

Assessment Team Progress Report
January – March 2017

1. Progress on Pilot Assessment Strategies:
 - A. Comparing checkout statistics to GPA and other student success measures; broken down by college and major.
 - a. Progress: 1) IR provided preliminary results in February. This second analysis did show some correlation to GPA for students. CASL and CECS students who had accessed electronic resources from off-campus (the only data we had for 2015-16) also had slightly higher GPAs.
 - b. Next: 1) IR is meeting with the implementation team in April 2017 to discuss results. 2) Based on a presentation from a Grand Valley State University librarian, IR was asked to analyze data as it pertains to retention, not GPA. GVSU was able to show significant differences when they compared the library's effect on retention, rather than GPA
 - B. Assessing building usage by specific areas/ tasks being performed
 - a. Progress: 1) Surveys are being taken during the winter semester. A student assistant completes the survey, walking the building, counting use of various spaces and furniture options, as well as usage of various technology options.
 - b. Next: 1) Analyze the data to determine what areas and technology options are being used. Data cannot be broken down by college/major since we do not interact with the students using the building.
 - C. Identifying who accesses electronic resources, broken down by college and major
 - a. Progress: 1) The data was downloaded in Access for easier sorting and analysis. 2) Changed how some data is collected in III, the library automation system.
 - b. Next: 1) 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 (GPA, retention).
 - D. Assessing use of resources in research bibliographies from faculty publications, student theses, and/or capstone projects.
 - a. Progress: 1) Staff members compared bibliographies of 14 students' dissertations, to determine if the resources cited are offered by the library.
 - b. Next: 1) Theses/dissertations from other areas need to be obtained for comparison, as well as some faculty publications and students' capstone projects.

- E. Assessing faculty knowledge of collections and services
 - a. Progress: 1) Staff developed a faculty survey about library services. The survey was conducted in February 2017.
 - b. Next: 1) Analyze the results.

- F. Comparing GPA of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction
 - a. Progress: 1) IR compared the GPAs of the two groups of students and found no statistical difference. 2) Based on this finding, IR was asked 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. 3) LRC librarians confirmed that statistics are being kept regarding classes/sections that receive library instruction, not just COMP 106.
 - b. 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 analyzed, 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. IR was asked to compare/analyze the retention rate of the fall 2011 COMP 106 students.

- G. Comparing graduation rates of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction
 - a. 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.
 - b. Next: 1) We will not pursue this strategy.

2. Findings to Date:

- a. Comparing checkout statistics to GPA and other student success measures; broken down by college and major. ***Note: It is important to remember that some statistics provided to IR for this pilot assessment were limited due to problems identified early in the project. Policies and procedures were changed so that more accurate statistics will be available for the 2016/17 academic year.
 - i. GPA: “**Students who checked out one or more books and students who accessed electronic resources one or more times were students who tended to have slightly elevated GPA’s (approximately +0.10)** at their particular student level. However, there were no striking differences between CASL students who tended to have higher library usage levels (3.09 GPA) and COB students who tended to have lower library usage levels (3.04 GPA).”

| Library Usage/GPA Analysis | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|
| Unit | Books Checked Out/GPA | | Electronic Resources Accessed/GPA | | Overall GPA Average by Unit |
| | 0 | 1+ | 0 | 1+ | |
| CASL | 2.98 | 3.12 | 2.99 | 3.16 | 3.09 |
| COB | 3.18 | 3.23 | 3.19 | 3.18 | 3.04 |
| CECS | 3.16 | 3.27 | 3.18 | 3.27 | 3.20 |
| CEHHS | 3.43 | 3.49 | 3.46 | 3.46 | 3.46 |
| Other | 3.05 | 3.27 | 3.03 | 3.46 | 3.19 |
| Overall Average by Library Usage Metric | 3.12 | 3.23 | 3.14 | 3.24 | 3.16 |

