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Part I: What is Total Library Assessment (TLA) and How is it Applied to Collection Assessment

- TLA is a placeholder for a phenomenon that doesn’t exist yet.
- Libraries are complex. Library assessment must account for this.
- TLA is comprehensive in scope, inquiry, and method.
- TLA is assessment deconstructed.
Mixed Methods Assessment: Data Types

• Target + method + question = assessment
• TLA is comprehensive in scope (X axis)
• TLA is comprehensive in method (Y axis)
• TLA is comprehensive in inquiry (Z axis)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Authority Metrics</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation stats</td>
<td>LibQUAL+ data</td>
<td>LibQUAL+ comments</td>
<td>Bowker</td>
<td>OCLC WorldShare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL/GIL books lent out</td>
<td>LibQUAL+ comments</td>
<td>Collection Assessment Faculty Survey</td>
<td>Incites Journal Citation Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house use stats</td>
<td>Collection Assessment Faculty Survey</td>
<td>ILL/GIL books borrowed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RED** = not addressed during the pilot year
TLA as Applied to Collection Assessment

- Distributed decision making requires distributed data
- Distributed decision making requires distributed analysis
- Data gathering and distribution is centralized; data analysis and report completion is decentralized
- This project seeks to inform collection management by answering questions about core collection interests: use, manner of use, existing needs, user satisfaction, peer-benchmarks, authority metrics, among others
Part II: The Project Plan

Target(s)

- Monographs
- Some journal data
- A modular approach
- Other collections not included (for now).

Collection Assessment Lives Here

- Assessment
- Liaison Program/Grad Librarians
- Collection Development
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

• Entire monograph collection is assessed over 5 years
• Maximize continuity between cycles
• Liaisons are encouraged to think long term about their collections. Where do you want to be in 5 years?
• LC classification ranges mapped to liaisons
  • Sociology = H, HM, HN, HQ, HS, HT, and HX (for example)
  • Interdisc. Studies = DT, E, F1201-3799, GN, HQ, HT, LC1390-5160.3, JX-JZ
One-Year Timeline

• Data Collection (Summer)
  • Access Services: Interlibrary Loan, GIL
  • Collection Development: Expenditures, Student Enrollment
  • Virtual Services: Holdings, Circulation
• Review (Fall)
  • Liaison Librarians working on reports
• Withdrawal (Spring)
  • Access Services
  • Technical Services: Catalog Updates, Book Repairs
13-Month Timeline:
June 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016
Part III: Report Format & Results Summary

- Section I: Who has a stake in this collection?
- Section II: What are the recent investments?
- Section III: Describe this collection (holdings, locations, age).
- Section IV: What is the usage of this collection?
- Section V: What are the existing needs?
- Section VI: Are users satisfied?
- Section VII: Identify areas of relative strength and weakness (authority metrics).
- Section VIII: How does the collection compare with our peers? (RED = not addressed during the pilot year)
- Section IX: Journal analysis
- Section X: Database analysis
- Section XI: Librarian stakeholder feedback
- Section XII: Goals and recommendations
### 3C: 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>

**Red Flag!**

### 6B: 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 me work</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>2/1/1936-1 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>1/1/1990-1 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>
Results Summary and Best Practices

**Best Practices**

- Lead from the front
- Training is essential
- Make friends and get buy-in
- Admin support crucial

**Beware!**

- Shifting library priorities
- Availability and reliability of data was an issue
- Watch out for toes!
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