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Workshop Outline

• Introduction to performance measurement and user-centered library assessment
• Association of Research Libraries programs and activities in assessment and performance measurement
• User needs assessment: some examples
• Performance measures and indicators
• The Balanced Scorecard
• Using data and results
• Assessment as a PR Tool
Your Role

- Be engaged
- Ask questions
- Participate in discussions
- Be skeptical!
- Stop us if we’re not clear

- Take a customer-centered approach
What Makes a Good Library?

• Library “Goodness” traditionally defined and measured:
  – Quality (Bigger was better!)
  – Access and availability
  – Effectiveness
  – Efficiency
  – Economy
  – Equity

• Now focus on: How much good does this library do?
  – Positive impact and outcomes for customers
  – Value to customers and stakeholders
Common Library Measures/Statistics

- Revenues and expenditures
- Community size/registered borrowers
- Staff size and salaries
- Collections/holdings
- Circulation and other collections usage
- Interlibrary borrowing/lending
- Instruction sessions/participants
- Library service measures (hours, patrons, ref stats)
- Computer use detail
- Web site usage

However, these don’t tell us the value to the user
The Challenge for Libraries

- Traditional statistics don’t define the 21st Century Library
  - Emphasize inputs, expenditures, acquisitions, holdings – how big and how much
  - Can no longer tell the library’s story
  - May not be aligned with library/organizational goals and plans
  - Don’t define and measure service quality

- Need metrics describing outcomes: success and value from the user’s perspective

- Provide the organizational culture, structure, tools, & skill sets needed for libraries to acquire & use this information

What difference do we make to our communities?
What’s Driving the Agenda

- **Environmental Changes**
  - Exploding growth in use and applications of technology
  - Increased customer expectations for services, including quality and responsiveness
  - “Competition” from other sources

- **Budgetary Constraints**
  - Justification for spending $$$ on libraries
  - Increasing competition for resources
  - Cost savings and/or reallocation

- **Justifying our Existence**
  - Fighting to remain relevant
Library Assessment

Library assessment provides a structured process to learn about our communities, their work and the libraries connection to what they do.

The information acquired through library assessment is used in an iterative manner to improve library programs and services and make our libraries responsive to the needs of our communities.

Libraries do not exist in a vacuum but are part of a larger organization. Assessment within the organization may take place in individual areas as well as at the broader organizational level.
Assessment Process

• Focuses on customer needs, defining measurable “outputs” and offering services that meet those needs
• Collects, analyzes and uses data for management, program development, and decision-making
• Emphasizes ongoing communication with customers, opportunities for collaboration, qualitative measures and circular process of continuous improvement
The Value of Assessment

- Accountability and justification
- Measure progress/achievement
- Improvement of services
- Comparison with others
- Identify changing use and needs patterns
  - Remote/In-person
  - Relevancy of current services and resources
  - New services
- Marketing and promotion
- Decisions based on data, not assumptions
  - Assumicide!
Measuring Outcomes and Performance

- Outcomes are the effect of the library on the environment or target population.

- Performance is the degree to which a library is achieving its objectives, particularly in terms of users’ needs.

- Performance indicators (measures) are quantified statements used to evaluate the performance of the library in achieving its objectives.
Libraries Respond

• Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries and Information Services held every 2 years since 1995. Recent conferences have emphasized:
  – User as focus point
  – Assessment of stakeholder views
  – Qualitative measures
  – Impact and outcome measures

• Library Assessment Conference first held in 2006 with more than 200 participants. Emphasis on assessment by and for practitioners. Next conference in Seattle, August 4-7 with 300-350 expected.
Thinking Strategically About Library Futures

- What is the central work of the library and how can we do more, differently, and at less cost?
- What important services does the library provide that others can’t?
- What advantages does the library possess?
- How is customer behavior changing?
- How do we add value to our customers work?
- What are the essential factors responsible for library success now and in the future?
What Will We Measure?

“What is easy to measure is not necessarily what is desirable to measure. It is always tempting to set goals based on the data that are gathered, rather than developing a data-gathering system linked to assessing progress towards meeting established goals.”

The Changing Business Model

Traditional Library Core Business

- Physical Collections
  - Print (primarily)
  - Microforms
  - Other

- Facilities
  - House collections
  - Customer service & work space
  - Staff work space

- Services
  - Reference
  - Instruction
  - Access

University of Washington Libraries Usage Data

- Items Used In-Library
  - 2.12 million in 1995-96
  - 0.36 million in 2006-07

- Gate Counts
  - 4.64 million in 2002-03
  - 4.33 million in 2006-07

- In-Person Reference Questions
  - 142,000 in 2002-03
  - 94,000 in 2006-07
The New Business Model

Customer-Centered Library
• All services & activities viewed through the eyes of customers
• Customers determine quality
• Library services and resources add value to the customer

Assess/Measure the Value the Library Provides the Community through:
• Online resources and services
• In-library resources and services
• In person services outside the library
• Contribution to learning, research and life
Life in the Networked World  (Adapted from Peter Brophy)

• Personal search replaces ‘ask a librarian’
• Global search of the global library
  – Google, flickr, del.icio.us; PubMed; Google Scholar
  – If there’s no response in 3 seconds, try elsewhere
    • Then: Resources scarce, attention abundant
    • Now: Attention scarce, resources abundant
• Social networking/communication - wikis, blogs
• Content please!  Discovery to Delivery is one action.
• Satisficing
  – Then: what is the best source of authoritative information?
  – Now: which is the most readily accessible source of adequate information?
• Network tools used are embedded in workflow
So Understanding Communities is Critical

- Your communities need library services which are embedded in their:
  - Workflows
  - Learnflows
  - Leisureflows
  - Lifeflows
- Engage with their languages and their processes of learning, research, leisure and … life
- Learn what’s important to them
- Because they may not come to you

Support learning, research and life where they occur and surface that support within their lifeflows
What Do We Need to Know About Our Customers?

