

JLSC

ISSN 2162-3309 | JLSC is published by the Iowa State University Digital Press | <http://jisc-pub.org>

Volume 9, General Issue (2021)

The Practical and the Aspirational: Managing the Student Employee Experience in Library Publishing Efforts

Rebecca Nelson, Becky L. Thoms

Nelson, R., & Thoms, B.L. (2021). The Practical and the Aspirational: Managing the Student Employee Experience in Library Publishing Efforts. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 9(General Issue), eP2390. <https://doi.org/10.31274/jlsc.12913>

This article underwent semi-anonymous peer review in accordance with JLSC's peer review policy.



© 2021 Nelson & Thoms. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

The Practical and the Aspirational: Managing the Student Employee Experience in Library Publishing Efforts

Rebecca Nelson

Institutional Repository Coordinator, Utah State University

Becky L. Thoms

Head of Digital Initiatives, Utah State University

INTRODUCTION Student employees are a critical component in the workforce of academic libraries. While more established library services have the benefit of attracting student employees specifically interested in their work, scholarly communication programs, and library publishing efforts in particular, have more difficulty describing and garnering interest in their work. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** This article describes the journey of the Digital Initiatives Unit at Utah State University Libraries as we navigated the particular trials that come with library publishing—specifically delving into the work of our institutional repository (IR) and the role of student employees in those efforts. The labor of our program is variable and largely project-based, which has presented a number of challenges related to our student employees: understanding the larger context of their work; retention of knowledge and skills alongside their ability to prioritize; and a struggle to transfer skills from one project to another. Addressing these problems involved more intentional gathering of student feedback, colleague brainstorming, and trial and error; through which process and results we are gaining a more developed understanding of the critical importance of the student experience. **LESSONS LEARNED/NEXT STEPS** When student employees see their work as more than just a job, and recognize the skills they are learning, they come away with greater satisfaction and our unit benefits from improved outputs. Using what we have learned, we will be able to continue our efforts for a better student experience as well as creating future goals for our unit.

Received: 06/19/2020 Accepted: 04/15/2021

Correspondence: Rebecca Nelson, 3000 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-3000, rebecca.nelson@usu.edu



© 2021 Nelson & Thoms. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Student employees are a critical component of the workforce in academic libraries. The expanding portfolio of library services, including scholarly communication and library publishing efforts, paired with limited budgets makes it necessary to integrate student employees in ways and to a degree that previously were not considered. While this presents a valuable opportunity, there are also hurdles to consider and overcome when expanding the capacity of your student employee team. In the Digital Initiatives (DI) Unit of the library at Utah State University, there are three primary functional areas where student employees play a significant role. The first area includes both Digital History Collections (DHC) and digital exhibits. The DHC are primarily created in collaboration with curators from our Special Collections & Archives (SCA), although we also work with community partners that lack the resources to host their own digital collections. Digital exhibits may also be products of SCA collaborations, but the exhibits are often created by student interns or as course-based research projects. Second is the IR, which houses the creative and academic output of the university while providing scholarly communication services. Lastly, DI administers the university's Open Educational Resources (OER) Program. With the growth and increased complexity of student employee contributions, we began to notice a pattern of problems and outlined the following questions: what are reasonable expectations for student employee output, both in terms of quality and quantity; to what degree are our student employees understanding and engaging with the larger concepts that frame our work; and are they satisfied with their work experience in terms of growth and learning? This article will describe the strategies we employed to mitigate these concerns. While many of the strategies apply to student employees across the unit, for the purposes of this article we will focus on the IR as it is our largest outlet for library publishing.

The IR at Utah State University (USU), Digital Commons@USU, is robust and active. Created in 2008, it currently holds over 79,000 items with more than 15 million downloads, with new content added at an average rate of 9,000 items per year, and the average number of downloads reaching 2,000,000 per year. With one full time staff member (the IR Coordinator) and partial time from two faculty members (Digital Initiatives Unit Head and Scholarly Communication Librarian) devoted to this work, we rely significantly on five to seven student employees to meet project demands. The work of the DI unit, specifically with regards to the IR, is dynamic and broad. Students are frequently introduced to new projects that may require skills, vocabulary, and workflows that are just different enough from previous projects to prompt questions and confusion, and with many projects happening simultaneously, students face multiple challenges. The primary being a lack of context or understanding of the *why* behind their work, which made it difficult for them to make decisions or use their own judgment to complete a task. On a more functional level,

we observed that students did not always remember how to do certain types of projects, and/or they were unsure how to prioritize their work. This led the unit to a discussion where we narrowed our focus to the questions listed above (quality and quantity, engagement, and overall satisfaction of student work) and brainstormed how to address those concerns.