- ii. Further IR analysis of checkout data: “The relative distribution of books checked out by unit as compared to the relative distribution of students assessed by unit reveals that **CASL students (37.1% of students) accounted for a greater percentage of library usage (50.8% of books checked out) than expected.** Conversely, **COB students (19.0% of students) accounted for a smaller percentage of library usage (7.7% of books checked out) than expected.** The remaining units had library usage levels that were expected given how many students were in each unit. Furthermore, CASL students, in particular undergraduates, tended to check out more books per student (2.22) and COB students tended to check out fewer books per student (0.66) than the remaining units.”
- iii. Items checked out by college. **CASL students checked out the most items, followed by CECS, CEHHS, COB.** ***Note: Numbers are based on an average number of books checked out by each student (number of total books checked out, divided by the number of months at UM-Dearborn, multiplied by 12). Scripts implemented in September will provide accurate data in the future.

| Number of Items Checked Out | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|------|------|--------------|
| Unit | UG | GR | ELPP | TOTAL (%) |
| CASL | 7895 | 192 | | 8087 (50.8%) |
| COB | 891 | 333 | | 1224 (7.7%) |
| CECS | 2626 | 2047 | | 4673 (29.4%) |
| CEHHS | 1057 | 537 | | 1594 (10%) |
| Other | 322 | 0 | 21 | 343 (2.2%) |
| TOTAL | 12791 | 3109 | 21 | 15921 (100%) |

- iv. The **top majors checking out library materials** (books per student; excluding majors that had only one student) are:
 1. CASL: Art History, History, Anthropology, Humanities, English, Chemistry, Urban & Regional Studies, Public Policy, African & African-American Studies, and French Studies.
 2. COB: Information Systems, Human Resource Management, Business Admin/Ind & Sys Engineering, Business Analytics, Accounting
 3. CECS: Manufacturing Systems Engineering, Automotive Systems Engineering, Bioengineering, Industrial & Systems Engineering, Electrical Engineering
 4. CEHHS: Public Health, Science Studies, Child Life, Public Administration, Teaching

b. Assessing building usage by specific areas/ tasks being performed

- i. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday are the busiest week days. Sunday is consistently the busiest weekend day.
- ii. At the busiest times recorded, there are almost as many people on the 2nd floor as there are on all 3 of the other floors combined.
- iii. When occupied, group study room 2030 averages about 3 people; group study room 2040 averages 3-4 people.
- iv. The white noise system seems to be doing its job, except at extremely busy times of the day

c. Identifying who accesses electronic resources (only off-campus access statistics available at this time); broken down by college and major. ***Note: Data is very limited: we only know whether or not a student accessed an electronic resource from off-campus. We do not know how many times resources were accessed, and we do not have major information at this time.

- i. **CASL is the largest user of resources, followed by CECS, COB, and CEHHS.**

| Unit | Did not access # (%) | Accessed # (%) | Total |
|-------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| CASL | 2700 (34.9%) | 941 (45.4%) | 3641 (37.1%) |
| COB | 1667 (21.5%) | 196 (9.5%) | 1863 (19.0%) |
| CECS | 2339 (30.2%) | 643 (31%) | 2982 (30.4 %) |
| CEHHS | 723 (9.3%) | 244 (11.8%) | 967 (9.9%) |
| Other | 308 (4%) | 48 (2.3%) | 356 (3.6%) |
| TOTAL | 7737 (78.9%) | 2072 (21.1%) | 9809 (100%) |

- d. Assessing use of resources in research bibliographies from faculty publications, student theses/dissertations and/or capstone projects.
- i. 14 theses/dissertations were analyzed; percentages reflect bibliographic citations available through library resources

| College/Degree | Number of Bibliographies For College | Number of Bibliographies for Degree | % of Resources Available through Library For College | % of Resources Available through Library for Degree |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| CECS | 5 | | 70.2% | |
| Autom. Sys Eng | | 3 | | 73.5% |
| Info. Systems Eng | | 2 | | 68% |
| | | | | |
| CEHHS | 9 | | 64.3% | |
| Curric & Practice | | 4 | | 57.5% |
| Educ Leadership | | 1 | | 80% |
| Metropolitan Educ | | 2 | | 60.5% |
| Special Educ | | 2 | | 74% |
| | | | | |

- e. Assessing faculty knowledge of collections and services
- i. Survey conducted in February 2017; data to be compiled and analyzed
- f. Comparing GPA of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction.
- i. No statistical difference found.
- ii. IR asked to compare retention rates for these groups of students.
- g. Comparing graduation rates of students who have in-class instruction in COMP 106 vs. students in sections who do not receive instruction.
- i. Assessment strategy will not be pursued based on IR recommendation.