Outcome 1: High Quality Reference Services

Measurement 1: Peer/Supervisor Reference Evaluations

2008:
Judgments:
- The librarians did not meet expectations in one area (Does the librarian seem at ease and take steps to make the user comfortable?). The library will need to provide professional development in this area.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- None

Judgments:
- The librarians did not meet the goal of scoring 0% on “does not meet expectations.” (new hires - rethink how and when new librarians are evaluated and to reconsider this performance goal).
- (Same as 2008) The library still had one score that did not meet expectations in one area (Does the librarian seem at ease and take steps to make the user comfortable?). The library will continue to provide professional development in this area.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- (For 2008 & 2009) Professional development provided (Nov. 12) from Amigos. Murray State, Southeastern, St. Gregory’s, and Eastern attended.
  a. This year, the library met the goal.
  b. It is necessary to see future data before deciding whether this area has been addressed sufficiently.
- Implemented a significant training program for new librarians. Theda Schwing was the first test in August.

Judgments:
- The librarians did not meet the goal of scoring 0% on “does not meet expectations,” but did improve over last year. The library implemented a significant training program for new librarians to address quality reference service. The library will need more than one year’s worth of data to determine if this training program sufficiently addresses the identified need.
2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- (For 2008 & 2009) Professional development provided (Nov. 12) from Amigos. Murray State, Southeastern, St. Gregory’s, and Eastern attended.
  a. This year, the library met the goal.
  b. It is necessary to see future data before deciding whether this area has been addressed sufficiently.
  c. In 2010 & 2011, the library met this goal. Based on meeting the set goals and improving percentages for the “exceeds expectations” category, this area has been addressed sufficiently.
  d. Continued training program for new librarians. Chelsea Baker was the second test in March.

Judgments:
- For this measurement, the library surpassed the performance goal for “exceeds expectations” by 5%. The peer/supervisor evaluation shows that the librarians did not meet the goal of scoring 0% on “does not meet expectations,” but did improve over last year. The library continued its training program for new librarians, particularly in the area of quality reference service. The library hired a new librarian in March 2011, and she was trained using the new program. Based on two year’s worth of data, the new training program seems to have positively impacted our performance on the use of resources.

Measurement 2: Reference Assessment Cards

2008:
Judgments:
- The library is satisfied that this performance goal was met during 2008.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- None

Judgments:
- The library is satisfied that this performance goal was met during 2009.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- None

Judgments:
- The library is satisfied that this performance goal was met during 2010.
2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None

Judgments:
  • The library satisfied that this performance goal was met during 2011.

Outcome 2: High Quality Instruction Services

*Measurement 1: Peer Evaluations*

2008:
Judgments:
  • The librarians scored above the performance goal in “exceeds expectations” as well as meeting the goal for 0% “does not meet expectations”.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None

Judgments:
  • The librarians scored significantly above the performance goal in “exceeds expectations,” but did not meet the goal of 0% “does not meet expectations.” Requires the library to implement better training in instruction for new librarians.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • Implemented a significant training program for new librarians. Theda Schwing was the first test in August.

Judgments:
  • The peer/supervisor evaluation shows that the librarians met the performance goal in “exceeds expectations,” but did not meet the goal of 0% scoring “does not meet expectations.” For this year, the items in which the library “does not meet expectations” involved instructional materials. The library will provide professional development in this area. Based on information from last year, the library considered revising this goal of 0% but has decided to keep the goal as is.

2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • Continued training program for new librarians. Chelsea Baker was the second test in March.
• To address “does not meet expectations” in instructional materials, the librarians attended an in-house professional development workshop at which they developed standardized instructional materials using the five-step research process. This workshop appears to have remedied the deficiency this year and progress will be monitored in future years.

Judgments:
• For the first time the library met the goal for the number of evaluations. The peer/supervisor evaluations show that the librarians met the performance goal for 0% scoring in “does not meet expectations.” The library did not meet the goal of 25% scoring “exceeds expectations.” Of the questions in which no librarian exceeded expectations, two questions were identified as areas for professional development: “librarians gave satisfactory answers to student questions” and “librarian incorporated student responses into instruction session.” Both of these questions reflect areas of student engagement, therefore, the librarians will attend a professional development workshop at Langston University on incorporating interaction and promoting student engagement in instruction.

