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The Value of Academic Libraries

- ACRL Goal-area committee
  - Part of association’s Plan for Excellence
- Goal: Academic libraries demonstrate alignment with & impact on institutional outcomes
  - Promote impact & value of academic & research libraries to higher education community
What’s come before...

2010 – The Value of Academic Libraries: A comprehensive research review and report published, written by Megan Oakleaf for ACRL.

• Review of quantitative & qualitative literature, methodologies & best practices for demonstrating value of academic libraries

- Introduced 5 recommendations for Academic Librarians to help demonstrate value of libraries

In 2015, the VAL committee conducted gap analysis of work based on recommendations of 2010 Value report & 2012 Summit whitepaper
Research Agenda

• The Value of Academic Libraries Committee recommended that ACRL seek a consultant to lead a research agenda development process with the assistance of a committee with members from the VAL Committee as well as other ACRL individuals and representatives from interested groups/sections/committees
Research Agenda

• Spring 2016 – call for proposal for research & delivery of a new ACRL “Action-Oriented Research Agenda on Library Contributions to Student Learning and Success”
  – Provides update on progress since 2010 publication of Value of Academic Libraries Report
  – Examines important questions calling for more research in areas critical to higher education sector
  – Focuses on institutional priorities for improved student learning & success (i.e., retention, persistence, degree completion)
Timeline

• June/July 2016
  – Review of proposals

• August 2016
  – Award of contract to OCLC Research project team

• Spring 2017
  – Research Agenda publication completed
Along the way

• VAL Committee & OCLC Research project team to engage community in updates & progress at various stages throughout the next 6-9 months — Including today!
PROGRESS TO DATE
Overview current literature

Collect and analyze interview data

Facilitate further research via RQs and visualization tool

Research process
## Initial codebook development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher education trend</th>
<th>Trend defined</th>
<th>Example of library responses to trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning in college (and beyond)</strong></td>
<td>Less objective concepts of learning. Usually not tied to a specific graded assignment or graduation.</td>
<td>Space: Collaborative working space for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research support</strong></td>
<td>Outcome tied to research outside of a class.</td>
<td>Service: Teach data management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching support</strong></td>
<td>Outcome viewed from an instructor perspective and deals with a specific course.</td>
<td>Collection: Online repository of syllabi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Response to Students**
- **Response to Students/Faculty**
- **Response to Faculty**
Content analysis of literature

- N=194 documents from LIS and Higher Ed. databases
- 2010-present, US-centric
- NVivo and Excel for analysis
- 100% agreement on coding schemes among three raters
Collection
Assessment
Teaching support
Provision of tech
Service
Inclusivity/Diversity
Communication
Research support
Success in college
Collaboration
Learning in college
### Table 2. Thematic coding changes over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>'10 (%)</th>
<th>'11 (%)</th>
<th>'12 (%)</th>
<th>'13 (%)</th>
<th>'14 (%)</th>
<th>'15 (%)</th>
<th>'16 (%)</th>
<th>Sparkline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity/Diversity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning in college</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of tech</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in college</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching support</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• Librarians not focusing on same thematic topics as higher ed. administrators
• Provision of technology and communication are two promising themes
• Minimal amount of empirical methods associated with assessment and communication
• Minimal use of mixed methods
• **BUT**... Librarians have identified many topical higher ed. themes
Questions & Discussion
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