

Cleveland State University
University Library

Program: Collection Development

**Assessment Report
May 2007**

Introduction

The Library reports on assessment activities for three programs: Access to Information Resources, Collection Development, and Library Instruction and Information Literacy. This report covers assessment of the **Collection Development** program.

The **Library collection** exists within the framework created by the mission of the University and the mission of the Library. With these statements in mind, the mission of Collection Management is to create the best possible collection of resources given available financial resources. The net result of the collection policy will be a lean but strong on-site collection that can meet the entry-level needs of faculty and students for information resources. In addition to the on-site collection, the Library depends on its web site with such pages as Virtual Reference and the Subject Portals to provide online, full text access to many journals and specialized databases. The Library also is a founding member of OhioLINK and in 2005 began to engage in additional partnerships to provide resources to the CSU community.

The Library is committed to acquiring, developing, and preserving **special collections** that focus on the business, cultural, industrial, and social history of the Cleveland regional area. The Cleveland Memory web site is maintained as the premier site in the Greater Cleveland area for electronic access to regional history resources.

There have been continued improvements in the assessment of library programs during the year. The alignment of assessment with the library's strategic planning process that was put into place in 2006 continues. The data collected and analyzed through the assessment process has become a central component of the planning process. A new head of Collection Management was appointed in Spring 2007, whose responsibilities included chairing the Collection Development Assessment Team. The team continues with the responsibility for assessment in two of the Library's program areas and for the assessment of the Collection Management program. The team reviewed and incorporated feedback from the *2006 Assessment Review* into its assessment plan. The complete cycle of research, findings, review, and actions has not yet been completed for all outcome measures. An example of this pertains to the focus groups that were held in Spring 2007. The findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08.

Goals

The Library Management Team (now, with an expanded membership, called Library Council) developed the goals in 2002. The format of the goals was modified in 2003 following a review by the Office of Assessment. The goals have not changed since.

Goal 1 Support student learning and faculty research by enhancing collections.

Goal 2 Support student learning, faculty research, and community outreach by developing special collections.

Outcomes

The outcomes were developed by various library units in 2002, then reviewed and agreed upon by the Library Council. Following a review by the Office of Assessment, the Library made slight modification to the format of the outcomes in 2003. In 2006/07, the Assessment Team added an outcome measure to Goal 1 (Students have increased access to, and use of, electronic resources, such as e-journals and e-books). The team deleted two outcomes from Goal 2 (Size of Special Collections books collection increases by 150 books per year; and 3 new curricular resources are developed each year through partnerships with faculty and outside institutions), which were less applicable and replaced with a new qualitative outcome measure. The new qualitative outcome measure states “Special Collections meets the curricular research needs of faculty and students”.

The outcomes for each goal can be found on the accompanying *Program Assessment Report* grid.

Research Methods

The Library staff outlined the research methods in 2002. The LibQUAL+ survey, conducted in 2002, 2003, 2005, and again in Spring 2007, is one of the important research tools used to measure perceived level of satisfaction with the Library collection. “LibQUAL+(TM) is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users’ opinions of service quality... The program’s centerpiece is a rigorously tested Web-based survey bundled with training that helps libraries assess and improve library services, change organizational culture, and market the Library.”

In Spring 2007, focus groups were used to gather information for both goals. Four sessions were held, with one session focusing on Special Collections. The findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08.

More specific information about the research for each goal can be found on the accompanying *Program Assessment Report* grid.

Findings

Preliminary data from the 2007 LibQUAL+ survey show that students and faculty did think that the quality of the collection has improved since 2005. The final and complete results of

the 2007 LiQUAL+ survey will not be available until August, 2007. Four focus groups sessions were held in March, 2007. Findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08.

A recommendation from the 2006 Assessment Report was specifically targeting special collections to 'solicit student feedback on the impact of special collections on their learning or research'. One of the focus group sessions that was held specifically for special collections included students. Findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08.

Review

In 2006/07, the Library Director, collection management librarians, and the Collection Management Assessment Team reviewed the assessment reports. The Library Council and the Faculty Senate Library Committee also reviewed the assessment report for the collection development program.

Actions

The library continued to take many actions to improve collections and access to them. Continuing actions included inventory of the collection, a formal collaboration with the Law Library to reduce duplication and enhance catalog records, purchasing additional online resources and improving access to online journals, and stack maintenance. There has been a continued increase in the amount of the materials budget devoted to online resources, including subject-specific websites, electronic course reserves, and streaming video and audio. Recent new collaborations with Cleveland Public Library were expanded to include resources for Mideast Studies and a popular magazine collection. In Special Collections, the library staff continues to work with faculty and community partners, including the Cuyahoga County Public Library, to create new content pertinent to the curriculum and the community resulting in increase in use of the Cleveland Memory website.