The steps we took to uncover barriers to student success will be covered in this article, alongside details of both what worked and what did not with our solutions. With a full-time staff that is juggling an expansive portfolio, the contributions of student employees are a necessity. We strive to balance our commitment to providing our student employees with a positive experience with the capacity of our unit. All the while recognizing that our core mission is to meet the needs of our stakeholders.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This article addresses a gap in the research at the junction between the role of student employees in academic libraries and the development of scholarly communication and library publishing efforts in those same libraries. Engaging student employees in the day-to-day work of academic libraries has long been a cornerstone of our systems (Arnold-Garza & Tomlinson, 2017; Ireland & Jackson, 2015; McKenna, 2020; among others). Budget realities coupled with a desire to engage with students—creating meaningful professional experiences for them while also providing the opportunity to acquire new and valuable skillsets—make the undergraduate student employee a ubiquitous asset in libraries across the higher education landscape (Aho, Beschnett, & Reimer, 2010; Becker-Redd, Lee, & Skelton, 2018; Melilli, Mitola, & Hunsaker, 2016).

Student employees are the backbone of the services we provide to our stakeholders. However, providing them with an experience that is about more than a paycheck and allows them to learn and develop new skills requires proactively exploring and developing an ever-evolving process of evaluation, feedback, and training (Benjamin & McDevitt, 2018; Gibbons, 2016; Meyer & Torreano, 2017; Rinto, Mitola, & Otto, 2019). And, likewise, we have a necessary objective to continue to achieve the goals, and respond to the mission, of our unit and the library.

The literature gives substantial treatment to students participating in internships or other credit-bearing opportunities based in the library, and those students, whether undergraduate or graduate, are motivated by factors beyond the specific work they are doing in the library (Mestre & LeCrone, 2015; Seeholzer, 2013). Likewise, libraries who hire and employ students for temporary, project-based positions, have the same advantage of obtaining students who were drawn to a position, in part or in total, because of the topic and type

of work as opposed to income being a primary factor (Becker-Redd et al., 2018; Denda & Hunter 2016; Reiman-Sendi, Barnes, & MacKintosh, 2018). Domain-specific knowledge such as copyright, data entry, metadata, and scanning are less likely to pique the interest of the typical undergraduate skimming available campus job postings, and little has been written about the challenge of hiring and training students to work in support of libraries' scholarly communication and publishing efforts (Madsen & Oleen, 2013).

While the critical role of student employees in academic libraries is almost universally accepted and frequently discussed in the literature (Arnold-Garza & Tomlinson, 2017; Guerrero & Corey, 2003; Matteson & Hankinson, 2018; McKenna, 2020; among others), much of the writing addresses the student employee at the surface level—we could not provide our services without them—without delving deeper into the full student employee experience. The data and research that does exist most often comes from the patron services (e.g. circulation, reserves, etc.) and reference/instruction areas of the library (Becker-Redd, et al., 2018; Denda & Hunter, 2016; Hogan & Conlin, 2019). In patron service areas, student work has begun to evolve from frontline assistance to include projects, whereas in scholarly communication their work is almost entirely project-based (Becker-Reed et al., 2018; Denda & Hunter, 2016; Reiman-Sendi et al., 2018; Seeholzer, 2013). Project-based work tends to be more complex than customer service, if not more diverse. This brings with it its own set of challenges yet to be explored in the literature.

As libraries involve student employees in project-based work, we are discovering the importance of encouraging the students to engage with the big picture and the why behind their work (Hogan & Conlin, 2019; Mestre & LeCrone, 2015; Rinto et al., 2019). The literature describes giving students opportunities to handle the minute details of their duties, providing them not only with tasks to complete but also context for the larger project at hand (Brenza, Kowalsky, & Brush, 2015; Denda & Hunter, 2016; Evanson, 2015). Mentoring is a great way to both teach students and show them the bigger picture, while even more significantly being a high-impact practice (Becker-Redd et al., 2018; Denda & Hunter, 2016; Mitola, Rinto, & Pattni, 2018; Reiman-Sendi et al., 2018; Rinto et al., 2019). Reports in the literature provided evidence that giving students room to be a part of the process resulted in a sense of pride in their accomplishments, investment in their work, and greater job satisfaction (Hogan & Conlin, 2019; Melilli et al., 2016). With this case study article, we aim to contribute to the discussion at the nexus of student employees working in support of library scholarly communication efforts and their job growth and satisfaction.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

