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Part I: Collection-Centered Approach
Objectives

- Understand the concept of collection assessment
- Recognize the benefits of assessing the collection
- Learn the different ways/methods of assessing the collection
- Implement an initial basic assessment of the library collection in the future
**Assessment vs. Evaluation**

**Evaluation**
How well the collection meets the demands of the community

**USE/UTILITY** of the collection

**Assessment**
Focuses on the collection’s purpose and how well it meets its purpose

**QUALITY** of the collection
“Assessment, like cooking, is something of an art with a creative dash of qualitative and quantitative data crunching for texture and flavor.”

- Aaron Dobbs
  Editor,
  The Library Assessment Cookbook, 2017
The **systematic** evaluation of the **quality** of a library collection to determine the extent to which it **meets** the library's service **goals** and **objectives** and the **information needs** of its clientele (ODLIS, 2014).
Why Perform Assessment? *(Nutrition Information)*

- If the collection is meeting its objectives
- How well it is serving the users
- Determine the strengths and weaknesses of the collection
- Allocate funds
- Selectors performing responsibility
When to Perform Assessment? (Cooking Time)

Policy or Legal Requirement
- Accreditation Purposes
- Part of Collection Development Policy
- Funding Cycle

Planning
- Goals (Short-term & Long-term)
- Take stock of what the current collection is doing

Need for information
- Size/Age of the Collection
- Cost/Expenditure per Subject Area
- Usage
- Unmet client needs
Data Used/Obtained from Assessment (*Ingredients*)

**Qualitative Data**
- How well?
- How satisfied?
- Why?

**Quantitative Data**
- How many?
- How much?
- How often?
Types of Assessment
*(Cooking Techniques)*

- **Collection-Centered**
- **User/Client-Centered**
Collection Profiling

Deals the **numerical picture** of the collection such as count by class letters/numbers and imprint years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L 2017</th>
<th>L 2018</th>
<th>L 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List Checking

- Compares collection to a standardized or authoritative list;
- Tedious and time-consuming;
- **2 key points**: Selecting the List / Doing the Checking

Balangue, J. (2014). The DLSU Libraries’ Print Book Collection on Education: An Assessment
Expert Appraisal

- Requires an **outside subject specialist** to evaluate the collection
- Hiring consultants
- Brings a **fresh perspective** in the collection
- Difficulty in looking for expert
- Lack of understanding
- Subjective

**Basic Steps**
- Ensure clear understanding of the expert’s responsibility
- Establish check points
- Acknowledge contribution
- Make use of other techniques to provide compelling results
- Report results
Shelf Scanning / Direct Analysis

Physically examining the books on the shelves directly & depending on the evaluation goal, draws some conclusion of the collection’s condition, scope, relevance or appropriateness

• Quick, on-the-spot process that can give instant data on collection strengths and weaknesses
• Helps to identify material that needs to be discarded, replaced or repaired
• Only able to evaluate what is currently on the shelf
Collection Mapping

- Shows what has been achieved and what needs attention to match collection development plan
- **A system to match collection strengths to population needs**

Segments

- **Basic** emphasis (e.g. History)
- **General** emphasis (e.g. History of Kazakhstan)
- **Specific** emphasis (e.g. History of Kazakhstan during the Soviet Times)
Citation Analysis

- Variation of the checklist method that creates a **specialized list from cited references**.
- Compiles list of bibliographies cited in a scholarly work.

- Easier to conduct;
- Presents referencing behavior of the users;
- Subjective;
- Tedious and time consuming;
- Not all students and faculty writes research
Comparative Statistics

• Information about collection sizes, expenditures and use
• **Comparing statistics to a peer or model collection (benchmark)**

• Can be easily obtained due to requirements
• Can be used to present quantitative data to stakeholders
• **Prone to human error**, lack of attention to detail, conflicting terms (“garbage in, garbage out”)
• Cautious that a fair comparison exists
Applying Standards

- Quick and easy tool to see how a collection measures up to what an official body considers critical
- **Adhering/meeting the specifications stipulated in the standard**

- Used as basis in allocating funds, issue accreditations, and awarding grants
- Information can be used to identify things to be done to meet standards
- Standards may be forced upon libraries without any consideration of local issues and challenges
- Standards tend to **encourage mediocrity** by allowing libraries to strive to meet just the barest minimum
The Assessment (Cooking) Process

1. Take stock of your pantry - Identify assessment goals
2. Check expiration date - Determine duration periods
3. Use high-quality ingredients - Determine source of data, responsible persons, and softwares to be used.
4. Beware of “must-have” kitchen gadgets - Try assessment softwares first before investing in them
5. Embrace creativity in the kitchen - Keep local context in mind
6. Presentation is everything - Disseminating results
7. Don’t go crazy - Focus on getting good data and good results will follow

Gudhe, 2017
Sample Collection Assessment Recipe *(Single-Subject Area Assessment by Madeline Kelly, George Mason University, 2017)*

**Nutrition Information:** This recipe was developed as a manageable way to assess specific subject collections comprehensively.

