Assessment Work Team Meeting
August 10, 2016
Essence Notes


We reviewed the first draft of an institutional effectiveness plan for FY17. We agreed to clarify that our efforts to enhance the quality of our public service would not be restricted to the Learning Commons and Circulation Desks. A concern was raised as to whether our performance target should be “will meet or exceed” or just “will exceed” LibQUAL+ 2016 scores, since just “meeting” those scores would not be an improvement. There was extended discussion about making the plan’s LibQUAL+ performance category objectives targets “improved 2019 scores, compared to 2016 scores”, instead of trying to document improvement in non-LibQUAL+ years. Some intervening data collection should be done to ensure the implementation strategy is being carried out as planned, but to ensure the performance scores being compared are not “apples vs. oranges” we should use the same measurement tool, i.e., LibQUAL+, to determine if there has been improvement. We also re-worded several proposed objectives, and considered how our plan might measure our efforts to communicate student concerns about matters not directly under our control, e.g., parking opportunities close to the library.

The team hopes to investigate whether it is feasible and worth the expense to contract with the Association of Research Libraries for their MINES survey. ARL’s website describes MINES as follows:

As libraries implement access to electronic resources through portals, collaborations, and consortial arrangements, the Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services (MINES) for Libraries protocol offers a convenient way to collect information from users in an environment where they no longer need to physically enter the library in order to access resources. MINES for Libraries adapts a long-established methodology to account for the use of information resources in the digital environment. The survey is based on methods developed to determine the indirect costs of conducting grant-funded R&D activities. The survey is administered for one year, in a short, random period each month at the time of user access. MINES for Libraries has been implemented in several libraries in Canada and the United States of America. For more information, see http://www.arl.org/focus-areas/statistics-assessment/mines-for-libraries

The team also hopes to develop a formula for calculating the return on investment value of funding to the library. One institution, the University of West Florida, uses a formula that shows for every dollar invested in UWF’s Pace Library, the university received $7.60 in return value.

Jeff Mortimore distributed some goals for web usability testing in FY17:
- Collaborate with CEIT faculty to continue class-based usability testing of the Library website.
- Through the Library’s Ongoing Usability Study, conduct one or more testing cycles to evaluate whether updates approved by the Library faculty during FY16 have enhanced access to, and utilization of, resources and services.
- Through the Library’s Ongoing Usability Study, conduct a baseline study of the top right-hand column of the Library homepage pursuant to coordinating content and links throughout the column.
- Through the Library’s Ongoing Usability Study, expand evaluation of page layout prototypes pursuant to further updating the Library website’s interior pages.
- Complete all Ongoing Usability Study testing cycles prior to the November 2016 IRB renewal deadline, at which time the Assessment Work Team will evaluate whether to continue with the current protocol.
- Develop questions and conduct focus group activities with the Faculty Senate Library Committee to solicit faculty feedback on updates approved during FY16.

The next meeting will be September 12 at 4pm.