Initially we noted that students displayed confusion when assigned new projects that were

similar but not identical to previous work. This led to a unit meeting where we brainstormed ideas for how to address this. The first step was to give students an anonymous survey to determine what they already knew about their work and the work of the unit as a whole. Questions included identifying individual staff members and their role in the unit, as well as asking students to describe their own work and what they did and did not enjoy about their work. The results clearly showed the need for new training materials that included an improved explanation of the mission and goals of the unit and the role of the student employees in that work. As a unit, we defined key concepts we wanted students to know to not only help them connect with their own work but also with the work of the overall unit. One straightforward approach to lay the groundwork for this was to create a board with the names and photographs of the faculty and staff in our unit along with short descriptions of what we do (see Figure 1). As part of the orientation and onboarding, we now also give them a more in-depth introduction to the unit, explaining all sides, including the IR, DHC, and OER. They receive a copy of an organizational chart we created that describes our division (Cataloging & Metadata Services, Digital Initiatives, and SCA) as well as specifics about the roles and responsibilities in our unit (see Figure 2).



Figure 1. Faculty/Staff introductory board. This board provides pictures with names and a quick summary of what each faculty and staff member does in the Digital Initiatives Unit.




Figure 2. Digital Initiatives Unit organization chart. This chart provides an overview of the unit's mission and each faculty/staff member's duties. How the unit fits into the SCA division is also demonstrated.

Student responses to the aforementioned survey revealed cursory understandings of the work of the unit. To create a higher-level, more comprehensive understanding of their work, students needed to know not only the specific steps to take a project from start to finish, but also the broader concepts underpinning the work. For many of our students, terms common in our work such as CVs, copyright, metadata, and open access (OA) are unfamiliar. To remedy this, we began providing straight forward, jargon-free definitions in their initial orientation, which provides a solid foundation for them to learn the projects they are assigned. We also divided their work into types and created simplified definitions for each, focusing on the most common recurring tasks that include: uploading; metadata creation (single or batch); copyright adherence; writing citations; digitization; and quality control (QC). As college students, our employees have some degree of familiarity with citations but vastly different experience reading and writing them. To meet this need, the IR Coordinator created a LibGuide that explains citations and the basics of copyright with an emphasis on how it relates to IRs. Through our projects, students heard terms such as embargoes and OA, but only knew how to apply them. The LibGuide reveals how we are able to make work under copyright available by highlighting the difference between green and gold OA, types of Creative Commons licenses, and how articles progress from being a pre-print to a post-print to the publisher's version.

After adding these things to their training in 2019, the IR Coordinator saw a difference in the types of questions being asked, as well as a decreased number of mistakes. They are able to do their work with fewer additional instructions on new projects that build on previous skills/knowledge. We have begun using general workflows for project types such as uploading classwork items. So far, these workflows have been well received. Students are able to implement the basic instructions, along with information specific to the project, without any problems. Understanding the context of their work has solved the problem of students being able to transfer knowledge from one project to another. To see if our students really do understand their work, in 2020 we asked some of our students who have worked for us throughout that time to answer related questions. Their answers showed they remembered terms relevant to IRs, and understood how these applied to their work. Interestingly, when asked what they do, all of the students included more specific answers for who they do it for than the first time we asked in 2018. Originally their answers included people, but this time they mentioned researchers and USU authors. This indicates our students are engaging at a deeper level and have achieved an understanding of their work.

The next area of concern we attempted to address was the overall quality and quantity of the student output. After making the improvements in the training described above, we were able to turn our attention to the issue of students struggling to manage the variety of work that was presented to them on any given day. For example, we receive Scopus reports on

articles written by USU researchers, and our students are tasked with checking copyright to determine what version, if any, of a particular article can be posted to the IR. They also create metadata for articles, presentations, theses/dissertations, and many other types of materials. USU researchers submit their CVs so their work can be documented in the IR, and extracting the metadata from those CVs that is necessary to create a researcher profile requires a knowledge of citations. Students may also digitize items, and this requires learning how to operate various scanning equipment as well as simple editing skills for PDFs. Lastly, we often receive special projects that involve a mix of all these tasks as well as others that are unique to a project for which we provide additional training. Usually the work builds on previous tasks they have accomplished so students can repurpose some of their skills and knowledge. However, students were not originally making these connections in their work without explicit instruction from the IR Coordinator.