- Who are our customers (and potential customers)?
- What are their teaching, learning, and research interests?
- How do they work? What’s important to them?
- How do they find information needed for their work?
- How do they use library services? What would they change?
- How do they differ from each other in library use/needs?

How does the library add value to their work?
How does the library contribute to their success?
The Value of Community Assessment

• Know actual and potential customers
• Understand needs and use preferences
• Use funding and staff effectively
• Understand and address “competition”
• Foster community involvement and “ownership”
• Aid marketing, market penetration and outreach
• Measure, demonstrate, present the value of the library to the community
Choosing the Right Method

- Define the question and need before you start
- Is there existing information you can use?
- Is the method appropriate?
- Is it timely?
- Is it cost effective?
- What expertise is needed to conduct and analyze?
- How will the results be used?

Are you assessing what’s important?
Are you assessing what’s important to your community?
Traditional Methods & Measures

Quantitative (numerically) based

- Counts
- Time efficiency
- Comparisons and trends
- Benchmarks
- Surveys

These comprise maintained statistics but may do not show value to community
Common Information Sources

- Community/institutional data sources
- Previous assessment efforts (library/organization)
- Library use data (including e-metrics)
- Acquisition requests and interlibrary loan data
- Computer/Web log data
- Comparative or trend data from other sources
- Local satisfaction surveys
Sometimes The Data Isn’t Revealing

How to recognize the moods of an Irish setter
Alternatives to Survey/Quantitative Data

- Observations
- Interviews
- Focus groups
- Usability
- Comments (solicited/unsolicited)
- Customer “panels”
- Social networking info
- Logged activities
The Qualitative Provides Insight

• Increasing use of such qualitative methods as, comments interviews, focus groups, usability, observation

• Statistics/quantitative data often can’t tell us
  – Who, how, why
  – Value, impact, outcomes

• Qualitative provides information directly from users
  – Their language
  – Their issues
  – Their work

• Qualitative provides understanding
Qualitative Provides the “Aha” Moment

“[Access to online resources] has changed the way I do library research. It used to be a stage process: Initial trip, follow-up trip, fine-tuning trip. Now it’s a continuous interactive thing. I can follow-up anything at any time. While I’m writing I can keep going back and looking up items or verifying information.”

Graduate Student, Psychology (2002 UW Libraries focus group)
“Sacred Cows”

All library cultures have certain givens that everyone understands are sacred....policies, practices, ways of doing things are so ingrained into the culture that people seldom dare to think that things could be done differently. ‘Sacred cows’ is an expression used in English that denotes those sacred, holy and unquestionable beliefs we may hold.

It’s important to learn how to question these given beliefs when brainstorming ideas, to encourage exploration of different ways of thinking. Participants will be asked to identify the “sacred cows” in their libraries in order to think about them critically and dispassionately. Why don’t we allow eating in libraries? Why do we have to check out books? Do undergraduates need a loan period shorter than faculty members? Isn’t library quality determined by organizational policies and procedures rather than ‘customers’?

Source: Colleen Cook, Dean of Libraries, Texas A&M
The Association of Research Libraries

- About the Association of Research Libraries (ARL)
- ARL and library statistics
- ARL sponsors “new measures” of describing and evaluating library services, resources and contributions
Mission:
Shaping the future of research libraries in the changing environment of public policy and scholarly communication.

Members:
123 major research libraries in North America.

Ratios:
4 percent of the higher education institutions providing 40 percent of the information resources.

Users:
Three million students and faculty served.

Expenditures:
40 percent is invested in access to electronic resources.
ARL Tools for Library Assessment

In the beginning…

**ARL Statistics** is a series of annual publications that describe the collections, expenditures, staffing, and service activities for ARL member libraries. These data have been collected since 1907-08, initially by James Gerould. Since 1961-62 ARL has collected and published these data annually. The whole data series represents the oldest and most comprehensive continuing library statistical series in North America.

**The series includes:**
- ARL Statistics
- Academic Health Sciences Library Statistics
- Academic Law Library Statistics
- ARL Preservation Statistics
- ARL Supplementary Statistics
- Annual Salary Survey
What Makes a Research Library?

• Breadth and quality of collections and services
• Sustained institutional commitment to the library
• Distinctive resources in a variety of media
• Services to the scholarly community
• Preservation of research resources
• Contributions of staff to the profession
• Effective and innovative use of technology
• Engagement of the library in academic planning

Association of Research Libraries ‘Principles of Membership’
What Are We Measuring? Reviewing the ARL Statistics

October 2005, ARL Board approved a study to:

• Determine if there are new ways of describing research library collections.
  – What is it we are currently measuring
  – Are they the right data
  – Develop alternative models

• Develop a profile of the characteristics of a contemporary research library

• Determine/develop new meaningful measures to augment current ones to support this profile
Updating the Traditional ARL Statistics – StatsQUAL™

• E-Metrics = ARL Supplementary Statistics
  – On going efforts to update and refine core data.
  – Exploring feasibility of collecting e-metrics.

• ARL Task Force on New Ways of Measuring Collections:
  – Growing concern with utility of membership index.
  – Study ARL statistics to determine relevance.
  – Develop Profile of Emerging Research Libraries.
Qualitative Profile

Developing New Metrics  (per Yvonna Lincoln)

• Uniqueness of collections
• Defining the value of consortia
• Administrative and budgetary efficiencies
• Student outcomes/student learning/graduate success
• Contributions to faculty productivity
• Social frameworks/intellectual networks
• Generating new knowledge
• Creating the collective good with reusable assets
Quantitative Stats
(Per Bruce Thompson)

• Expenditure Focused Index (EFI)
• Current ARL stats that could be used for benchmarking
  – Collections
  – User interactions
    • # Participants in group presentations
    • # Presentations to library groups
    • # Reference transactions
  – Collaborative Activities - Interlibrary loan activities
    • Borrowed total items
    • Loaned total items

• Set of statistics related to the digital library (from ARL supplementary statistics)
Library Assessment and its Global Dimensions

