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## Preliminaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This webinar (hopefully) will...</th>
<th>This webinar will not...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight several big questions of collection assessment</td>
<td>• Show you <em>the way</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate a way to integrate library assessment into collection development</td>
<td>• Provide a simple, one-size-fits-all answer to all collection questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highlight potential challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to Collection Assessment at KSU
KSULS Context

• Staffing Issues
  • Collection Development Librarian hired in 2013
  • Assessment Librarian hired in 2013

• Nascent Liaison Program
  • Program initiated in 2013
  • Distributed monograph selection

• Collection Issues
  • Lack of policies and procedures
  • Aging collection and other legacy issues
  • 431,546 print books; 241,382 eBooks
KSULS Context, Con’t.

• Rapid enrollment growth
  • Horace W. Sturgis Library built in 1981 for a university of 3,500 students
  • KSU expected to grow to 5,000 students
  • Current enrollment: ~33,500, in the top 50 for public US institutions

• Consolidation
  • KSU consolidated with Southern Polytechnic State University in FY ‘15
  • Addition of the Lawrence V. Johnson Library on the Marietta, GA campus
  • Addition of ~120,489 print books
Why Collection Assessment?

• To make assessment an integral part of collection development
• To inform collection maintenance and development
• To increase the vitality of the collection
• To share results with internal and external stakeholders (particularly teaching faculty via the Liaison Program).
• To address space issues
• To support budget needs: knowledge enables advocacy
• To guide strategic planning: knowing a collection enables the setting of goals and objectives
Principles & Methodology
Collection Assessment Lives Here!
Principles

• Distributed decision making requires distributed data

• Distributed decision making requires distributed analysis

• Library assessment seeks to determine and articulate value by answering questions about our core interests: use, manner of use, existing needs, user satisfaction, peer-benchmarks, authority metrics, among others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Data/Metrics</th>
<th>Satisfaction Data/Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation statistics</td>
<td>LibQUAL+ data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL and GIL books lent out</td>
<td>LibQUAL+ comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection assessment faculty survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixed Methods Assessment: Data Types

Data/Metrics Showing Need

• LibQUAL+ comments
• Collection assessment faculty survey comments
• ILL and GIL books borrowed in

Authority Data/Metrics

• Bowker
• Incites Journal Citation Reports
Plan Logistics
## Project Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Not Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Monographs</td>
<td>• Diverse formats (media, music scores, ebooks, Microfilm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some journal data</td>
<td>• Micro-collections (Government Documents, Professional Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A modular approach</td>
<td>• Specifics on assessment of databases and other electronic resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Year in a Nutshell

• June 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

• Four collections were assessed:
  • Anthropology
  • Information Systems
  • Interdisciplinary Studies (excluding Asian Studies)
  • Sociology

• Expectations: Work out the kinks, establish roles and responsibilities, familiarize everyone with the process, establish a workflow

• Assess the Assessment Plan
5-year Cycle

• Staggered subject areas grouped loosely by discipline / College

  • Business, Social Sciences, Humanities, Health Sciences, Arts & Architecture, Math & Sciences, Computing & Engineering, Education, General Library

  • Groupings further subdivided into “A”, “B”, and “C” by Liaison Librarian

  • Reduce redundancy of communication with departments and boost faculty participation

  • Appropriate Graduate Librarian(s) assigned to assessment each year

• Maximize continuity between cycles
### Sample Collection Assessment Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Faculty Liaisons</th>
<th>Call Number Ranges</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Business Programs</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>Business A</td>
<td>Liaison #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Business A</td>
<td>Liaison #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics, Finance &amp; Quantitative Analysis</td>
<td>Business A</td>
<td>Liaison #8</td>
<td>HB-HC; HG-HJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Social Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #1</td>
<td>GA-GF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science &amp; International Affairs</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #5</td>
<td>JA-JZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #6</td>
<td>GN-GT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #7</td>
<td>HM-HT; HX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Social Sciences A</td>
<td>Liaison #9</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Faculty Liaisons</th>
<th>Call Number Ranges</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Business Programs</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Professional Sales</td>
<td>Business B</td>
<td>Liaison #3</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Business B</td>
<td>Liaison #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Health Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Health A</td>
<td>Liaison #13</td>
<td>RA-RZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Humanities Programs</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Humanities A</td>
<td>Liaison #11</td>
<td>PC-PD; PF-PH; PK-PM; PQ; PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Humanities A</td>
<td>Liaison #5</td>
<td>PB; PE; PN; PR-PS; PZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Humanities A</td>
<td>Liaison #7</td>
<td>BC-BD; BH-BJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Social Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Graduate Librarian #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Social Sciences B</td>
<td>Liaison #10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>Social Sciences B</td>
<td>Liaison #12</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Social Sciences B</td>
<td>Liaison #14</td>
<td>HV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-Year Timeline

• Data Collection (Summer)
  • Access Services: Interlibrary Loan, GIL
  • Collection Development: Expenditures, Student Enrollment
  • Virtual Services: Holdings, Circulation
• Review (Fall)
  • Liaison Librarians
• Withdrawal (Spring)
  • Access Services
  • Technical Services: Catalog Updates, Book Repairs
  • Surplus/Other
13-Month Timeline:
June 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016
Assessment Reports in Detail
Report Format: 12 Sections

• Section I: Who has a stake in this collection?
• Section II: What are the recent investments in this collection?
• Section III: Describe this collection (in terms of holdings, locations, and age).
• Section IV: What is the usage of this collection?
• Section V: What are the existing needs?
• Section VI: Are users satisfied?
### Section I (partial): Who has a stake?