Measurement 2: Faculty Evaluations

2008:
Judgments:
• The faculty survey showed that the faculty were satisfied with the instruction although two faculty did not respond to the question “The students' reactions to the instruction session were positive.” The library will investigate this item more closely in the coming year

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• None

Judgments:
• The faculty survey showed that the faculty were satisfied with the instruction although one faculty member did not respond to the questions “The students' reactions to the instruction session were positive” or “The librarian made it clear how database searching relates to course assignments.” Both of these non-responses were for the newest librarian, suggesting that more training is needed. In order to increase the number of faculty evaluations, the library will investigate different methods of administering the evaluation form.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• None
Judgments:
- The faculty survey showed that the faculty were satisfied with the instruction sessions, although one faculty member did not respond to the five “agree/disagree” questions. Although the number of evaluations received did increase this year, the librarians determined that the response rate is still too low based on the number of instructions administered. Therefore, beginning in the spring 2011 semester, the librarians will administer the evaluations on paper immediately following the instruction session.

2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- The library decided to administer faculty evaluations on paper immediately following instruction sessions in order to improve the number of returned faculty evaluations. The instructing librarian asks the faculty member to put the completed evaluation in a secured box located in the library classroom. If the instruction is conducted outside the library, the instructing librarian provides the faculty member with a paper evaluation in an interdepartmental envelope addressed to the Library Director’s office. If the faculty member is not present for the instruction, no evaluation is provided. The number of evaluations collected this year was 32, an increase of 68% over last year.

Judgments:
- With 96% positive responses on this evaluation, the library did not meet this performance goal. The faculty survey showed that for four of the questions on the assessment tool, the faculty feedback was 100% positive. There were five negative responses recorded. Concerning the length of library instructions, both responses of “too long” and “too short” were recorded. One instructor disagreed that student reactions to the instruction were positive, commenting that off-campus students did not receive a handout. One other respondent suggested the session was too remedial. All these comments indicate that librarians need to work more closely with faculty to determine the instructional needs and faculty expectations for each session. This summer, the library will hold a professional development workshop to develop a faculty communication plan. The Instruction Committee, a standing committee composed of the five librarians, will implement this plan. The library will continue to monitor future assessment data to determine if further action is warranted.

Measurement 3: Student Evaluations

2008:
Judgments:
- The student survey showed that students were satisfied with the instruction.
• The library is satisfied that this performance goal was met during 2008. However, one weakness in the data is the low number of faculty and student evaluations completed. The library will work to increase the number of surveys administered and returned.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• In 2008, the number of faculty and student surveys was very low. This year the number of surveys has increased. (No reason provided)

Judgments:
• The student survey showed that students were satisfied with the instruction. All answers but one were positive, although some responses were only marginally positive as indicated by the “Some” column. Although the library met this performance goal, the librarians will continue to improve these services through continued training and professional development. The library will continue to work to increase the number of surveys administered and returned.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• The library was able to greatly increase the number of survey responses. (No reason provided)
• In looking at the responses for 2010, the library discovered that the data from 2009 was calculated incorrectly. The numbers have been corrected.

Judgments:
• Based on the revised data, the library did not meet this performance goal last year and did not meet this performance goal this year.
• During the spring 2011 semester, the survey will be modified to elicit clarifying information regarding session length. The modified version will be administered during fall 2011.

2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• The library was able to again greatly increase the number of student survey responses. (No reason provided).

Judgments:
• The responses received for 2011 show that the librarians received a larger percentage of positive responses, while receiving lower percentages of “marginally positive”, “negative”, and “not sure” responses. This indicates an overall improvement in student satisfaction with library instruction. However, librarians received 96% positive responses from students, which does not meet the goal of 98%.
• Of the 36 total negative responses received, most dealt with the length of the instruction session. Twenty-eight (28) respondents found the session to be too long, while 4 found it to be too short. Student perception of instruction length was addressed in last year’s assessment report and continues to be an ongoing issue. However, the percentage of negative comments regarding the length of instructions was reduced by half when compared to last year’s numbers (6% for 2010; 3% for 2011).
• The other negative responses received were for: failing to make the library welcoming and approachable (2); unclear explanation (1); and unorganized presentation (1). Because these comprise such a small percentage of the overall responses, they will be addressed with individual librarians in their evaluations.

Outcome 3: High Quality Resources

Measurement 1: Access Numbers

2008:
Judgments:
• Although the library met this performance goal, the library needs to improve circulation numbers, including in-house use.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• None

Judgments:
• In running the numbers for this year’s report, the library discovered an error in last year’s numbers. Although the library reported this performance goal was met last year, in fact it was not.
• However, the library has some concerns about these numbers and what they indicate. After one more year of data, the library will be better equipped to determine trends and deviations. Further analysis of how the data is collected and what it indicates is needed. The library will look at the data this year to determine better measures of access.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
• A lengthy webinar an access numbers was viewed by the committee. It was not helpful causing further concern.