• Markets and people exposed to economic and social frameworks unheard of before
• Competing internationally
• Library users exposed to global forces
• Libraries facing similar challenges
• Libraries as the Internet
• Libraries as Google
• Libraries as Collaborative Spaces
Assessment at ARL

• A gateway to assessment tools: StatsQUAL®:
  - ARL Statistics -- E-Metrics
  - LibQUAL+®
  - DigiQUAL®
  - MINES for Libraries®
  - ClimateQUAL™

• Library Assessment Conferences
• Service Quality Evaluation Academy
• Library Assessment Blog
• Library Assessment Consulting Service
  - Making Library Assessment Work
  - Effective, Sustainable, Practical Library Assessment
ARL Tools for Library Assessment

As a result of the work of the New Measures and Assessment Initiative (1999)…
ARL Tools for Library Assessment

- Common User Interface
- Unified Data Structure
- Enhanced Data Mining/Warehousing Opportunities
- Faster Development Cycle for New Tools
- Common Workflow
Library Assessment in an Electronic Era

Where are the most critical needs and opportunities?

What are the lessons learned?
Defining Success in a Digital Environment

• Crafting new measures of success.
• Moving from measuring inputs to outputs and outcomes.
• Understanding impact of library roles and services.
• Agreeing on qualitative measures of success: user perceptions, user success, creating value, advancing higher education goals.
• Reallocating and managing capabilities to focus on new definitions of success.
The LibQUAL+® Update

- The LibQUAL+® premise, dimensions, and methodology
- LibQUAL+® Results
- LibQUAL+® in Action
The Need for LibQUAL+®

- Underlying need to demonstrate our worth
- The reallocation of resources from traditional services and functions
- Rapid shifts in information-seeking behavior
  - Need to keep abreast of customer demands
- Increasing user demands
Why Use LibQUAL+®?
Feedback from LibQUAL+® Users

“Why did you choose to use LibQUAL+®?”

- LibQUAL+® was recommended to us as offering a well designed, thoroughly Library-focused set of survey tools
- Opportunity to benchmark
- Cost-effectiveness
- Automated processing & fast delivery of results
- Respectability and comparability (with others and historically)
“only customers judge quality; all other judgments are essentially irrelevant”

Multiple Methods for Listening to Customers

- Transactional surveys*
- Mystery shopping
- New, declining, and lost-customer surveys
- Focus group interviews
- Customer advisory panels
- Service reviews
- Customer complaint, comment, and inquiry capture
- Total market surveys*
- Employee field reporting
- Employee surveys
- Service operating data capture

*A SERVQUAL-type instrument is most suitable for these methods
LibQUAL+®
LibQUAL+® Languages

Over 1,000 institutions
1,000,000 respondents
Survey – “22 items…"

Cranfield University
Library Service Quality Survey

Please rate the following statements (1 is lowest, 9 is highest) by indicating:

Minimum -- the number that represents the minimum level of service that you would find acceptable
Desired -- the number that represents the level of service that you personally want
Perceived -- the number that represents the level of service that you believe our library currently provides

For each item, you must EITHER rate the item in all three columns OR identify the item as "N/A" (not applicable). Selecting "N/A" will override all other answers for that item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>My Minimum Service Level Is</th>
<th>My Desired Service Level Is</th>
<th>Perceived Service Performance Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Library staff who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Readiness to respond to users’ enquiries</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
<td>C C C C C C C C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and A Box.”

- Why the Box is so Important:
  - About 40% of participants provide open-ended comments, and these are linked to demographics and quantitative data
  - Users elaborate the details of their concerns
  - Users feel the need to be constructive in their criticisms, and offer specific suggestions for action
Understanding LibQUAL+® Results

• For the 22 items LibQUAL+ asks users’ to rate their:
  • Minimum service level
  • Desired service level
  • Perceived service performance

• This gives us a ‘Zone of Tolerance’ for each question; the distance between minimally acceptable and desired service ratings

• Perception ratings ideally fall within the Zone of Tolerance
General Findings

• Highly desired
  • Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office
  • Print and/or electronic journals I require for my work
  • A haven for study, learning or research

• Lowest
  • Library staff who instil confidence in users
  • Giving users individual attention
  • Space for group learning and group study
Using LibQUAL+® Results

- **Strategic Service Developments**
  - Data to support service development
  - Ability to identify where not meeting expectations
  - Measure if change has met need

- **Budget Discussions**
  - Data to support bid for increased funding
  - Data to support case for change in emphasis (towards e-provision)

- **Marketing Position**
  - Status of the library within the University
  - Importance of national & international benchmarking
In Closing, LibQUAL+®:

- Focuses on the users’ point of view (outcomes)
- Requires limited local survey expertise and resources
- Analysis available at local, national and inter-institutional levels
- Offers opportunities for highlighting and improving your status within the institution
- Can help in securing funding for the Library
"Each organization must create and communicate performance measures that reflect its unique strategy."

Dr. Robert S. Kaplan, Harvard Business School
Developing the DigiQUAL™ Protocol for Digital Library Evaluation

- Building on the LibQUAL+® experience
- Secures feedback on user’s perceptions of library’s web site
- Five questions on services, functionality, and content
- Goal is to determine utility, reliability, and trustworthiness
DigiQUAL™ Dimensions

Accessibility
Navigability
Interoperability
Collection building
Resource Use
Evaluating collections
DL as community: users, developers, reviewers
Copyright
Role of Federations
DL Sustainability
Outstanding Issues and Challenges

• Unique DLs: niche market, critical mass, both?

• Balance:
  – custom vs. generic content → results
  – flexible vs. standard implementation → scaling

• Mixed methods
  – Preserving user privacy
  – Collecting truly useful data

• Moving target: digital libraries as… it depends.
Assessing the Value of Networked Electronic Services

The MINES Survey

Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services (MINES) - MINES for Libraries™
What is MINES for Libraries™?