#### 1B: Curriculum Support Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments/Subjects Supported</th>
<th>Liaison Name</th>
<th>Major? Y/N</th>
<th>Areas of Concentration</th>
<th>Enrollment (Fall Semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Primary: Sociology            | Luther       | Y          | • Organizational & Social Change  
• Cultural Diversity Studies  
• Criminology  
• Medical Sociology          | 402          |
| Secondary: Political Science  | Sharpe       | Y          | • Diplomatic and Int’l Service  
• Int’s Business, Econ. & Policy  
• Applied Languages  
• Applied Global Experience    | 342          |
| Secondary: Criminal Justice   | Sharpe       | Y          | • Crim. Justice Administration  
• Forensic Behavioral Sciences  
• Technology & Crime           | 679          |
| Secondary: African & African Diaspora Studies/Interdisciplinary | Guimaraes | Y | • Arts & Literature  
• History  
• Social Sciences | 1            |
| Secondary: Nursing            |              | Y          | N/A                     | 1,764                      |

*Comments: Every section has a comment area to note your observations, ideas, or concerns:*

---

[Logo: Kennesaw State University Library System]
### Section III (partial): Collection Age Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Range</th>
<th>% &lt;5 Yrs.</th>
<th>% &lt;10 Yrs.</th>
<th>% &lt;15 Yrs.</th>
<th>% &lt;20 Yrs.</th>
<th>% &lt;25 Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HX</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

- % <5 Yrs.
- % <10 Yrs.
- % <15 Yrs.
- % <20 Yrs.
- % <25 Yrs.
Section VI (partial): LibQUAL+ Quantitative Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Adq. Mean</th>
<th>Overall Adq. Mean</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC-1</td>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-2</td>
<td>A library web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-3</td>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-4</td>
<td>The electronic information resources I need</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-5</td>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-6</td>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-7</td>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-8</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report Format: 12 Sections, Con’t.

• Section VII: Identify areas of relative strength and weakness.
• Section VIII: How does the collection compare with our peers?
• Section IX: Journal analysis
• Section X: Database analysis
• Section XI: Librarian stakeholder feedback
• Section XII: Goals and recommendations
## Section VII (partial): Bowker Analysis

**Section 7: Identify areas of relative strength and weakness.**

### 7A: Bowker Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Classification</th>
<th>Core Titles in Library</th>
<th>Core Titles NOT in Library</th>
<th>Total # Core Titles</th>
<th>% of Core Titles Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H1-99) Social sciences (General)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H1-99) Social sciences (General)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM401-1281) Sociology (General)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM1-434) Sociology (General)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>38.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM435-477) History of sociology. History of sociological</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM481-554) Theory. Method. Relations to other subjects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM621-656) Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HM661-696) Social control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 9: Journal Analysis

#### 9A: Top 25 Subject Area Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Provider(s)</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>E, Print, Both</th>
<th>Abst. or FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW</td>
<td>SocIndex w/ Full Text</td>
<td>2/1/1936-one year ago</td>
<td>4.390</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annual Review of Sociology</td>
<td>JSTOR; JStage</td>
<td>1/1/1975-1/31/2009; 1988-present</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SocIndex w/ Full Text</td>
<td>1/1/1990-one year ago</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH</td>
<td>Science Direct</td>
<td>1973-Present</td>
<td>2.685</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sociological Methodology</td>
<td>JSTOR; Sage Journals</td>
<td>1/1/1969-8/31/2012; 8/1/1999-present</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section XI & XII: Wrapping things up

• Section XI: Librarian Stakeholder Feedback
  • XI a: Graduate Librarian Comments
  • XI b: Undergraduate Librarian Comments

• Section XII: Goals and Recommendations
  • XII a: 5 Year Collection Goals
  • XII b: Recommended Titles to withdraw
A Review of the Pilot
Year: 2015-16
Challenges and Obstacles

• Staffing Challenges
  • Anthropology Librarian left KSU in the Fall of 2015
  • Training new staff midstream

• Time Challenges
  • Workload concerns for Project Coordinators and Liaison Librarians
  • Start-up costs and time investment
  • Shifting library priorities
  • Weeding component postponed until after ALMA implementation
Challenges and Obstacles, Con’t.

• Data Challenges
  • Accessibility of reporting tools (Voyager, Access, ALMA?)
  • Specificity of report requirements was onerous
  • Reformatting reports manually was tedious and time-consuming
  • Likelihood of human errors
  • Availability and reliability of data was an issue (GIL, eBooks, journal holdings)

• Assessment Report Challenges
  • Low response rate on faculty survey
  • Manual data entry was time-consuming
  • Gaps in available data
Recommendations & Best Practices
Recommendations & Best Practices

• Library Administration Support
  • Incorporate Assessment into Faculty Performance Agreements
  • Adequate training for project participants

• Technology Support
  • ILS with advanced, easy to navigate reporting features (ALMA)
  • Project Management software (i.e. Microsoft SharePoint)
  • OCLC’s WorldShare Collection Evaluation tool

• Peer Support
  • Collaborate with other Library Units in the development of the Assessment Plan and encourage “buy-in”
  • Role of the Graduate Library
Project Coordinators’ Responsibilities

• Act as conduits for information among all project participants
• Coordinate data flow in Phase 1, in collaboration with Heads of Access, Virtual, Technical Services, and other staff
• Provide orientation and training for Liaisons in Phase 2, in collaboration with Liaison Coordinator (one orientation, and 2 Lunch and Crunch sessions in fall semester): Open to All
• Coordinate withdrawal project(s) in Phase 3 with Liaisons, Head of Access Services, Head of Technical Services, and other designated staff
• Troubleshoot as needed
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