Prior to this effort to reimagine how students engage with our unit and their work, selecting assignments was up to the individual students. They could see what projects were available on a project management system we use, Trello, and students assigned themselves to any project that was not already claimed by another student. While this method of project management offered flexibility, certain projects were not getting done and high priority projects were not receiving immediate attention. After talking with the students, the IR Coordinator discovered the projects that were not getting done were not well liked or students did not remember how to do them. CVs, for example, are intermittently received and are lengthy to process. Even though we have workflows that provide detailed instructions, students did not feel comfortable taking on CVs if it had been a long time since doing one. They also admitted to not reading the workflows after they had been trained on a project. After learning this, and receiving a student's suggestion from the survey mentioned earlier, the IR Coordinator decided to print the workflows. Copies for each student were kept in binders at individual workstations. To ensure the physical handbook would be useful, the IR Coordinator asked one student to trial it by using it every day for a couple of weeks, and then provide feedback. From this we learned that not everyone knew where to find the digital files of our workflows, as this student told us workflows were easier to find physically. They admitted answers to frequent questions they had were in the workflows, but they would not be inclined to use them unless instructed by the IR Coordinator, their reasoning being it was easier to ask someone else their question than look it up. With these motives in hand, the IR Coordinator asked all of the students to only use the physical workflows. She began checking in with students to make sure they were using it. When asked questions, the IR Coordinator sent them to read the workflows first and to come back if that didn't answer them. This helped to reduce the number of questions received. It also improved the quality of their work and the workflows themselves. If something was unclear in a workflow it was fixed as a result of student feedback.

Another reason IR students were skipping over projects was because they assumed if they did not work on one, someone else would. Daily reminders to students about which projects they should be working on, and in what order, seemed to be the only thing keeping projects moving forward while students assigned themselves to projects. With these problems in mind, the IR Coordinator brainstormed solutions with colleagues that might help increase quantity and knowledge retention. The conclusion was that students needed to have more regular assignments in order for them to become experts on the types of projects they were being asked to do; the idea being if they did the same projects more often, students would not have a chance to forget how to do them. This led to a division of responsibilities, using the existing Trello boards and adding a whiteboard that hung in the shared physical space that listed all ongoing and current projects (see Figure 3). Each student received at least one primary assignment, a QC assignment, and a back-up QC assignment for the CV, Scopus, Items to Upload, and New ETD boards on Trello. If a student was absent for a shift and unable to complete an assignment, the QC person would step in for the main person and the backup QC person would step in for the QC person to ensure timely project completion (see Figure 4). This was intended to provide flexibility in case something needed to be finished before the student assigned would be able to complete it. After some trial we realized this backup method complicates things unless the student is gone longer than a day. Having one student pick up where another left off causes confusion on who should be working on what when they come back, and is better used as a last resort. As a result, modifications were made to the assignments so that backup was used less frequently.

There were other assignments besides these Trello boards that needed to be accounted for. Our unit also provides on-demand digitization, and those requests often happen under short notice with a quick turn-around. On-demand requests take top priority, so we made that the first step for students at the beginning of each shift; checking the queue for these projects and assigning themselves to either scanning or QC. Lastly there are special projects, which don't fit into the other Trello board categories. The other categories mentioned are recurring on a regular basis, while special projects can recur, only less often, or they are one-time projects. Some examples of this are conferences, magazines, and events; these projects are often completely born-digital, but in approximately 5%, there will be a digitization component. We dealt with special projects by assigning them individually as well as creating scanning shifts, during which students utilize digitization equipment such as our robotic scanner (Treventus ScanRobot). These project types were laid out in separate sections on the whiteboard in the order they should be worked on: digitization requests first, Trello board assignments, then special projects. A calendar was placed next to the digitization equipment to remind students of their scanning shifts.




Figure 3. IR whiteboard. It outlines projects and student assignments. Cards with student names hang next to the projects/assignments they are working on. Their primary assignments are labeled as main on the whiteboard.




Figure 4. Process for student assignments when one student is absent.