- A research methodology consisting of a web-based survey form and a sampling plan.
- Measures who is using electronic resources, where users are located at the time of use, and their purpose of use.
- Adopted by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) as a part of the “New Measures” toolkit May, 2003.
- Different from other electronic resource usage measures that quantify total usage or measure how well a library makes electronic resources available.
Questions Addressed

• How extensively do sponsored researchers use the new digital information environment?
• Are there differences in usage of electronic information based on the user’s location (e.g., in the library; on-campus, but not in the library; or off-campus)?
• What is a statistically valid methodology for capturing electronic services usage both in the library and remotely through web surveys?
• Are particular network configurations more conducive to studies of digital libraries patron use?
Library User Survey

UConn Library Electronic Services Web Survey

This survey is being conducted during a two-hour time period by the University of Connecticut to assess the usage of the Library’s electronic services. All responses are anonymous. The data is critical for obtaining continued funding.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.

Thank you for your help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patron Status</th>
<th>Select Patron Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Select Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Select Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for Using this Electronic Resource:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Sponsored (Funded) Research [Definition]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Instruction/Education/Departmental (Non-Funded) Research [Definition]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Other Activities [Definition]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit Survey
Library Connection to Research: MINES for Libraries™

A web-based transactional survey that collects data on users’ demographics and their purpose of use. Traditionally used to document library use for sponsored research.

Administered at 40 North American universities in the last four years. Offered by Association of Research Libraries.
Discussion

• How do we allocate expenditures for electronic resources?
• How do we allocate indirect costs for electronic resources?
• What is the appropriate balance between electronic and print?
• What is the appropriate balance between centralized and distributed purchasing?
• How are electronic resources affecting learning and research outcomes?
What are the most critical assessment needs and opportunities?

• Complementing LibQUAL+® with additional measures.

• Developing impact studies on user success, economic value, and community return on investment.

• Moving target: what is a digital library?

• E-Resources: understanding usage.

• Gaining acceptance and use of standard measures for e-resources.

• Building a climate of assessment throughout library.
What is the lesson learned?

• Building standardized assessment methods and tools are a key component of understanding users, performance measurement, and improvement of services.
Building Assessment Capability in Libraries through Consultation Services

- ARL project “Making Library Assessment Work” approved in 2004
- Funded by participating libraries
- Conducted by Steve Hiller and Jim Self – 1.5 day site visit
  - Presentation and best practices
  - Interviews and meetings
  - Report to the library with recommendations
- 24 libraries in U.S. and Canada visited in 2005-06
- Succeeded by Effective, Sustainable and Practical Library Assessment in 2007 (open to all libraries)
  - 15 libraries participating in 2007-08
  - Including 4 outside North America
Organizational Factors That Impede Effective and Sustainable Assessment

- Lack of an “institutional” research infrastructure
- Emphasis is on management and service responsibilities not research
- No assessment advocate within organization
- Poor coordination or awareness of internal efforts
- Library staff lack research methodology skills
- Library “culture” is skeptical of data
- Librarians have multiple time-consuming responsibilities
- Leadership does not view as priority
- Library organizational structure is often “silhouette-based”
Commonly Identified Assessment Needs
(24 Libraries)

- Use Data Effectively: 23
- Data Collection: 18
- Data Analysis: 18
- Staff Data Use Skills: 17
- Understand Assessment Methods: 17
- Build Assessment Culture: 16
Organizational Indicators of Effective Assessment

• Library leadership/management want to use data
• Customer focus is a shared library value
• Organizational culture receptive to change and improvement
• Assessment responsibility recognized and supported
• Library has a process for strategic planning/priorities
• Evidence/Data used to improve services/programs
  – Web sites (usability)
  – Facilities (qualitative methods)
  – Serial subscriptions (emetrics)
  – LibQUAL+™ results are followed-up
In Closing

- As higher education is challenged on accountability and effectiveness issues so will libraries.

- A growing appreciation of need for fresh assessment measures, techniques, and processes - old arguments don’t work.

- Basic questions of role, vision, and impact must be answered by library community.
User Needs Assessment
Some Examples
Understanding How Researchers Work

3 Separate Studies Using Mixed Methods (2005-06)
Focus first on work of faculty/grad students and then on connection to library

• University of Minnesota
  – Humanities/Social Science research followed by Sciences

• New York University
  – 21st Century Library Study

• University of Washington
  – Biosciences Review
Researchers and Libraries: Results Summary

• University of Minnesota
  – Extremely comfortable with electronic sources
  – Interdisciplinary critical in sciences
  – Inadequate methods for organizing research materials

• New York University
  – Researchers (all disciplines) no longer tied to physical library
  – Physical library can play a “community” role
  – Expectations for info shaped by Web and commercial sector

• University of Washington
  – Start info search outside library space (virtual and physical)
  – All digital all the time
  – Could not come up with “new library services” unprompted
UW Interview Focus Group Themes

• Content is primary link to the library
  – Identify library with ejournals; want more titles & backfiles

• Provide library-related services and resources in our space not yours
  – Discovery begins primarily outside of library space with Google and Pub Med; Web of Science also important
  – Library services/tools seen as overly complex and fragmented

• Print is dead, really dead
  – If not online want digital delivery/too many libraries
  – Go to physical library only as last resort

• Could not come up with new services unprompted
University of Washington
(Site of the 2008 Library Assessment Conference!)

