
Take Back the Data

— Kirsten Kinsley, Lisa R. Horowitz —
Library Assessment Conference
November 1, 2016

Assessment Advocacy

What metrics mean something to our audience(s)?

What metrics tell the story of the 21st Century Library?

How do we bring metrics together in a context that tells that story & advocates for our audience?



Methodology















- Instrument used: Qualtrics survey
- Questions developed: Metrics from trends, divided into categories
- Audience: Academic Librarians
- August 2016 (3 weeks)
- Incentive
- Caveats

1a. Regarding metrics about resources (i.e., collections, data sets, etc.) as represented to Stakeholders:

Please select and rank these academic library resources that could be used to represent the 21st Century Library to our stakeholders. Drag items up or down to number of rank desired, with one being the highest ranked item. Only the top 5 will be used in analysis.

Library expenditures per student FTE	1
Extent of collection use	2
Collection breadth (extent of subject coverage)	3
Accessibility on-site of special, rare or archival materials	4
Number of items locally digitized by the library	5

Data Analysis

Major Categories Ranked	Weighted top 5 ranked librarian perceptions of Stakeholders	Weighted top 5 librarian ranked perceptions of Users	Compared S & U top 5 ranked lists	Compared top five admin. Librarian responses w/non-admin. responses
Resources				
Services				
Access and Space-Related Services				
Outcomes				

What we learned: Resources

Rank	Stakeholders	Users
1	Extent of collection use	Collection breadth (extent of subject coverage)
2	Library expenditures per student FTE	Number of electronic journals
3	Collection breadth (extent of subject coverage)	Collection depth (number of titles in the collection)
4	Consortial memberships, which offer access to additional materials	Accessibility of special, rare or archival materials
5	Availability of repository services to store digital materials and/or data over time	Library expenditures per student FTE

What we learned: Services

Rank	Stakeholders	Users
1	Number of individual reference/research transactions or consultations	Availability of caffeine and food at all hours
2	Number of instruction sessions	Access to unique or expensive hardware or software
3	Altmetrics used to demonstrate impact of scholarship	Number of individual reference/research transactions and/or consultations
4	Access to unique or expensive hardware or software	Number of instruction sessions
5	Number of outreach services for unique user groups	Number for equipment checkout: laptops, cameras, chargers, etc.

What we learned: Access & Space Related

Rank	Stakeholders	Users
1	Number of hours open	A mix of quiet and collaborative spaces
2	Availability of 24/7 space	Availability of 24/7 space
3	Device-neutral digital environment (access to materials and/or databases/platform vendors no matter what device)	Number of hours open
4	Number of study rooms available for reserving	Number of study rooms available for reserving
5	Availability of a free and accessible makerspace for 3D printing, audiofile generation, etc.	Easy access to the library (distance from parking lots, classrooms and residence halls)

Outcomes Important to Stakeholders

1	Information literacy and/or critical-thinking instruction with student GPA, retention, graduation rates, or higher GRE scores
2	Library expenditures per student FTE with retention and graduation rates
3	ARL statistics (e.g., number of professional library staff per student) with first-year retention rates and six-year graduation rates from IPEDS data
4	Library resource and space usage with student GPA, retention, or graduation rates
5	Library instruction with paper and course grades

Additional Trends and Metrics

- Open access metrics
- Self-service options
- Access to digital materials
- Physical space usage
- Correlations with job placement, well-being
- Contributions to community engagement
- Cost-savings
- Staff participation and engagement in campus-wide committees

Impact of Job Role on Responses

- Overall agreement between what metrics administrative positions & non-administrative positions perceived as important to users and stakeholders. (At least 3 out of 5 top five)
- Most agreement in terms of items included and order in which they were listed with what the two groups thought would be important metrics for users' access and space-related services
- Categories where there were also 4 out of 5 items shared between the two groups included:
 - Perceived importance of resources to Users
 - Perceived importance of access and space-related services metrics to stakeholders
 - Perceived outcomes metrics important to stakeholders

Next Steps

“... we also need to consider how smaller institutions can use these or similar metrics to remain competitive and/or talk to stakeholders about library value.”

“I know from listening to our tour guides students at my institution make the library sound like the cool place to be on campus; which is better marketing than telling them we have X number of volumes or we spend x number of dollars on each student”

Select Bibliography

- Bires, S. (2015, October 2). America's Libraries for the 21st Century [Text]. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/pp/prog/century>.
- Center for the Future of Libraries. (2016). Trends. Retrieved October 24, 2016, from <http://www.ala.org/transforminglibraries/future/trends>.
- Committee, A. R. P. and R. (2014). "Top trends in academic libraries A review of the trends and issues affecting academic libraries in higher education." *College & Research Libraries News*, 75(6), 294–302. Retrieved from <http://crln.acrl.org/content/75/6/294>.
- Committee, A. R. P. and R. (2016). "2016 top trends in academic libraries A review of the trends and issues affecting academic libraries in higher education." *College & Research Libraries News*, 77(6), 274–281. Retrieved from <http://crln.acrl.org/content/77/6/274>.
- Dugan, R. E., Hernon, P., & Nitecki, D. A. (2009). *Viewing library metrics from different perspectives: Inputs, outputs, and outcomes*. Santa Barbara, Calif: Libraries Unlimited.
- Hadley, Malcolm, "Picking college, major, comes down to money," *USA Today*, August 15, 2013.
- Horowitz, L., Kinsley, K., Koltay, Z., & Szentkirályi, Z. (2015). Metrics with Meaning: How Can We Effect Change to Library Assessment Metrics used by Non-Library Organizations. Southeastern Library Assessment Conference. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/southeasternlac/2015/track/5>.
- Matthews, K. (2010, January 20). Issues. Retrieved October 16, 2016, from <https://21stcenturylibrary.com/issues/>.
- Oakleaf, M. (2010). *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report*. Retrieved June 23, 2016, from http://222.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.

Questions?

Kirsten Kinsley
Assessment Librarian
Florida State University Libraries
Tallahassee, FL
@kmskinsley
kkinsley@fsu.edu

Lisa R. Horowitz
Assessment Librarian
MIT Libraries
Cambridge, MA
@lisahmit
lisah@mit.edu