This helped tremendously but did not fix everything at once. As students felt more confident with their assignments, projects were being forgotten about less often and completed in a timelier manner. Adjustments had to be made based on the problems we were still seeing, along with the feedback we received from the students on what they felt was working and what needed improvement. While students better remembered how to complete their projects, depending on the student, special projects were either being worked on not at all or too often. There also continued to be some confusion over what they should be working on during a particular shift. A priority list was created, solidifying their work into the same categories as the whiteboard: requests, Trello board assignments, and special projects (see Figure 5). Each category explicitly states a priority of QC corrections for themselves first, QC for someone else second, and beginning new items third. There is a reminder for them to check back frequently for next steps on projects. Special projects were designated to their scanning shift, or they could complete them after finishing everything else. With the priority list implemented, and a print copy hanging at every student workstation, the confusion lessened considerably.

Shift Priorities

- 1- Requests (DRC or RSDD)
 - a. QC Corrections (for yourself)
 - b. QC (for someone else)
 - c. New items
- 2- Trello boards assigned to you
 - a. QC Corrections (for yourself)
 - b. QC (for someone else)
 - c. New items
- 3- Special Projects
 - a. QC Corrections (for yourself)
 - b. QC (for someone else)
 - c. New items

Always check back frequently to see if any projects are ready for you to do the next step.

Only work on Special Projects during your Treventus shift, or if you are finished with everything else.

Figure 5. Shift priorities. This document is printed and hung at every student workstation as a reminder of the order they should work on projects. The Treventus shift is their scanning shift.

Over time another problem presented itself, which was significant variation in the amount of work students had assigned to them. By stepping back and analyzing a couple of factors, frequency of requests for new projects and how much time individuals had to work on special projects outside of their scanning shifts, we modified the assignments to distribute the work more evenly. For example, a student with a large primary assignment would receive a smaller QC assignment. The backup QC assignment was not often being utilized, so some backup QC assignments were removed, and we added a second set of primary and QC assignments to a particularly large project—Items to Upload. To avoid confusion, we paired the students for both sets of primary and QC assignments so they were always working with the same person for Items to Upload.

Even after implementing the shift priorities, and more equally distributing assignments, some projects were lagging behind. Feedback from students indicated that because the whiteboard did not always change, they sometimes did not read it. In an effort to give the students more accountability, a solution was implemented that required students to initial and date after they read the whiteboard at the beginning of each shift. We also asked each student to create a specific to do list for their shift after reading the whiteboard. The IR Coordinator reviewed the list and discussed any misunderstandings about priorities or tasks with the students. After just a few weeks, this exercise really helped students adapt to the process and we saw an improvement in the quantity of project completion.

In 2020 we interviewed three students that were here before and after these changes were made what they felt was useful about the current process, and why. They also answered how the priority list affected their feelings on managing their projects and daily workload, as well as how often they have questions about what they should be working on. (See Appendix for their answers.) All three agreed projects are more organized now. They know where to look for projects, using our organizational tool Trello, and what they should be working on. Confirming workflows have helped with knowledge retention, Student A also mentioned, “Workflows have become much more of a thing. Can rely on it because things change so much.” Some students start their positions with us having better project management skills than others. This variation may account for the difference we saw in their answers about the priority list. Overall, however, they agreed priorities have become clearer with less time spent figuring out what to do next.

Our third and final question was how students gauged their experience and whether or not they felt they were learning and improving. Based on the original survey we administered in 2018, we created a very brief anonymous plus/delta survey for student employees which is distributed at least once a semester. This simple three question tool provides valuable insight into what students enjoy about their work while also illuminating points of frustration or

opportunities for improvement. The questions we ask are: What do you like or value about working in Digital Initiatives? What do you think could be improved? Is there anything else you would like to share? On a scale of 1-10, in Fall 2019 students rated their overall job satisfaction at 8.9 on average, which improved from earlier that year and has stayed fairly consistent since. Generally, they had more to say on what they enjoyed about their work than things that could be improved. This seems to suggest we are on the right track with the solutions we implemented. Some students even pointed out the changes we were making addressed their current concerns. The suggestions students shared were still useful, and helped guide our efforts as we went along.