- Located in beautiful Seattle metro population 3.2 million
- Comprehensive public research university
  - 27,000 undergraduate students
  - 12,000 graduate and professional students (80 doctoral programs)
  - 4,000 research and teaching faculty
- $800 million annually in federal research funds (2nd in U.S.)
- Large research library system
  - $40 million annual budget
  - 150 librarians on 3 campuses
UW Libraries Assessment Priorities
Customer Needs, Use and Success

- Information seeking behavior and use
- Patterns of library use
- Value of library
- User needs
- Library contribution to customer success
- User satisfaction with services, collections, overall
- Data to make informed and wise decisions that lead to resources and services that contribute to user success
University of Washington Libraries
Assessment Methods Used

  – All faculty
  – Samples of undergraduate and graduate students
  – Research scientists, Health Sciences fellow/residents 2004-
• In-library use surveys every 3 years beginning 1993
• LibQUAL+™ from 2000-2003
• Focus groups/Interviews (annually since 1998)
• Observation (guided and non-obtrusive)
• Usability
• Use statistics/data mining
• Information about assessment program available at: http://www.lib.washington.edu/assessment/
Qualitative Assessment
Some Examples from UW

• **Usability**
  – Library Web site design, OCLC World Cat local, Wayfinding

• **Observation**
  – Unobtrusive observation of public access computer use
  – Faculty and grad searching of bibliographic databases
  – Use of main library space and service hours

• **Focus groups**
  – Interlibrary loan, instruction, info seeking behavior, scholarly communication, bioscientists

• **Interviews**
  – Electronic journals, scholarly publishing, finding information, data management, bioscientists
**UW Triennial Library Survey**  
Number of Respondents and Response Rate 1992-2007

Large number of respondents allows for analysis within groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad/Prof Students</strong></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergrads</strong></td>
<td>467</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mode of Library Use by Group 2007
(weekly or more often)

Undergrad
- Visit Only: 27%
- Remote & Visit: 39%
- Remote Only: 14%
- Non-Weekly: 20%

Grad
- Visit Only: 2%
- Remote & Visit: 45%
- Remote Only: 47%
- Non-Weekly: 6%

Faculty
- Visit Only: 1%
- Remote & Visit: 19%
- Remote Only: 72%
- Non-Weekly: 8%
Reasons for In-Person Library Visits 2001
Faculty and Undergrads Visiting Weekly or More Often

Use Collections
Use space or services
Only Collections
Only space or services

Faculty
Undergrads
Library as Place
Change In Frequency of In-Person Visits 1998-2007 (weekly+)

- Grad
- Undergrad
- Faculty

Undergrad Activities During Library Visits
(% using at least weekly in 2004/2007)

- Get assistance
- Look for material
- Use library computers
- Individual Work
- Group Work

Comparison between 2004 and 2007.
Frequency of Off-Campus Remote Use
(% connecting at least 2x week)
Primary Reasons for Faculty Use of Libraries Web Sites (at least 2x per week)

The ability to access full-text or pdf research articles online through the library subscriptions is my primary use of the library and is central to my research. Neurobiology Grad Student
Sources Consulted for Information on Research Topics  
(Scale of 1 “Not at All” to 5 “Usually”)

- **Open Internet Search**
  - Faculty: 4.5
  - Grad: 4
  - Undergrad: 3.75

- **Open Internet Ref Source**
  - Faculty: 2.75
  - Grad: 3
  - Undergrad: 3.5

- **Library Catalog**
  - Faculty: 3.5
  - Grad: 3.75
  - Undergrad: 4

- **Bibliographic Databases**
  - Faculty: 3.5
  - Grad: 3.75
  - Undergrad: 4.25
Importance of Books, Journals, Databases by Faculty Academic Area

- **Health Sciences**
- **Science-Engineering**
- **Hum-Soc Science**

### Comparison of Importance

- **Books**
  - Health Sciences: 3.25
  - Science-Engineering: 4.5
  - Hum-Soc Science: 5

- **Journals <1985**
  - Health Sciences: 3
  - Science-Engineering: 4
  - Hum-Soc Science: 4.25

- **Bib Databases**
  - Health Sciences: 3
  - Science-Engineering: 4
  - Hum-Soc Science: 4.25

- **Journals >1985**
  - Health Sciences: 5
  - Science-Engineering: 3.75
  - Hum-Soc Science: 4.5

Legend:
- **Blue** = Books
- **Teal** = Journals <1985
- **Green** = Bib Databases
- **Red** = Journals >1985
Usefulness of New/Expanded Services
Faculty and Grad

Scan and send
Digitize collections
Office delivery of books
Integrate services into campus Web sites
Manage your info and data

Grad Faculty

Manage your info and
data
Integrate services into
campus Web sites
Office delivery of
books
Digitize collections
Scan and send
Grad Faculty
Usefulness of New/Expanded Services Undergraduates (Physical Library Services in Red)

- Quiet work/study areas
- Increase weekend hours
- More library computers
- Integrate services into campus Web sites
- Book Self-Check out
- Group/Presentation Spaces
Scholarly Communications: Important Factors in Where Faculty Publish Journal Articles (% Faculty marking “Very important”)

- Journal reputation: 90%
- Non-profit publisher: 60%
- Journal online: 50%
- Library subscription: 30%
- Open Access: 20%
- Retain copyright: 10%
- Journal cost: 0%
What We’ve Learned about the UW Community

• Libraries are still important source of information used for teaching, learning and research but lessening in value
• Library needs/use patterns vary by and within academic areas and groups
• Remote access is preferred method and has changed the way faculty and students work and use libraries
• Library as place important to students
• Library/information environment is perceived as too complex; users find simpler ways (Google) to get info
• Customers cannot predict the future of libraries
Performance Measurement

“Measuring performance is an exercise in measuring the past. It is the use of that data to plan an improved future that is all important.”

“Performance measures are no more than an aid to planning and service delivery, not the driving force behind it.”

Peter Brophy
Measuring Outcomes and Performance

• Outcomes are the effect of the library on the environment or target population

• Performance is the degree to which a library is achieving its objectives, particularly in terms of users’ needs

• Performance indicators (measures) are quantified statements used to evaluate the performance of the library in achieving its objectives
Performance Measurement and Standards
International Perspectives

• Convergence where higher education and public libraries are funded on a national or regional level
• Divergence where higher education and public libraries are funded locally, have different missions, stakeholders.
• Measures and standards have been most successful in working with automated systems and quantitative data
• Measures and standards traditionally have not captured qualitative information well
Criteria for Performance Indicators
ISO 11620

• Informative
• Reliable
• Valid
• Appropriate
• Practical
• Comparable

Performance indicators should relate to institutional and library mission, goals and outcomes
Measuring Quality
Performance Measurement in Libraries

FOUR KEY AREAS with 40 Indicators Using the Balanced Scorecard as the Framework

• Resources, infrastructure
  – What services does the library offer?