Judgments:
• The library did not meet this performance goal. However, as stated last year, the library continues to have concerns about these numbers and what they indicate.
• Last year, the library hoped that an additional year of data would provide more insight into access trends. However, that is not the case. Therefore, the library will spend this calendar year investigating and implementing alternate ways to assess access.

**2011:**

*Actions taken for previous year judgments:*

• A literature search and discussions with peers (PASIG, SIGALO) were conducted, and several ACRL presentations on access numbers were viewed to no avail. None were helpful causing further concern for the committee.

*Judgments:*

• The library met this goal with a 6.9% overall increase over last year. However, as stated in previous years, the library continues to have concerns about what these numbers indicate. Six categories above show increases, while four show decreases. Additional years of data have not made any trend in access numbers apparent. In fact, there seems to be no discernable pattern in any category except ILL lending and Circulation Renewals (decreasing), and use of E-reserves (increasing). All other categories fluctuate between increasing and decreasing.

• Since the library began reporting these numbers, the librarians have expressed concern about whether these numbers truly indicate access to resources. The Assessment Committee investigated accepted library standards for reporting access through reviews of the literature, national webinars, and consultations with peer universities. None of these investigations provided any guidance. However, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) recently released a new set of Standards for Libraries in Higher Education. These new standards focus on demonstrating value. The Assessment Committee will consider these standards to determine what data is a meaningful indicator of access to resources. Next year’s tables will reflect these new indicators.

**Measurement 2: Faculty Survey**

**2008:**

*Judgments:*

• The library has met this performance goal.

**2009:**

*Actions taken for previous year judgments:*

• None

*Judgments:*

• The library only administers the faculty survey every other year. There is no data to report this year.
2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None

Judgments:
  • Although the library showed a 3% increase in faculty satisfaction, the response rate to the survey had a 67% decrease. Efforts will be made in 2012 to increase the number of responses, perhaps by offering an incentive to faculty.

2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None

Judgments:
  • The library only administers the faculty survey every even fall semester. There is no data to report this year.

Measurement 3: Student Survey

2008:
Judgments:
  • The Student satisfaction survey shows a 93% approval rate from the students, which does not meet our goal.
    o The overall and specific approval ratings are too low. The only two categories in which the goal was met were electronic resources and magazines and journals. All other categories need improvement.
    o The number of student responses (approximately 10%) is quite low and perhaps does not accurately reflect the opinions of the student body. The library needs to address both of these issues.

2009:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None

Judgments:
  • The library only administers the student survey every other year. There is no data to report this year.

2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
  • None
Judgments:

- The library did not meet its goal, showed a decrease from the satisfaction level reported in the 2008 survey, and had an appalling response rate. The library will provide incentives for the next survey administration and will investigate ways to improve student perception of the collection.

2011:

Actions taken for previous year judgments:

- Incentives were offered for taking the survey in the form of three $25 gift certificates at the bookstore (two provided by LLAF, one from the bookstore). The return rate increased dramatically (267%) over 2010, but was still considerably lower than the 2008 response rate. The library will continue to offer incentives for completion of the student surveys in future years.

Judgments:

- The library did meet its goal, with 96% of students responding that they were satisfied with library resources. This represents an 8% increase over the last time the survey was administered.

Measurement 4: WorldCat Collection Analysis

2008:

Judgments:

- The library has access to this tool but has not incorporated it into the collection development process. This mechanism will be used in future years.

2009:

Actions taken for previous year judgments:

- WorldCat Collection Analysis incorporated into the collection development process for weeding purposes only in conjunction with a new systematic collection development plan (five disciplines/per year so that each is reviewed every five years).

Judgments:

- Of the five disciplines, weeding was completed for three areas. One area not completed was assigned to a new librarian and one area not completed was assigned to a librarian who was out on medical leave for part of the fall semester. The library did not meet its weeding goal for all five disciplines.
- Next year, and future years, the library will also make more use of WCA’s capabilities by comparing our collection to peer institutions to determine the quality of our collections and to make collection development decisions.
2010:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- The two disciplines not completed in 2009 were completed in 2010.
- WCA comparisons were not implemented.