LESSONS LEARNED/NEXT STEPS

While in-depth workflow analysis is not always the most exciting task, it was a vital component of our process and we viewed it as an opportunity for growth and a sign of the maturing of our unit. Normalizing the day-to-day work of our unit and creating routines where none existed before were necessary steps in allowing us to think more broadly about the role of students in the work of our unit. This created the space to open a discussion about balancing the needs of meeting production goals, responding to stakeholder demands while also maintaining some agency of our own to develop in areas we, and our student employees, identify as of interest. If well directed, these areas of interest can provide growth for our student employees while simultaneously improving our unit. So far, we have allowed students with interests in coding to create computer-automated processes that were previously done by hand. We would like to both continue and further develop these types of opportunities.

Students learn more and engage better with their work when they understand the why behind everything. We saw an improvement in the quality of their work and a shift in the types of questions they were asking once they had a holistic understanding. Creating opportunities for them to make connections between the concepts of scholarly communication and their work allows for understanding on a deeper level. The processes we have discussed set our students up for success.

As we develop and fine tune the ways in which we describe our work to students, we also consider how we might use these approaches to improve communication with stakeholders and other groups. Our students have connected with their work better when we break it down into concepts they engage with on a regular basis but did not realize the meaning of previously. We recognize anyone who visits our unit or interacts with us virtually could benefit from similar contextual information. Next, we hope to create visuals in our space that explain what we do and why we do it, and this information could also ultimately trans-

late to a more robust web presence for Digital Initiatives. This would provide insight for colleagues and potential partners, among others, which allows them to see our value, while potentially serving as a reminder to our students.

That student employees are core to our function is something we know instinctively, and we regularly acknowledge their contributions and make efforts to recognize the role they play in our unit's success. However, that cannot be where the conversation about student employees ends. As we look ahead and continue to plan the work of the Digital Initiatives Unit and consider how the unit's goals tie into the mission of the library as a whole and the entire USU campus, we are determined to be more intentional in both our planning and our assessment. This includes a careful and honest look at the role and contributions of our student employees.

With the recent hire of an Assessment Coordinator USU Libraries and all of its units are engaging in a process of formally assessing our services, and while this initiative is driven in large part by a need to demonstrate the impact of our work, it is also providing an opportunity to carefully analyze our output as a unit. The data gathered through the assessment activities of the last year is providing an opportunity to have serious conversations about our efficiency and effectiveness at completing existing projects as well as our capacity to take on new work. This information—a full project portfolio assessment including completions and timeline; student output in terms of hours logged, items uploaded, content scanned; detailed feedback from students about their experience and perspective; etc.—all combines to lay the groundwork for our conversations about next steps. There can be a trade off in terms of more student labor directly correlating to greater capacity for projects, and that is without additional full-time staff to guide, mentor, and support student employees, we run the risk of their time with us being “just a job.” As we look at the last year's cumulative data, we hope to see evidence of increased efficiency as a result of the careful consideration and reconsideration of workflows, processes, and training; ultimately meaning that we were able to achieve increased productivity without increased staff. This will provide the starting point for our goal setting for the next year which will include opportunities for students to have some self-directed work and learning by choosing the occasional project rather than everything being assigned. Our pilot implementation will be a trial effort where students identify at least one individual goal for the semester.

For the 2019-2020 academic year, we articulated a goal of “DI student employees obtain new skills and feel valued as contributors to overall mission,” built specifically in response to the concerns we identified with students and their work—quantity and quality, engagement and understanding, and growth. We were able to institute practices to make progress toward achieving that goal, and more importantly, we are well positioned to build on the success of

the past year to create an even more mutually beneficial experience for our student employees and our unit. We have begun to see the positive impact this has had and hope to carry that momentum into our future efforts.