• Use
  – How are the services accepted?

• Efficiency
  – Are the services offered cost effectively?

• Potentials and Development
  – Are there sufficient potentials for further development?

IFLA, 2007, Edited by Rosewitha and Peter te Broekhorst
Measuring Quality
Performance Indicators Selected

• Cover full range of resources/services found in academic and public libraries
• Traditional and electronic services
• Indicators that have been documented and tested
• Cover aspects of service quality that are part of the balanced scorecard
Measuring Quality
Performance Measurement in Libraries

• Resources, infrastructure
  – Per capita: user area, seats, expenditures, staff

• Use
  – User satisfaction; collection use; reference questions

• Efficiency
  – Cost per user, visit, use, download; processing speed

• Potentials and Development
  – % of acq. budget spent electronically, library staff providing and developing electronic services
Measuring Quality
Use Indicators

- Market penetration
- User satisfaction
- Library visits per capita
- Seat occupancy rate
- Number content units downloaded per capita
- Collection use (turnover)
- % stock not used
- Loans per capita
- % loans to external users
- Attendance at training sessions per capita
Specific Use Indicator:
Number Content Units Downloaded per Capita

• Background
  – Most expressive measure for use of electronic collections

• Definition
  – Content unit, population

• Aims
  – Relevance of collection to users

• Method
  – Number of content units downloaded per year divided by population

• Interpretation and use of results
  – High score is good; low score shows inadequacy
Specific Resources/Infrastructure Indicator: Seats per Capita

• **Background**
  – Library as physical place to work is still important

• **Definition**
  – Number of seats provided divided by population served

• **Aims**
  – Adequacy of number of seats to population

• **Method**
  – Count number of seats; population is persons not FTE

• **Interpretation and Use of Results**
  – Higher score (more seats per person) is better
Questions about Performance Measures

- Measuring what is most important or measuring what can be measured?
- How is qualitative information quantified?
- Are all measures or indicators equal?
- How do measures or indicators relate to outcomes?
- How much time and resources should go into devising measures, methods and analysis?
- How do we incorporate customer perspectives?
- What is the balance between national/international and local measures?
Benchmarking

• Benchmarking is a systematic and structured approach to finding, implementing, and comparing best practices within and/or between organizations

• Benchmarking may use existing statistics, performance measures or standards

• Comparability both in data definition/acquisition and type of organization is critical for benchmarking to be effective
The Balanced Scorecard

Examples from the University of Virginia Library courtesy of Jim Self, Director, Management Information Services

www.lib.virginia.edu/bsc
The Balanced Scorecard

• A layered and categorized instrument developed in the 1990’s by Kaplan and Norton that:
  – Identifies the important statistics
  – Ensures a proper balance
  – Organizes multiple statistics into an intelligible framework
The Balanced Scorecard

• Reflects the organization’s vision
• Clarifies and communicates the vision
• Provides a quick, but comprehensive, picture of the organization’s health
Scorecard Measures are “Balanced” into Four Dimensions

• The user perspective
• The finance perspective
• The internal process perspective
• The learning and growth perspective
The Balanced Scorecard at the University of Virginia Library

- Implemented in 2001
- Reports for FY02 to FY07
- Metrics and targets recalibrated on a regular cycle
- A library staff group is responsible for choosing and selecting metrics and targets and sending recommendations to library administration
- A work in progress
The Balanced Scorecard

• Provides performance measurement indicators (measures), based on library objectives
• Reflects the organization's mission and strategies
• Evaluates current performance and potential for the future
Constructing a Balanced Scorecard

• Four dimensions:
  – User perspective
  – Internal processes perspective
  – Finance perspective
  – Future/growth/learning perspective

• Select a limited number of meaningful and measurable indicators for each dimension

• Select targets for each indicator
Core Questions

- **User Perspective**
  - How well is the library meeting user needs?

- **Internal Processes**
  - Do the library’s processes function efficiently?

- **Finance**
  - How well are the library’s finances managed?

- **Learning and Growth**
  - Is the library well positioned for the future?
Choosing the Metrics

- Reflecting Values
  - What is important?
  - What are we trying to accomplish?
- Diversity and Balance
  - Innovations and operations
  - Variety of measurements
- Ensuring validity
  - Does the measurement accurately reflect the reality?
- Being Practical
  - Use existing measures when possible
  - Use sampling
  - Collect data centrally
  - Minimize work by front line
What University of Virginia Measures

• Customer survey ratings
• Staff survey ratings
• Timeliness and cost of service
• Usability testing of web resources
• Success in fund raising
• Comparisons with peers
Metrics and Targets

- Specific targets indicating full success, partial success, and failure
- At the end of the year we know if we have met our target for each metric
- The metric may be a complex measure encompassing several elements
Importance of Targets

• Measure quantitatively
• Set challenging, but achievable targets
• Consider two sets of targets:
  – Complete success
  – Partial success
• Aggregate regularly to provide feedback
• Address problems that are revealed
User Perspective

• How can we fulfill user expectations?
• Customer ratings in our periodic surveys
• Use of materials
• Turnaround time for patron requests
Finance Perspective

• How can we secure and use resources in an effective way?
• Cost per use of purchased materials
• Revenue from state and private sources
• Library expenditures as a proportion of University expenditures
Internal Processes Perspective

- How should we organize internal processes to meet user needs and expectations?
- Throughput times for making materials available
- Satisfaction ratings from internal surveys
- Quality of physical infrastructure
Learning/Growth Perspective

• How can we secure the future capability of our services?
• Staff training outcomes
• Measure of job satisfaction and salary competitiveness
• Progress in staff diversity
• Indicators of growth in our digital environment
Balanced Scorecard Examples

User Perspective

• Overall rating in student and faculty surveys
  – Target1: An average score of at least 4.25 (out of 5.00) from each of the major constituencies
  – Target2: A score of at least 4.00

Internal Processes

• Processing time for routine acquisitions
  – Target1: Process 90% of in-print books from North America within one month.
  – Target2: Process 80% of in-print books from North America within one month
Balanced Scorecard Examples

Finance

• Unit Cost (cost per download) of Electronic Serial Use
  – *Target1*: There should be no increase in unit cost each year.
  – *Target2*: Less than 5% annual increase in unit cost.