**Cooking Time:** 1-2 months

**Cooking Techniques:** Citation analysis, usage data analysis, user feedback, list checking, counting, and comparison to external benchmarks

**Ingredients:** 15 hrs/week (or less), 1 assessment advocate, 1 adventurous librarian, assorted assessment tools, dedicated funding (optional)
Sample Collection Assessment Recipe *(Single-Subject Area Assessment by Madeline Kelly, George Mason University, 2017)*

Procedures:

- *Preparation:* Set parameters. Identify goals and subject area to be assessed.
- *The Assessment:*
  - Collect the data using various assessment tools.
  - Organize the data in an accessible folder or software.
  - Prepare the final report by identifying the findings, listing out results, try to display results visually, and discuss results to stakeholders. Revise if needed.
  - Take action by taking recommendations as backed up by the results of the assessment.
  - Evaluate the recipe by taking into account what worked well and the challenges encountered along the way. Revise if needed. Repeat the process for the next subject.
Sample Collection Assessment Recipe *(Single-Subject Area Assessment by Madeline Kelly, George Mason University, 2017)*

**Allergy Warnings:** This recipe will be different at every institution, perhaps for every subject assessed. Be sure to set your parameters and prepare the final report with care to ensure a good fit.

**Chef Notes:** Try using various assessment tools to provide more reliable and accurate results. Revise the procedure if needed.
Workshop

Following the recipe above, create your own collection assessment recipe. Identify briefly the following:

a. Nutrition Information
b. Cooking Time
c. Cooking Techniques
d. Ingredients
e. Procedure
f. Allergy Warnings
g. Chef Notes
References


Part II: Client-Centered Approach
Objectives

To enumerate and explain the different approaches in client-centered collection assessment methods;

To educate the participants about the advantages/disadvantages in client-centered collection assessment methods;

To provide basic examples on how to do such approaches.
Outline

- Client-Centered Approach (Frias, 2011)
- Different Approaches

- Circulation Studies
- Resource Sharing Statistics Analysis
- Citation Studies
- User Surveys
- Focus Group Discussions
Client-Centered Approach

- A method of assessment that depends on the inputs coming from the users.
- Focuses on the degree of which the users find the collection useful.

- Users’ perceptions – means how users see the collection; In getting users’ perceptions, patrons may be asked if the collection is to their advantage, of high or low quality, up-to-date or obsolete, and so on.
- Users’ needs – presents how the users see the collection in relation to their research needs.
- What users want – imparts how users see the collection in relation to their area of interests that are not necessary covered by the curriculum.
Circulation Studies

- The way to perform this approach is to cull statistics either from the automated library system or from manual records of the library.

- Transaction Log Analysis (TLA) is the most popular way of conducting research under this approach.

Advantages
Data being studied are objective.

Data obtained may be helpful during the de-selection/weeding process.

Disadvantages
The data may not be complete. Available data may not include circulating materials which were not properly borrowed.

Statistics do not show how the materials were used
Example of Circulation Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1-Q295</td>
<td>Science (General)</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q300-Q399</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>6475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QB</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QE</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QK</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,497</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,982</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,845</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,855</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,603</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,782</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data was analyzed by solving for the mean (average), using the formula:

Percentage of Use per category = \frac{\text{Total Category Usage} \times 100}{\text{Total Usage}}

Average Annual Usage = \frac{\text{Total Usage}}{\text{Total number of years}}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Letter</th>
<th>Subject Category</th>
<th>Total Usage</th>
<th>Use per category (%)</th>
<th>Average Annual Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1-Q295</td>
<td>Science (General)</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>238.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\frac{1194 \times 100}{16,782} = \frac{1194}{5} = 238.8
\]

The data was analyzed by solving for the mean (average), using the formula:

\[
\text{Percentage of Use per category} = \frac{\text{Total Category Usage} \times 100}{\text{Total Usage}}
\]

\[
\text{Average Annual Usage} = \frac{\text{Total Usage}}{\text{Total number of years}}
\]
Resource Sharing Statistics Analysis

- This approach is done by analyzing data from statistics such as:
  - **Referrals** – indicates the adequacy of the collection by means of the number of referrals received and sent by the library.
  - **Document Delivery Service (DDS)** – same as referrals, statistics of document delivery service also indicates the adequacy of the collection.