Judgments:
- Of the five areas planned to be evaluated in 2010, three were completed. One area not completed was assigned to a new librarian. The library did not meet its weeding goal for all five disciplines.
- Beginning next year, the library will also make more extensive use of WCA’s capabilities by comparing our collection on a one-to-one basis with peer institutions, which have been collaboratively chosen with the teaching faculty.

2011:
Actions taken for previous year judgments:
- The two disciplines not completed in 2010 were completed in 2011.
- WCA one-on-one comparisons were implemented, but no action was taken.

Judgments:
- Of the five areas planned to be evaluated in 2011, two were completed. The library did not meet its weeding goal for all five disciplines. Due to staff turnover, not all WCA data was recorded. In addition, the Assessment Committee is concerned about the ability of WCA data to answer questions about the collection’s quality and usefulness. These two areas affect whether or not the library’s stakeholders choose to access the collection.
- Because of the continued and pervasive issues with this criterion, the Assessment Committee will re-evaluate the outcome of High-Quality Resources according to the new ACRL standards.

Summary:

2008:
- Overall, the library is satisfied that most outcomes were met although improvement is possible in several areas.
- References and instruction services meet performance goals.
- The library sees room for improvement in resources, particularly for students.
- One other area of improvement is in the quantity of the data.
- The library needs to make sure that sufficient data is collected for future comparisons.
2009:

- Overall, the library is satisfied that most outcomes were met although improvement is possible in several areas.
- Reference and instruction services met most performance goals. In the areas where we did not meet a goal, it was due to having a new librarian. The library will consider modifying these performance goals to accommodate new library faculty.
- The library partially met the performance goals for access. However, in reviewing this year’s data, the library is questioning whether the data is an effective measure of access. The library will consider whether the access numbers used indicate an increase in the use of the collection.
- Additionally, the library will continue to delve into the extensive features of WorldCat Collection Analysis to evaluate the library collection.
- The library is pleased with the increase in the data collected and we continue to examine the quality and quantity gathered and how the data can help the library improve and reach our goals.

2010:

- Overall, the library is satisfied that most outcomes were met, although improvement is possible in several areas.
- Reference and instruction services met most performance goals. For the goals not met, the library will offer professional development in the next year. Last year the library considered revising reference and instruction performance goals to take into account new library faculty. The library decided to implement a new training model and offer more professional development, rather than revise the performance goals.
- The library partially met the performance goals for access. However, in considering data from the past three years, the library questions whether this data is an effective measure of access. The library will investigate what the access numbers actually say about the use of the collection.
- Additionally, the library will continue to delve into the extensive features of WorldCat Collection Analysis to further evaluate the library collection.
- The library is pleased with the increase in the amount of data collected, and will continue to examine the quality and quantity gathered and investigate how the data can help the library improve and reach our goals.

2011:

- This is the fourth assessment report which the library has submitted to the university. The library has continued to increase the amount of data collected, for the first time meeting the goals for data collection. The library met some, but not all, performance goals. For the goals not met, the library either showed improvement over last year or has a strategy for addressing the situation. These strategies include attending an external professional development workshop, hosting an internal workshop, and addressing issues during librarian’s annual evaluations. Additionally, the library continues to
update the training model used for new librarians, which seems to have been effective based on assessment data.

- The university is increasingly focused on student learning outcomes, and the new ACRL standards emphasize value demonstrated by these outcomes. In the coming year, the Assessment Committee will revisit the Assessment Plan’s criteria, measurements, and performance goals to better align with this student learning outcome focus.

2012:

- The latest UAC review discussed that the library’s assessment report did not focus on student learning outcomes. The library has revised the 2011-2012 Assessment Report to report on the academic year and measure student learning outcomes related to information literacy skills.
- The library will administer SAILS to all MWF sections of UNIV 1001 every fall semester.
- The library will administer SAILS to all UNIV 3001 sections one semester per year.
- Based on the SAILS benchmark data, the library will focus specifically on teaching skills for evaluating sources, citing information sources appropriately, and adhering to ECU’s academic integrity policy on plagiarism.
- Based on the SAILS benchmark data, the library will address developing a search strategy and using finding tool features.
- During Fall 2012, librarians will pilot multiple assessment techniques to measure student learning outcomes. At the conclusion of the Fall 2012 semester, the Instruction Committee and the Assessment Committee, which includes all the instructing librarians, the director, and a staff member, will select the most effective techniques.
- In Spring 2013, librarians will implement selected assessment techniques, using this data in the 2012-2013 Assessment Report.