Learning

• Comparing librarian salaries to peer groups
  – *Target1*: Average librarian salaries should rank in the top 40% of average salaries at ARL libraries.
  – *Target2*: Rank in top 50%.
Metric U.3 Circulation of New Monographs

- **Target1**: 60% of newly cataloged monographs should circulate within two years.
- **Target2**: 50% of new monographs should circulate within two years.
- **Method**:  
  - Data from the SIRSI records documenting circulation of print monographs over a two-year cycle. Only items circulated to users (not binding, etc.) are counted.
- **Result FY07**: Target 1 Met.  
  - 62.9% circulated (16,363 out of 26,032)
Metric I.2.: Internal Communications

- **Target1**: Positive scores (4 or 5) on internal communications statements from 80% of respondents in the biennial work-life survey.

- **Target2**: Positive scores from 60%.

- **Method:**
  - In the biennial staff work-life quality survey staff rates their agreement with statements on aspects of internal communication on a 1 to 5 scale. The responses from the communications section will be tallied in aggregate.

- **Result FY07**: Target not met.
  - 48% gave positive scores.
Metric L.3 Expenditures for Digital Materials

- **Target1**: Rank in the top 25% of ARL libraries in percentage of collections dollars spent on digital materials.
- **Target2**: Rank in top 33%.

**Method**
- Use ARL statistics

**Result FY07**: Target not met.
- Ranked 60 of 118 (53.4%)
Metric F.1 Library Expenditures as a Proportion of University Expenditures

• Target1: The University Library will account for at least 2.50% of the total expenditures of the academic division of the University.
  Target2: The University Library will account for at least 2.25%.

• Method:
  – Total expenditures of the academic division of the University will be obtained from Institutional Assessment and Studies (IAAS); University Library expenditures will be obtained from Oracle

• Result FY07: Target met
  – $26.159 million out of 963.687 million (2.71%)
To summarize…

The Balanced Scorecard

• Reflects the organization’s vision
• Clarifies and communicates the vision
• Provides a quick, but comprehensive, picture of the organization’s health
Determining Importance

• What are the five most important activities to measure or evaluate in your library? Why?

• How would you go about establishing measures and/or indicators?
Using Data and Results
Use Data Wisely

- Understand your data
- Know the limitations of your data
- Use appropriate analysis methods and tools
- Comparative data provide context and understanding
- Seek internal or external validation
- Identify what is important and why
Making Data Meaningful

• Summarize
• Compare
• Analyze
• Present
• Go below the surface to examine results by:
  – Demographic group
  – Users and non-users
  – Stakeholders vs non-stakeholders
• Compare current data with information from the past
• How can we use the data for action?
Analyzing Qualitative Data

• Identify key themes
• Categorize them
• Review for:
  – Frequency
  – Extensiveness
  – Intensity
  – Body language
  – Specificity
  – Consistency
  – Language

Specialized (e.g. Atlas T.I.) or standard applications (e.g. MS Access) can be used to help analyze
Presenting Data and Results

• Make sure data/results are:
  – Timely
  – Understandable
  – Usable

• Identify **important** findings/**key** results
  – What’s important to know
  – What’s actionable

• Present **key/important** results to:
  – Library administration/institutional administration
  – Library staff
  – Other libraries/interested parties/stakeholders
“Often the most effective way to describe, explore and summarize a set of numbers – even a very large set – is to look at pictures of those numbers. Furthermore, of all methods for analyzing and communicating statistical information, well designed data graphics are usually the simplest and at the same time the most powerful.”

Edward Tufte

The Visual Display of Quantitative Information

"The Leonardo da Vinci of data." THE NEW YORK TIMES
Presenting Results: What’s Important

• What’s the message?
  – Fewer “messages” means greater impact

• Who’s the audience
  – Multiple audiences may need different presentations

• How is it presented?
  – Quantitative data
    • Tables, charts, text, “data”
  – Qualitative data
    • Be selective, use direct quotes from users

• How is the presentation structured?
The data is analyzed...now what?

Need more data?

Yes -> Collect more data
   (focus groups, targeted surveys, individual interviews, etc)

No -> Set and implement action plan

Publicize findings and actions
Publicize findings and actions…

Public Relations 101

• **Who?** → Who are your audiences?

• **What?** → What are your messages?

• **Where?** → What location do you choose to deliver your message?

• **When?** → Who do you communicate with first? Second? Third?

• **How?** → What mode of communication do you use…in-person event, e-mail, staff meeting, etc?
Delivering a quantitative message...


Communicate, Market, Share

- Marketing is part of overall communication strategy
- Visual representations of data using charts or graphs
- In person events: e.g., Library Summit, focus groups
- Permanent library Web site with data, analysis, and follow-up
Library Summit

• Gather stakeholders
• Opportunity to share survey results
• Facilitated small group discussions on:
  – issues raised by survey results
  – solutions/suggestions for improvement
• Major visibility for library
• Chance to market library resources & services
• Catalyst for constructive dialog and institution-wide collaboration
Assessment as a PR Tool
Visual Representation of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Employees who trust confidence in users</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Employees who are sensitive to feedback</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Readiness to respond to user questions</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a friendly fashion</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Dependability in handling users’ service problems</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IC1 | Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC2 | A library website enabling me to locate information on my own | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC3 | The printed library materials I need for my work | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC4 | The electronic information resources I need | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC5 | Modern equipment that lets me measure access needs for information | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC6 | Ease-of-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC7 | Making information easily accessible for independent use | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| IC8 | Print and electronic journal collections I require for my work | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |

| LP1 | Library space that inspires study and learning | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| LP2 | Space for focused intellectual activities | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| LP3 | A comfortable and inviting location | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| LP4 | A getaway for study, leisure, or research | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |
| LP5 | Community space for group learning and group study | 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84 |

