

Mardigian Library
Assessment Team Progress Report
July - September 2016

1. The Assessment Implementation Team attended several webinars about academic library assessment.
2. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) application was submitted and reviewed in Ann Arbor. Our research was designated as exempt from further IRB review. Staff will be able to write articles about assessment findings, present at conferences, etc.
3. The team implemented several of the assessment strategies and is currently conducting/planning other strategies. Institutional Research (IR) staff conducted several pilot assessments, pulling Banner data and analyzing the results. Team members met with IR staff to discuss findings and refine strategies further. Progress for each strategy is listed below.

NOTE: No data sets include unique identifiers, such as the UMID, so that identifying a specific individual is not possible and privacy is maintained. IR worked with us to pull student data, remove unique identifiers, and compare/analyze results.

Pilot assessment strategies:

1. Comparing checkout statistics to GPA and other student success measures; broken down by college and major.
Progress: 1) IR compared the data we sent and found no statistical difference regarding GPA. However, breakdowns by college and major were very interesting. IR suggested we allow them to further analyze the data, which is currently in process.

Next: 1) IR will provide data about who is using the library's physical resources, broken down by college and major.
2. Assessing building usage by specific areas/ tasks being performed
Progress: 1) We created a "walk around" tablet survey and an Excel file to collect and store data. 2) A student assistant tested the survey, walking the building, counting use of various spaces and furniture options, as well as usage of various technology options. 3) The survey has been tweaked and is being tested again.

Next: 1) Finalize the survey. 2) Determine the timeframe for collecting data. 3) Schedule student assistants to conduct the building surveys. 4) Analyze the data to determine what areas and technology options are being used. We will not be able to breakdown the data by college/major since we are not interacting with students using the building.

3. Identifying who accesses electronic resources, broken down by college and major
- Progress: 1) We had no statistics about on-campus access of electronic resources, and very little statistics about off-campus usage. We only knew if a student or faculty member had access an electronic resource from off-campus at least one time during the academic year. 2) Staff created scripts to collect statistics about both on and off campus usage of electronic databases. 3) Collecting these statistics required implementing an authorization procedure, regardless of whether or not the person was on or off campus. 4) The scripts and authorization procedure were implemented in early to mid-September.

Next: 1) We need to analyze one or two months of data this fall to ensure we are collecting the statistics we want. 2) Data will be collected for the academic year and analyzed by college/major. 3) Data will be included in the analysis comparing use of physical resources with student success measures (assessment #1).

4. Assessing use of resources in research bibliographies from faculty publications, student theses, and/or capstone projects.

Progress: 1) A staff member compared the bibliographies of some students' theses to the resources offered by the library.

Next: 1) Theses from other areas need to be obtained for comparison, as well as some faculty publications and students' capstone projects. 2) Data from the various comparisons needs to be analyzed and broken down by college/major.

5. Assessing faculty knowledge of collections and services

Progress: 1) Staff are meeting to discuss the survey questions and process.

Next: 1) Develop a test survey, get feedback from other library staff, test the survey, and conduct the survey during the fall semester.

6. Comparing GPA of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction

Progress: 1) IR compared the GPAs of the two groups of students and found no statistical difference. 2) Based on this finding, we asked IR to compare the GPAs of the COMP 106 students who had librarian led instruction with students who received library instruction from their faculty member. Again, IR found no statistical difference.

Next: 1) At a recent webinar, Grand Valley State University (GVSU) presented data from four years of their library assessment. A key finding was that for each of the four years, students who had received library instruction had a 4% or greater rate of enrolling for the following academic year, thus showing a correlation between library instruction and retention. We will discuss asking IR to compare/analyze the retention rate of the fall 2011 COMP 106 students. 2) We need to be sure statistics are being kept regarding classes/sections that receive library instruction, not just COMP 106.

7. Comparing graduation rates of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction

Progress: 1) When meeting with IR staff, we discussed performing this type of analysis. IR felt that this analysis would not yield valid results due to the many factors influencing graduation rates.

Next: 1) We will not pursue this strategy. 2) Based on the webinar presentation by GVSU staff, we will discuss asking IR to compare/analyze the retention rate of the fall 2011 COMP 106 students. 3) We need to be sure statistics are being kept regarding classes/sections that receive library instruction, not just COMP 106.