REFERENCES

- Aho, M. K., Beschnett, A. M., & Reimer, E. Y. (2010). Using an untapped resource: expanding the role of the student worker at the bio-medical library. *Public Services Quarterly*, 6(1), 65–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228950903523579>
- Arnold-Garza, S., & Tomlinson, C. (2017). *Students lead the library: The importance of student contributions to the academic library*. Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Becker-Redd, K., Lee, K., & Skelton, C. (2018). Training student workers for cross-departmental success in an academic library: A new model. *Journal of Library Administration*, 58(2), 153–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2017.1412711>
- Benjamin, M., & McDevitt, T. (2018). The benefits and challenges of working in an academic library: A study of student library assistant experience. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(2), 256–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2018.01.002>
- Brenza, A., Kowalsky, M., & Brush, D. (2015). Perceptions of students working as library reference assistants at a university library. *Reference Services Review*, 43(4), 722. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-05-2015-0026>
- Denda, K., & Hunter, J. (2016). Building 21st century skills and creating communities: A team-based engagement framework for student employment in academic libraries. *Journal of Library Administration*, 56(3), 251–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1121662>
- Evanson, C. (2015). “We aren’t just the kids that sit at the front”: Rethinking student employee training. *College & Research Libraries News*, 76(1), 30–33. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.76.1.9245>
- Gibbons, P. (2016). Training tomorrow’s workforce. In C. Smallwood & L. Sanborn (Eds.), *Library volunteers welcome!: Strategies for attracting, retaining and making the most of willing helpers* (pp. 103–110). McFarland & Company.
- Guerrero, T. S., & Corey, K. M. (2003). Training and retaining student employees a case study at Purdue University Calumet. *Journal of Access Services*, 1(4), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.1300/J204v01n04_08
- Hogan, S., & Conlin, K. (2019). Library Student Employee Expertise: Strategies for Maximizing Your Student Employee Contributions to the Library. *Public Services Quarterly*, 15(2), 104–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2019.1586618>

- Ireland, S., & Jackson, J. (2015). The shifting roles of student workers. In S. S. Hines & M. Simons (Eds.), *Advances in Library Administration and Organization: Library staffing for the future* (Vol. 34, pp. 201–223). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0732-067120150000034009>
- Madsen, D. L., & Oleen, J. K. (2013). Staffing and workflow of a maturing institutional repository. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 1(3), eP1063. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1063>
- Matteson, M. L., & Hankinson, E. (2018). Getting off on the right foot: Psychological contracts, socialization theory and library student workers. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(4), 486–492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2018.05.001>
- McKenna, J. (2020). So many students, so little time: Practical student worker training in an academic library. *Journal of Access Services*, 17(2), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15367967.2020.1718505>
- Mestre, L. S., & LeCrone, J. M. (2015). Elevating the student assistant: An integrated development program for student library assistants. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 22(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2015.1001240>
- Meyer, K., & Torreano, J. (2017). The front face of library services: How student employees lead the library at Grand Valley State University. In S. Arnold-Garza & C. Tomlinson (Eds.), *Students lead the library: The importance of student contributions to the academic library* (pp. 39–55). Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Melilli, A., Mitola, R., & Hunsaker, A. (2016). Contributing to the library student employee experience: Perceptions of a student development program. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(4), 430–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.04.005>
- Mitola, R., Rinto, E., & Pattni, E. (2018). Student employment as a high-impact practice in academic libraries: A systematic review. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 44(3), 352–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2018.03.005>
- Reiman-Sendi, K. A., Barnes, C. A., & MacKintosh, P. J. (2018). Leveraging Student Employee Expertise for Collection Projects. *Collection Management*, 43(3), 198–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2018.1433567>
- Rinto, E., Mitola, R., & Otto, K. (2019). Reframing library student employment as a high-impact practice: Implications from case studies. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 26(4), 260–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2019.1692747>
- Seeholzer, J. (2013). Making it their own: Creating meaningful opportunities for student employees in academic library services. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 20(2), 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2013.789690>

APPENDIX A

Interview Answers

Student A

Imagine a friend is asking you where you work and what you do. How would you describe our unit, Digital Initiatives, and how would you describe your work specifically?

His work; help with archiving and digitization of physical and digital research papers, documents, that are then published publicly on University's website, DigitalCommons (DC). Machines we use, Treventus, scanners, etc.

Unit provides public with access to old and stuff that is coming out. Access to research and documents they would have to check out physically. Make documents available so people can research them, students and researchers. A number of it is stored in SCA.

Do you think the work that you do is important? Describe why or why not.

Yeah from a broad standpoint. He can understand, particularly because he has seen all of the stuff that is physically stored in the library, and had family members that had things that weren't available and is now. Very cool to be able to search family members and have things pop up. Grandparents, other family members work at USU. Has enjoyed adding commencement programs. Coding side of it, making data cleaner on DC so people can find things easier. Items are more searchable, metadata is more correct. Lines up more with making things available to people.

Many changes have been made to managing projects and giving assignments. What do you think is useful about the current process, and why?

Workflows have become much more of a thing. Not meant to be annoying. Can rely on it because things change so much. Better understanding of that than when he first started. Used to be someone told you how to do it, and that is what you went off of. Didn't have to compare instructions to workflow. Very nice to have. They are up to date. Perspective has changed since he had to write a bunch. Easy to forget stuff to include.