Overall: 5.90 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 0.84
Visual Representation of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Minimum SD</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Desired SD</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
<th>Perceived SD</th>
<th>Adequacy Mean</th>
<th>Adequacy SD</th>
<th>Superiority Mean</th>
<th>Superiority SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Service</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Control</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as Place</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Visual Representation of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Attention</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand Needs</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to Help</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service - Overall</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Access</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Materials</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Resources</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Equipment</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Access Tools</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Use</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals (Print/E)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Info Control - Overall</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring Space</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Space</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable Space</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Getaway</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Space</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Place - Overall</strong></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Brian Mathews, Georgia Tech, ALA Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, June 25, 2007
## Faculty Use of Electronic Journals: School by Journal Topic  [21,634 article views]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>MED</th>
<th>NURS</th>
<th>SAS-Sci</th>
<th>SAS-SSci</th>
<th>ENGNR</th>
<th>VET</th>
<th>SAS-Hum</th>
<th>WHRTN</th>
<th>DENTAL</th>
<th>SOC-WRK</th>
<th>EDU</th>
<th>COMMN</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>11,101</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14,398</td>
<td>66.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>14.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Econ</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Info Sci</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sci</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 14,999 2,135 1,091 673 450 429 417 364 348 323 289 116 21,634 100.00%

Peer Comparisons

LibQUAL+ 2006
Faculty Ratings of Journal Collections
ARL Libraries

Peer Comparisons

Library as Place - Undergrads
Benchmark 2003/2004

Source: Brian Mathews, Georgia Tech, ALA Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, June 25, 2007
Peer Comparisons

**Adequacy Gap**
The difference between the minimum and perceived score.

Source: Fred Heath, LibQUAL+® Results Meeting, ALA Annual Conference, Seattle, WA, January 22, 2007
Peer Comparisons

LibQUAL+ 2006
Overall Quality of the Service Provided by the Library
38 ARL Libraries

Progressing from Analysis to Action

• From all of the data, determine what can and should be addressed

• Prioritize some action items
  – Align with mission, vision and goals of parent organization
  – Address users’ top priorities, by user group
  – Improve areas of strong user dissatisfaction
  – Build on strengths, if they are truly user needs and priorities
  – Identify work that can be de-emphasized and resources that can be reallocated
Using S.M.A.R.T. Goals

• **S** Specific
  – the desired outcome or result is clearly defined

• **M** Measurable
  – accomplishment can be charted and/or observed

• **A** Attainable
  – achievable, goal is challenging but realistic

• **R** Relevant
  – results-oriented, in line with institutional goals and library vision

• **T** Timely
  – deadlines are set for accomplishment
Using SMART Goals -- Examples

• 75% of materials acquired from other libraries are received by users within 10 days of request by 4/08
• 50% of new books are on shelf within 5 days after library receipt by 6/08
• 60% courses utilizing WebCT include links to library research materials by 9/08
• Lower the unit cost of each service desk transaction by 10% from FY’08 to FY’09

Versus general goals:
  Improve ILL turn-around time
  Make new materials accessible to users more quickly
  Decrease staffing budget

Goal: ____________________________

Objective: ____________________________

Initiative: ____________________________

PMI\Target: ____________________________

Measure: Green = ____________________________

          Yellow = ____________________________

          Red = ____________________________

SMART

• Results-oriented: ____________________________

• Specific: ____________________________

• Accountable: ____________________________

• Measurable: ____________________________

• Time-Bound: ____________________________
Organizational Memory - Access to Data

Welcome to the University of Illinois Library Assessment Website. Assessment is helping our library to be more responsive. The Services Advisory Committee is overseeing assessment activities and welcomes your suggestions.

**FACTS @ A GLANCE**
UIUC Library unit annual reports by fiscal year and University of Illinois quick facts

**ARL COMPARISON STATISTICS**
ARL resources including statistical annual reports, publications and comparative graphs and tables

**LIBRARY SURVEYS**
Library surveys including introductory documents, recent student and faculty surveys, LibQUAL+ and user surveys

**DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIES**
Check out statistical information being collected by departmental libraries

**WEB RESOURCES & TOOLS**
Online tools to assist in the research process of compiling statistics and forming surveys, includes survey builder tools

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**
Readings on assessment, books on survey research methods and related Library faculty publications

[http://library.uiuc.edu/assessment/](http://library.uiuc.edu/assessment/)
Organizational Memory - Access to Data

Tools and Data

- **E-resource Tracking** (use measures for e-journals, databases, and other electronic resources)
- **Selected Counter Data** (the interface loads slowly)
- **Gate Counts**
- **Photocopier & Printer Use**
- **Image Collection Use** (maintenance in progress)
- **E-resource Benchmark** (new entry page monitor)
- **BorrowDirect Data Repository**
- **EZBorrow Data Repository**
- **Public Web Log Analytics**

Research & Instructional Services

- **Annual Data Collection**
- **2004 Library Quality/Impact Survey**
- **2002 Library Quality/Impact Survey**
- **Graduate Student Workshops**
- **Annual Survey of Who Asks Questions Where**
- **Library Staff Census** (under construction)

http://metrics.library.upenn.edu/prototype/datafarm/
Assessment can…

• Support decision making
• Establish accountability
• Strengthen organizational mission, goals, and objectives
• Realign library goals and mission statements with the needs of users
• Identify trends in user behaviors and technology
• Measure learning outcomes and impact
• Improve programs and services
What’s in a word?

What makes a quality library?

“Quality much like beauty is in the eye of the beholder”
What’s in a “Library”?

A word is not crystal, transparent and unchanged; it is the skin of a living thought, and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and time in which it is used.

--Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes
Interpreting Data

$1 + 1 = 2$
Thank you

• Steve Hiller
  hiller@u.washington.edu

• Martha Kyrillidou
  martha@arl.org