**Advantages**
- Data is available and recorded.
- Data being studied reflects the real need of the users.

**Disadvantages**
- Resource sharing may be patronized by only a group of users.
Example of Resource Sharing Statistics

Requests by Schools/Departments

- **Unknown**: 34
- **University staff**: 71
- **SSH**: 68
- **SMG**: 52
- **CPS**: 39
- **GSB**: 73
- **GSE**: 83
- **NLA**: 73
- **NUSOM**: 73
- **SEDS**: 274

- Unknown: 4.7%
- University staff: 11.5%
- SSH: 9.4%
- SMG: 7.2%
- CPS: 1.2%
- GSB: 9.8%
- GSE: 10.1%
- NLA: 2.2%
- NUSOM: 5.4%
- SEDS: 37.8%

Figure taken from Reference Department Report 2019
This approach is primarily used on research-level materials such as thesis and journal publications. It evaluates the “fitness” of the collection as against the users’ research needs by matching the references cited by library users in their researches with the resources found in the library. most preferred and dependable approach in evaluating faculty outputs and students’ theses and dissertations.

**Advantages**
- Presents changes in the strengths of collection.
- Has the ability to compare the research habits of the researchers.
- Data being studied are concrete.

**Disadvantages**
- Time consuming and labor intensive.
- Susceptibility to popular trends.
Example of Citation Studies

A total of 500 references were extracted and examined from 10 master’s theses in education. 30% of the theses came from MA Multilingual Education and 70% of the theses came from MS Educational Leadership. Figure 1 shows the distribution of references by type of source.

Figure 1. Pie chart representing the kind of reference sources the student used in their theses. Students cite more journal articles (55%) compared to print books (30%). Only a few students cited thesis and conference proceedings.

http://eadnurt.diit.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/11732/1/Yap.pdf
User Surveys

Uses questionnaires in gathering data and utilizes oral or written responses, as long as these responses are directly coming from the respondents.

**Advantages**
Surveys include the whole academic community in decision-making.

**Disadvantages**
Responses can be subjective.

Past experiences of library patrons can influence their views.
Example of User Studies

The survey asked the respondents to rate the adequacy of the collection from 1 to 5, 5 being the most adequate. The result will be easier to analyze when applied with weighted average. Weighted average is extracted using the formula:

\[
\text{Weighted Average} = \frac{n \times \sum R_n + 5 \times \sum R_5 + 4 \times \sum R_4 + 3 \times \sum R_3 + 2 \times \sum R_2 + \sum R_1}{\sum R_n + \ldots + R_5 + R_4 + R_3 + R_2 + R_1}
\]

Example: Textbooks = \[\frac{137(5)+307(4)+226(3)+87(2)+8}{137+307+226+87+8}\]

\[\frac{2773}{765} = 3.62\]
Focus Group Discussions

- Focus group discussion is composed of a small number of people (usually between 4 and 15, but typically 8) brought together with a moderator to focus on a specific topic.

- Focus groups aim at a discussion instead of individual responses to formal questions.

Advantages
Explores the depth and degrees of opinions regarding an issue.

Explains differences in perspectives between fellow respondents

Disadvantages
Needs facilitating skills on the part of the researcher.

Participants may be very sensitive about certain issues.
**APPENDIX A**

Questions posed

- How do you use the library?
- How do you see your information needs changing?
- What will you need from the library in the next five years?
- What are your frustrations in using the library?
- Do you have any other advice for us?


EXERCISE

Find this article online: http://unilibnse.diit.edu.ua/article/view/186961
(An article will be sent in the chat box)
Access our A-Z Journal List: [https://nu.kz.libguides.com/Journals](https://nu.kz.libguides.com/Journals) (Link will be sent in the chat box)
- Go to the references list of the article. How many references were used by the authors?

- From this list, how many came from journals?

- Find the journal titles using the online journal title list.

- How many journal titles were found?

- How many journal titles were not found?

- Do you think we have a strong collection?
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