Used Box as a way to track stuff with individual items; tag system they used. Grateful they put a bigger emphasis on Trello, notifications working, looking at things assigned to. Pulled emphasis off of Box, figuring out who was working on what, versions and tags. Easier to track on Trello. People keeping a better eye on what needs to be done. Having specific proj-

ects they are focused on, enjoyed that, less running around looking for things. Know what to look for when you have projects. Have notifications when new projects are there. More organized on what projects you need to do and priorities for them. More confusion, less clarity with this, early on.

Please answer the following considering before and after having a priority list: How do you feel about managing your projects/daily workload? How often do you have questions about what you should be working on?

Before was more looking for stuff. Things would still get done, but it was easy to find stuff that you were working on, and work on that board constantly. Tend to not check other things. There were certain boards no one was checking, even for high priority stuff. Those things still got done, but someone had to tell you this is here now.

Now there is something to look at. Harder for things to go under the radar. Like the structure of it now. In the past special projects are different, random, have other things. Pulled him from other boards in the past. Fine if projects are higher priority. Helps move people through projects, rotating so they don't forget to work on things. Doing things for a long period of time in the past, those things are still there but the priority tasks rotate what they're doing on a daily basis. Don't forget how to do things, and doesn't exclude special projects.

After not super often. More if things run out, which doesn't happen as much anymore. Long term projects means there isn't ever a moment where he doesn't have anything to do. Easy to transition out of those projects and go work on something else. Less of a problem than it was in the past. Less of a question what is available to work on. Also checking if what he has determined to work on is less priority than what I have in mind (as IR Coordinator).

Student B

Imagine a friend is asking you where you work and what you do. How would you describe our unit, Digital Initiatives, and how would you describe your work specifically?

Explain he works in the second floor of the library. Part of our unit he uploads documents and getting database USU uses organized correctly. Work with PDF files, getting things that only exist physically converted to digital and uploaded to library database so people can use it for research/curriculum.

Do you think the work that you do is important? Describe why or why not.

It is important overall. Helping to keep living archive available for students and users of the university in general. As we continue to update, there is more research for people trying to progress academically. Important that we provide more resources so there are things that people need to progress in whatever their field of study is. Perhaps not always the general public will benefit, for those that use the resources.

Many changes have been made to managing projects and giving assignments. What do you think is useful about the current process, and why?

System is very effective. Able to start something and continue to check on it until you know it is complete and ready to go. Satisfying because you can see when it is finished. Beyond Trello assembly line see it is completed and know that effort has reached its destination.

Use category of boards for assignments. Good so that you know what your priorities are and those projects are set apart. If you're asked to do something else, a supervisor points it out so you know where else to look.

Please answer the following considering before and after having a priority list: How do you feel about managing your projects/daily workload? How often do you have questions about what you should be working on?

Back to early days had a list of projects, looked to see what he could do in his time. Focused on what he felt most prepared to do, then went on to the next thing. Might have been a priority difference in what should have been done first, but wasn't aware. Had to go find supervisor to know what to do next. Didn't know what order was most important, and what to do next.

New system easier to find priority and what to do next. Can still ask if he doesn't have something to do. More independent more easily.

Know more what he is trying to do with priority list. Can reference that list when he has a question. A little bit of that probably has to do with his experience as a student worker. Feels like he needs to ask less clarifying questions.

Student C

Imagine a friend is asking you where you work and what you do. How would you describe our unit, Digital Initiatives, and how would you describe your work specifically?

Works in the library, digital side of it, upload articles and research for the library authors.

Do you think the work that you do is important? Describe why or why not.

Important because then it creates more access to these articles. In a place where they can be easily found and searched. As well as digitizing them.

Many changes have been made to managing projects and giving assignments. What do you think is useful about the current process, and why?

It's easier to know what she should be working on as well as what is higher priority. Very well organized. Trello is very useful as well as Airtable.

Please answer the following considering before and after having a priority list: How do you feel about managing your projects/daily workload? How often do you have questions about what you should be working on?

Thought both were easy, but even more clear with the priority list. Don't have to remind herself as much now for what she should be doing.

Most of the time questions happen when she finishes projects and doesn't know what should be done next. Or waiting for someone else to finish their part so she can continue working on it.