Additional information about *actions* for each goal can be found on the accompanying *Program Assessment Report* grid.



| | |
|---|--|
| Program: <u>Collection Development</u> | Completed By: <u>Carol T. Zsulya & Team</u> |
| Department: <u>University Library</u> | Date: <u>May 31, 2007</u> |

Goal 1: Support student learning and faculty research by enhancing collections

| Outcomes | Research Methods | Findings | Review | Actions |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Faculty's and students' perceived level of service will be equal to or greater than the level of service reported in aggregate by all 4 year universities in Ohio under the "Information Control" (previously called "Access to Information") section of the LibQUAL+ survey. | LibQUAL+ Survey administered in Spring 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2007. | Preliminary results of the Spring 2007 LibQUAL+ Survey are positive; however, final results not available until August, 2007. | Reviewed by Library Council, the Library's Collection Development Assessment Team. Beginning in 2006/2007, library assessment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Library Committee. | Continue inventory of the collection; collaborating with law library to reduce duplication and enhance catalog records; cataloging all government documents in both the law and university libraries; continue to improve stack maintenance; continue to help students find materials on shelves. |
| Percent of materials budget spent on electronic resources will increase by 2% per year. | 7/1/02, repeated 7/1/03, 7/1/04, 7/1/05, 7/1/06 | FY01: 37.7%; FY02: 42.5%; FY03: 43.5%; FY04: 49.7%; FY05: 59.0%; FY06: 80% | Reviewed by Library Council, the Library's Collection Development Assessment Team. Beginning in 2006/2007, library assessment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Library Committee. | There has been a continued steady increase in the amount of the materials budget devoted to online resources, making more resources available from home & office in a format preferred by students and faculty. |



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| In focus groups and meetings, graduate students and faculty will judge the quality of the collection to be improved in selected disciplines. | Focus groups conducted in Spring 2007 for faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students and users of the Special Collections. | Better communication of collection development policy mentioned by all; faculty and graduate students did think the quality of the collection had improved. Findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08. | Will be reviewed by Library Council, the Collection Development Assessment Team, Library Faculty Senate Committee, and the Collection Management librarians and faculty liaisons. | Focus group report finalized in early FY08 and further improvements and actions based on the findings. 5 librarians now work in colleges/departments to work more closely with faculty and students on collections and services (4 librarians worked in colleges/departments in 2006.) |
| Use of the collection will increase by total of 10% over 3 years through collaborations and refocusing expenditures for resources. | The baseline measurement from June 2005 is 325,119 annual circulations and 90,226* in-house uses; June 2006 is 310,506 annual circulations and 82,950 in-house uses. *erroneously reported as 1,204,346 in 2006 Assessment Report | While collecting and analyzing collection use, a shift has been identified from a majority of print resources to increased number of electronic resources and increasing usage by students. Analysis of print and electronic resources will be discussed in FY08. | Reviewed by Library Council, the Collection Development Assessment Team, Library Faculty Senate Committee, and the Collection Management librarians. | Cleveland Public Library (CPL) now supplies popular reading materials to CSU; collaboration with CPL for resources on Mideast Studies and popular magazines. |
| Students have increased access to, and use of, electronic resources, such as e-journals and e-books. (new outcome measure) | The baseline measurement for use of electronic resources from June 2006 is 141,076 e-journals; 4,679 e-books (one vendor); and 432,283 e-databases. | New outcome measure – no findings yet. | Reviewed by Library Council, the Collection Development Assessment Team, Library Faculty Senate Committee, and the Collection Management librarians. | After collecting and gathering data, additional types of electronic resources identified, including subject-specific websites, electronic course reserves, and streaming video and audio; these resources will become part of the assessment process in FY08. |



| Goal 2: Support student learning, faculty research, and community outreach by developing special collections | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Outcomes | Research Methods | Findings | Review | Actions |
| Size of Cleveland Memory website increases by 3,000 images per year | Number of images were counted annually | Cleveland Memory contained 19,457 images in May 2006; 23,553 images in May 2007 which was an increase of over 4,000 images from May 2006 to May 2007. | Reviewed by Library Council, the Library's Collection Development Assessment Team, and Special Collections department. Beginning in 2006/2007, library assessment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Library Committee. | Large number of images added to existing Cleveland Memory websites was the primary force in increased size including images added to Yesterday's Lakewood, the Walter Leedy postcard collection and a new page for Cleveland Ethnographic Museum. |
| Use of Cleveland Memory website increases by 5% per year | The Library's software package to record web use statistics (implemented in 2005) provided the baseline measure for calendar year 2005 for the Cleveland Memory website: 2,099,058 'hits on pages' and 898,168 'total visiting users'; increase in both statistics in calendar year 2006: 2,158,213 'hits on pages' and 1,153,245 'total visiting users'. | In the 2006 Assessment Review, the 2005 calendar year statistics provided were for a portion of Cleveland Memory (Content DM database): 7,169 'hits on pages' and 91,929 'total visiting users'. The Team determined that, to best reflect the stated outcome, statistics for use of all of the Cleveland Memory would be stated. | Reviewed by Library Council, the Library's Collection Development Assessment Team, and Special Collections department. Beginning in 2006/2007, library assessment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Library Committee. | Outreach and collaboration with community organizations were the key reasons in the large increase use of Cleveland Memory, i.e., Cuyahoga County Public Library. In FY08, the Assessment Team will review all available statistics in the software package that would insure that all relevant statistics would be included and analyzed. |
| Special Collections meets the curricular research needs of faculty and students (new outcome measure) | Focus group held in Spring, 2007; findings are currently being finalized and will be discussed in early FY08. | New outcome measure – no findings yet. | Will be reviewed by Library Council, the Library's Collection Development Assessment Team, and Special Collections department. Beginning in 2006/2007, library assessment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Library Committee. | Further improvements and actions based on findings of focus group including user satisfaction survey planned in upcoming FY08. |