only contact is via group email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know total potential respondent group from beginning; could randomize</td>
<td>Don’t know how many hospitals will participate, or how many physicians, nurses at each hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB approval needed; UNC can give “blanket” approval</td>
<td>Individual institutions may require separate IRB approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Survey

- Prior to actual survey, need to pilot registration and survey process
- Recruit some specific libraries, to be sure to cover variations
- Spring/Summer 2009
- Pilot results will be analyzed along with actual survey results
Second Study Component: Interviews

- Interviews of 4 individuals (physicians, nurses) per selected institution
  - 2 users of mediated searches
  - 2 user of e-resources (without using mediated services)
- Seeking more in-depth insight into information-seeking behavior
- Interview questions not yet finalized
- Will be conducted by Univ. North Carolina researchers
Third Study Component: Librarians Focus Groups

- Gain additional insight
Questions, Comments?

- Funding – Karen
- Cost Benefit/ROI Tool
- Other